Reverend J. Edkins, D.D.
Presented by
his friend
Tanabe
Feb. 22nd 1892
Peking

GENGHIS KHAN.

THE IDENTITY

OF THE GREAT CONQUEROR

GENGHIS KHAN

WITH THE

JAPANESE HERO YOSHITSUNÉ

An Historical Thesis.

BY

K. SUYEMATZ,

Of Japan.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR BY

W. H. AND L. COLLINGRIDGE, ALDERSGATE STREET, E.C.

1879.

ON THE

IDENTITY OF GENGHIS KHAN

WITH THE

JAPANESE HERO YOSHITSUNÉ.

PART I.

In theorising on the many wonderful phenomena connected with the history of the different races of mankind, how greatly must we admire the untiring efforts made by the historian to present us with a striking and faithful picture of them; yet how many problems remain still unsolved, which if solved might effect some changes in the philosophy of history, and in the opinions of posterity with regard to those causes and consequences with which such facts are necessarily allied.

The irruption which the powerful Mongols made on our hemisphere in the early part of the thirteenth century, under the leadership of Genghis Khan, spreading dismay and terror among all nations, is one of the great phenomena alluded to, and Gibbon compares it to the primitive convulsions of nature, which have "agitated and altered the surface of the globe," and regards these ruth-

less invaders as an author, immediate or remot
of the fall of the Roman Empire (Eastern).

How little, notwithstanding, is really known of
the origin and the antecedents of this formidable
conqueror. No genuine historian can do mo
than express a single word—*obscure!* It w
some seven years ago that an assertion of th
identity of this conqueror with Minamoto Yoshi
suné, or Gen Ghi-kei in another way of pronunci
tion, a great hero of Japan, who fled thence, at a
epoch just before Genghis Khan began to flouris
was made among the students of Tokio Unive
sity in Japan, warmly supported by Mr. I
House, an American writer, and now editor o
the *Tokio Times*, but owing to the scarcity
evidence, was allowed to rest in abeyance. I a
not one who worships the individuality of any gre
man, since great men often play their part at
head of the public; yet the greatest who ma
them great is the public. Nor am I one who
deavours to glorify his own nation at the expens
the dead, whose relics cannot possibly be more th
a few white bones, for one should do his best
his own day by his own efforts, or not at
Nevertheless, if one saw that any idea of his o
might become a public interest, why should
feel it necessary to hesitate in appealing to pu
criticism? The task I have before me is no ot
than this: I have taken up a question alrea
started, and I hope my labour of careful inqu
and investigation during the last few months n
throw considerable light on the subject, and so
or help to solve a difficult problem involved
the obscurity which hangs over the origin of

greatest of conquerors; and for that success I shall be greatly indebted to the assistance afforded to my researches by the reading-room of the British Museum.

Now it may be scarcely necessary to mention how Yoshitsuné is as well known among the Japanese, as Wellington or Nelson is in England, that it would be difficult to find any one who does not know something about him, or how fierce rivalry raged between the families of Gen or Minamoto, and Hei or Taira, resembling that between the Burgundians and Orleanists in French history; or in another aspect, from their use of the red and white banners, the wars of the Roses in England, and occupying a most interesting portion of Japanese history. But I shall proceed to give a succinct view of the period. The time was December, 1158 A.D., or, if we reckon precisely the number of days according to the present calendar, in the early part of 1159, when the second struggle between the above-mentioned families broke out in Kioto, the then capital, and Yoshitomo, the head of the Gen, was treacherously murdered after his great defeat, his two elder sons both falling by the sword of their enemies after displaying conspicuous valour, and the fortunes of the Gen appeared to be on the brink of ruin.

Then arises a little turning-point in their history. I need not detail how Yoritomo, the third child of Yoshitomo, then thirteen years old, was saved from a perilous captivity at the intercession of the stepmother of Kiyomori, chief of the Hei, who discovering in the youthful Yoritomo the likeness to a son of the same age of whom death

had bereft her, conceived a strong compassion for his misfortunes, pleaded for him, and with difficulty saved his life; that he was afterwards exiled to the province of Idzu, and also that the infant Ushiwaka, afterwards Yoshitsuné, youngest son of Yoshitomo, with his other two child-brothers, afterwards killed, was released by Kiyomori from a most romantic cause.

But perhaps it will be desirable to give here more minute circumstances concerning this matter, because I may have to allude to it hereafter. There is no need, however, to picture these in any new form; it will be sufficient to quote from Mr. Griffis, an American, author of a work entitled, 'The Mikado's Empire.'

"Tokiwa was a young girl of humble birth and surpassing beauty, whom Yoshitomo had made his mistress, and who bore him three children. She fled to escape the minions of the Hei. Her flight was in the winter, and snow lay on the ground. She knew neither where to go nor how to subsist; but clasping her babe to her bosom, and with her two little sons by her side, one holding his mother's hand, the other carrying his father's sword, trudged on. That babe at her breast was Yoshitsuné, a name that awakens in the breast of Japanese youth emotions which kindle his enthusiasm to emulate a character which was the mirror of chivalrous valour and knightly conduct, and which sadden it when it thinks of one who suffered such a cruel end at the hands of a jealous brother. Yoshitsuné, the youngest son of Yoshitomo, lives and will live in the minds of young Japan as the Bayard of their country.

Kiyomori, intoxicated by success, conceived the plan of exterminating the Gen, root and branch. Not knowing where Tokiwa and her children had fled, he seized her mother, and had her brought to Kioto. In Japan, as in China, filial affection forms the strongest tie. Kiyomori well knew that Tokiwa's sense of a daughter's duty would prevail over that of a mother's love or womanly fear: he expected Tokiwa to save her mother."

Then he goes on to show how Tokiwa at last found a refuge, and how, when the report of her mother's seizure reached her ears, the fierce struggle between filial and maternal love dis tracted her bosom, and how at last she sought the court of Kiyomori and surrendered herself and children; how Kiyomori was dazzled by her beauty; how at first she utterly rejected his proposals, till her mother, weeping floods of tears, rent her heart and constrained her to yield to Kiyomori's wicked passion, on condition of his sparing her offspring. Such is a strange repetition in our history of Marc Antony blinded by the charms of Cleopatra. The children were sent separately to the monasteries on Mount Kurama and others, to be brought up, and in due time to be made monks.

Then comes the most glorious time of the Hei; but this prosperity could not be expected to last long, since Yoritomo and his youngest half-brother were not boys to content themselves without looking back to the past, and onward, in their dreams of the future. My readers may easily imagine how Ushiwaka employed his time in mental culture by day, and in bodily exercises by night,

while he resided on Mount Kurama, and how his energy and restless habits became a source of trouble to the monks; how he refused to be consecrated, and to submit to the tonsure. It is also well enough known how, when he was sixteen years old, he tried to escape from the monastery to seek future fields of desperate adventure, and how he became acquainted with a dealer in iron, of Oshiu, who came among others to visit the monastery for the purpose of worship, and ran away with this man and another companion to the above place, in order to get admittance into the camp of the prince of Oshiu, which region was something like what Scotland was in old time to England, and its prince was the only one in the empire independent of the Hei's influence; and also how he displayed his fearless courage on his way to Oshiu by capturing and killing a certain Kumasaka Chiohan, a well-known desperate robber, and his band, who infested these places; and how he was warned by his companion of the danger of attracting public notice by indulging in these unnecessary displays of daring; and how from this epoch he assumed his title-name Minamoto Yoshitsuné, or Gen Ghi-kei, and was most kindly received by the said prince, who fully appreciated the ability of his guest, and assisted him in his preparation for his future career. In the meantime, Yoritomo, the elder half-brother of Yoshitsuné, also a man of great talent, had not been idle in his exile. In the autumn of A.D. 1180, he raised the white banner in revenge against the Hei, and though at the outset he was unsuccessful, still maintained his ground

against the overwhelming power of his enemies, and shortly after the tide began to turn in his favour. At this juncture, he was joined by his youngest and most admirable half-brother Yoshitsuné from Oshiu, then only about twenty years old, who had refused to listen to the persuasions of the prince of that province to assert his cause separately, and promising him his powerful support. From this date the youthful Yoshitsuné took the principal command—offered him by his brother, who fully understood his military genius —of their assembled and daily-increasing armies.

Here commence Napoleonic wars in our history, though naturally on a much smaller scale, steering the way to future great social changes; that is to say, the transfer of the imperial authority to the military government of the Shogunate, and Mr. Griffis, the author I have previously referred to, compares the relative position of Yoshitsuné to Yoritomo, with that of Ney to Napoleon; but this, I think, can hardly be justifiable, since Ney was only a subordinate commander in the great campaigns fought by Napoleon himself; but the entire warlike operations of Yoritomo's army were practically carried on by Yoshitsuné, while the former, though nominally holding the chief command, actually only administered the government in his capital, Kamakura; in other words, the military *rôle* of Napoleon was played by Yoshitsuné; whereas Yoritomo, devoting himself to the study of political organisation, a study which in time brought Napoleon to the throne, also made the former the virtual ruler of the country. And, moreover, this comparison is further untenable when

we take into account that Ney, though brave, was little else than a soldier, but that Yoshitsuné's great capacity for organisation is indisputable. Yoshitsuné now marched on westward at the head of a large army, and first of all overcame his cousin, Yoshinaka, who had raised his standard in the same cause against the Hei, but independently in Kiso, which was nearer to Kioto than the position held by Yoritomo and Yoshitsuné, which latter City he had captured, being also a man of ability in military science, so much so that he was named among the people "The marshal of the rising sun;" but who, being unable to keep up the necessary discipline among his troops in the intervals of fighting, fell into general contempt, and became an object of fear to the Imperial court, and eventually the enemy of the jealous Yoritomo.

Soon after this took place the battles of Yichi-no-tani, Ya-shima, and finally that of Dan-no-ura, in which the Hei were thoroughly routed. During the whole course of these events Yoshitsuné's military talents became conspicuous; in fact, his strategics have never been surpassed by anyone throughout the whole course of Japanese history of more than two thousand years. It will not be necessary to recite here all his famous exploits; suffice it to say that his military fame among the Japanese is in no wise less than that of Buonaparte in France, and Marlborough in England. But the stronghold of the traditional military centre of Kuanto (Ultramontane provinces) had been grasped and retained by the strong hand of Yoritomo, as we have said before, who already

began to assume the position of ruler *de facto*, although Yoshitsuné, residing in the Emperor's capital, was treated with distinction, and, in some respects, enjoyed higher honour than his brother. And it need not be a matter of surprise if, when Napoleon had, in a similar manner, seized the governing power of the French people, he began to fear his brother Lucien, who had once been his ablest supporter, or that William III. dreaded Marlborough even before the latter had achieved his greatness; and in this respect we find Yoritomo, in the same way, influenced by the like ungenerous feelings, and these sentiments had, moreover, been fostered by the deceit of Kajiwara, who had been sent by Yoritomo as superintendent of war, but whose dilatory counsels had always been superseded by the vivid intelligence of Yoshitsuné, and who became, for this reason, his personal enemy, and a most miserable fate befell the latter, who had already resigned his command, but who was now compelled to resist by force of arms rather than perish by the treacherous attacks of the emissaries of his once loved brother, and though he obtained the favour of the Imperial Court against that brother, yet found his position so insecure, that he was constrained to leave Kioto, greatly regretted by the inhabitants of that city, where he had firmly established peace and order, for the purpose of raising fresh troops.

Here I must not omit to make a remark on this subject: I mean, it would be idle to suppose that one had been less active and daring than the other, but the latter was more sagacious than the former

in devising plans for the future usurpation of the ruling power; and to show the opinion of posterity on the comparative merits of these two great characters, I will again quote from Mr. Griffis, who, as a foreigner, will probably be impartial in his opinion:—

"Yoritomo is looked upon as one of the ablest rulers and greatest generals that ever flourished in Japan; yet, while all acknowledge his consummate ability, many regard him as a cruel tyrant and a selfish and heartless man; certain it is that the splendour of Yoritomo's career has never blinded the mind of posterity to his selfishness and cruelty, and though, like Napoleon, he has had his eulogists, yet the example held up to posterity and for the imitation of youth is that of Yoshitsuné—not that of Yoritomo."

Yoshitsuné unfortunately suffered shipwreck on his voyage to Kushiu, which caused the dispersion of a small band of his followers, but landed with some of his most devoted friends on the coast of Daimotsu. Then, omitting all the intervening incidents, we come to the most marvellous escape of this small party from the very midst of their watchful foes, and their arrival once more in safety at the province of his old friend the prince of Oshiu. Throughout these sad vicissitudes and sufferings we may see how Saito Benkei and Washinoo Saburo and others were most faithful and attached to him; how Hidehira welcomed him once more so heartily, that he would have placed all his military force and fortune at Yoshitsuné's disposal. But soon a great blow fell on Yoshitsuné by the death of Hidehara, which oc-

curred not long after, though the latter at his death enjoined his successor Yasuhira to place the whole of his dominions at the service of Yoshitsuné, and to oppose Yoritomo. Yasuhira, however, having received an order from the Imperial Court, which had become nothing more than the tool of every strong party successively, to get rid of Yoshitsuné, an order cunningly backed and supported by various demonstrations of force on the part of Yoritomo, was compelled to act in opposition to his late father's injunctions, and to become the supposed instrument of the hostility of the former. At this juncture, therefore, an attack took place at Koromo-Gawa, where Yoshitsuné and his followers were posted. This happened in the Japanese month of May, A.D. 1189, when Yoshitsuné was about thirty.

Now Yasuhira gave out that Yoshitsuné, after having killed his wife and children, whom he had brought with him from Kioto, committed suicide, and that his followers were slain in battle, and the supposed head of Yoshitsuné was sent by Yasuhira to Kamakuru to be examined; but the story was doubted and even disputed at the very time, and it was rumoured he had made his escape to Yezo; but the cunning Yoritomo took no steps to have it cleared up, and, accusing Yasuhira of obstinacy and treacherous delay in executing the Imperial order, invaded Oshiu, contrary to the wishes of the Imperial Court, and after some fighting, Yasuhira was defeated and fled to a certain mountain; and while contriving an escape to Yezo, according to *Odai Ichiran* ('Short History of Imperial Régime'), was treacherously murdered by one

of his own retainers, who surrendered to Yoritomo.

Another author says that Yoritomo, again cunningly concealing his former enmity, pretended that the conduct of Yasuhira against those who had been driven by danger and extremity to seek a refuge and protection at his hands, was strange and disgraceful; and, besides knowing that Yoshitsuné was his brother, had attacked and caused his destruction. All this was inexcusable, though they might have acted in pursuance of an Imperial order. On this pretext Yoritomo invaded Oshiu. Whatever the truth may be, we are certain there was some irregularity in these proceedings very difficult to be clearly explained.

Ever since this time Yoritomo's power predominated over the whole empire, leaving to the Mikado a mere nominal sovereignty, and the system of a Shogunate government was firmly established in Japan, and was only done away with in our own time, less than twelve years ago.

But to return to Yoshitsuné. It is not clearly known whether Yasuhira intrigued with him, and connived at his escape, or had really attacked him, and so Yoshitsuné had fled at his own impulse. But looking at Hidehara's (Yasuhira's father) attachment to Yoshitsuné, and the desires expressed to his son, at his death, in favour of the latter, we are inclined to consider the first opinion as the true explanation of his flight; though our best history does not decide the point, perhaps it will be more satisfactory to show what

the best authenticated histories do state on this matter.

Dai-Nihon-Shi ('History of Great Japan'), which was composed under the personal superintendence of the Prince of Mito, grandson of Iye-yasu, in the seventeenth century, who had collected all possible authorities and records, and also had assembled almost all the distinguished scholars and *literati* of his day for the prosecution of this great task. The work is written in the style of the dynastic histories of China, and in the compositions of this style it is especially considered the author's duty to rely as much as possible on the evidence of the public records; consequently, in the principal references to the life and career of Yoshitsuné which are to be found in that history, his death is simply stated as if it were a fact; but in its reflections on this head it says, "The general opinion, however, is that he did not die at Koromogawa, but escaped to Yezo," and after mentioning that some ambiguity attached to the story of Yasuhira's sending out the supposed head of Yoshitsuné, and its arrival at Kamakura, to be examined, it goes on to remark, "Forty-three days had elapsed between the supposed death of Yoshitsuné and its examination by Yoritimo's mission, and this took place in the very hottest time of the year. How could it possibly remain for so long a time, exposed to such great heat, without undergoing the alterations of decay, although it is said to have been preserved in pure *saké*, and who could certainly distinguish whether it was real or supposititious? Was then the story of his death a deception, and did he really escape?

Up to the present time the aborigines of the island (Yezo) deify and still worship him. Can we refuse the evidence of such facts?"

Nihon-Guaishi ('Military History of Japan') states, in rather a doubtful manner: "In June the head arrived. Wada and Kajiwara were appointed to examine it. Some said, 'Yoshitsuné is not dead; he has escaped.' Yoritomo, however, made no effort to clear it up; but requested permission of the Imperial Court to punish Yasuhira, on the ground that, relying on the impregnability of the region, he had failed in immediate obedience to the commands of the Emperor."

Indeed, Yoshitsuné's escape to the island of Yezo is an indisputable fact. The Ainos hand down so many legends about him. They love and admire him. They have built a large shrine to his memory. They mark out so many places which are said to have had some connection with his actions; and, lastly, they deified and still worship him. These are well-known facts to Japanese people, and many of these accounts have been brought back to them by travellers, notwithstanding the absence of uniform and positive records, owing to the non-existence of the art of writing among the Ainos. I regret that I cannot procure in London all the best authorities relating to this subject, which is impossible; however, I have done my best to obtain evidence from certain works which I have found in the library of the British Museum. The first of these is entitled *Higashi-Yezo-Yawa*, ('The Evening Tales about Eastern Yezo.') The author of this work is a Mr. Ochi, a medical man and a retainer of

Yoshida, a feudal *daimio*, who had some possessions in the island where this gentleman was sent, in 1856, by his lord's command, and came back after a sojourn of three years. On his return this book was written, and published some years afterwards. In the introduction he states that he was compelled to return home, sooner than he intended, by illness, and was therefore unable to make himself thoroughly acquainted with minute details, nor had any opportunity of visiting Saghalien, and that he ought, notwithstanding, to know something about the matter, and takes up his pen for the information of his friends and to save himself the trouble of constantly repeating the same stories over again. In this book we find several references to Yoshitsuné, with which I will not venture to weary my reader, as in substance they do not differ from those already related. But he also states that in some parts he is called Okikirimai and in others Hoguan. The former name is probably a title by which the contemporary aborigines indicated him, while the latter is a title of respect derived from the word Hanguan or Hoguan (Preserver of the law), by which he was usually addressed by the Japanese of his own time, and is also often so named in modern times; this is because he held the office of censorship in the Imperial Court. Mr. Yoshikawa, Japanese delegate of the last international telegraph conference in London, once visited Yezo. Speaking on this subject, he told me that all those traditions are generally current among the Ainos, and as far as they go are strong and undeniable testimony to the facts they refer to;

and he also informed me that Mr. Ono, a secretary of the Japanese Government who accompanied him to the island, told him that a certain place in his native province, Yechigo, was that where Yoshitsuné's party embarked for Yezo. There is an old family there which still preserves a writing of Yoshitsuné, which was given to one of its ancestors who supplied some quantity of rice to the former, and this writing was given to him in recognition of this service, stating that he (Yoshitsuné) would not, at a future time, forget the kindness; and Mr. Yoshikowa added that he also believed he had been informed by the same Mr. Ono that this family used to receive a certain hereditary annual allowance from the Shogunate Government in consideration of this historical event; such liberal consideration being a characteristic of this Government.

These facts, I think, are quite sufficient to prove the truth of Yoshitsuné's having been at Yezo.

PART II.

Now comes the next question of Yoshitsuné's crossing over to the continent of Asia. Yezo was, of course, a field too narrow for his ability and ambition, and his stay there seems to have been of short duration.

It is generally believed by Japanese people, and also by the natives of Yezo, that he and his followers sailed to the continent from Cape Kamui, which is a promontory facing it, and near the spot where the temple before mentioned stands, and in proximity to this promontory there is another, a small headland, named Benkei. On these points the 'Evening Tales about Eastern Yezo' tells us not much. Quoting from the *Henkai Bunkai* ('National Frontiers'), the work of a much earlier traveller, it says: "When Yoshitsuné resided on the banks of the Saru, he used to frequent the Kikiroi Mountain. On one of these occasions he saw a golden-feathered eagle flying before him and, following it, entered the country of Ponruruka. (No such place as this Kikiroi Mountain is known, but I [Mr. Ochi] was informed that it might be the present Shikinai.) The country of Ponruruka is situated on the coast of Kamsaska [Kamchatka], formerly called Bonruruka, and is inhabited by the tribe of the Kurumishé. The Kurumishé, according to the native legends, are descendants of the savage people who lived in Yezo previous to the Ainos;

but when the latter began to increase, they were driven back, further and further, until they retired to the Seal Islands [Kurile], or to Kamsaska, and formed tribes in those places."

Then again, in another passage, speaking on the same point he says: "Now the reason of the want of positive evidence touching Yoshitsuné's further adventures is because there exist no written documents in the island. The proof, however, of his having crossed over to the Continent is confirmed by the report brought back by certain shipwrecked sailors of Kampo, a small harbour in the province of Yechijen, who were driven on the Mantchoo coast by a hurricane in the year of Kuanyei (between 1524—1523), A.D., and this being the time of the removal of the Tartar capital to Pekin, were taken thither by the Tartar authorities, and when on their journey they passed through the regions of the Keitre, they saw the figures of Yoshitsuné and Benkei pasted up on every door, which is an unequivocal proof of Yoshitsuné and his followers having crossed over." This last part of the story may be unintelligible to those Europeans who have not visited Oriental countries, but we know very well that such a practice is very common. I have seen myself in my own country villages, when the small-pox threatened the neighbourhood, in which, on the doors of several houses, pictures were stuck up, or the names written in plain characters, of Tametomo (uncle of Yoshitsuné), to whom I shall again refer, who was the best archer ever known in Japan. This being a superstitious custom, under the idea that this keeps off the demon of the dis-

ease, frightend by the sight of one who in his life used to be the terror of evil doers.

When I went to the Corea I observed on every door of the towns much the same sort of thing, it being a constant practice to place, not pictures, but different kinds of mottoes, written in large characters, on their portals, such as "Enter happiness like the breezes, bring the spring, and depart evil-spirit, as snow melts in water;" and this custom also prevails in China, where one may see every door placarded like the walls of London.

Now the practice of sticking figures of warriors on their doors among the Mongols appears to arise from the same notions—namely, their great admiration of the valour of such heroes, and the superstitious feeling that their exploits are a kind of defence against those powers of darkness who bring evils upon men; but whether these pictures which these sailors saw in Keitre were really those of Yoshitsuné and Benkei, is a question we will examine by and by; it may, however, be more expedient for my readers that we should explain briefly who Benkei was, and what was his character. Saito Musashibo Benkei, being his full name, was originally a monk; but his active genius and warlike spirit would not long permit him to live secluded from the busy world, although the monks of this period were not such quiet and peaceable beings as those of a later date. He, at any rate, resolved to take an active part in its affairs, and subsequently became a follower of Yoshitsuné. I do not know how this came to pass, yet, if popular report can be trusted, it says that when he determined to enter into the business of the world he

resolved to seek some one to whose superior intellect he could bow, and in whose work he might assist, and to do this he makes a resolution to challenge every individual he might meet until he found such an one to whom he might offer his services, provided no more than a thousand should be challenged. This is called, in the terms of the popular legend, "Benkei's slaying a thousand men." This task was performed principally in the night, on a certain bridge called Gojio. At first he met with no one whom he could regard with submission. At last, however, he met with a young prince, and challenges him to combat; but he soon finds himself in the presence of his conqueror, being subdued by the mysterious and fairy-like activity of the prince, and to him he at once offers his services. This prince was Yoshitsuné. I, of course, cannot vouch for the truth of this popular story, yet it is a subject so common in our arts, that I think I need not say that even my European readers may have often seen this representation of the combat between the young prince and warrior-like monk. Such and several other warlike actions forming the career of Benkei, his name is also so well known in connection with that of Yoshitsuné, that there is no one who, if he knows Yoshitsuné, does not also know Saito Benkei. This is well illustrated by a saying in vogue among Japanese boys who challenge others to combat, thus: "Here is Ushiwaka (Yoshitsune's boy-name), who overcame even Benkei, Who will fight me?" as we ourselves used to do, and which is also spoken of in a preface to the *Yezo Kunko-ki* ('The Illustrious Achievement

n Yezo'), to which book I shall refer presently. Benkei was, however, not only a mere hero; his early life being spent in monasteries in which literature and learning were in those ages especially preserved, he had a fair share of literary culture. Consequently, after he became associated with Yoshitsuné, the greater part of his time was always spent by the side of the latter, giving his services and advice—in a word, he was at once aide-de-camp, private secretary, as well as soldier. When misfortune fell upon Yoshitsuné at the hand of his brother, Benkei, with some twenty others, remained faithful to his cause, and their flight to Oshiu was principally arranged by his skill. He advised his party to disguise themselves as *Tauist* pilgrim monks, he himself taking the part of chief monk. When this party arrived at a barrier, where a guard of soldiers was placed, he first advanced, the others following, and demanded a passage. On entering the gate, Benkei purposely struck Yoshitsuné with his pilgrim staff, accusing him of some neglect in his duty, to make it appear that he had the power of punishing his company, and he also read before the officer on guard the *Kanjinchio* (a certain document necessary for pilgrim monks). This he accomplished very well, as he was well acquainted with its nature, and satisfied the officer who, though he might have himself suspected, or even known, the true state of the case, had a friendly feeling to the brave men in his power to let them pass; and this incident became a favourite subject for the drama of after generations, and is still very popular. There are also some legends about the death of

Benkei in Koromogawa, which says, that when the assault which I have mentioned before took place, he of course fought vigorously, and when he saw his end at last approaching he stood in the middle of the flowing stream, leaning on the handle of a *nagi-nata* (a sort of pike) and died standing, before any enemy had ventured to approach him, until he was carried away by the stream. This is called in the legends, "The thousand days standing of Benkei." Critics may exclaim against this as impossible. Some writers say, however, that when Yoshitsuné was attacked there was one retainer who begged to offer his life for his master, and putting on his armour, and professing himself to be Yoshitsuné—thus to die in his stead amidst the enemy; and others recommended, since Benkei was the terror of every soldier, a figure of straw should be enclosed in his armour, and be placed in the middle of the river, considering it a certainty that no one would rashly venture to approach him. These plans were finally adopted, and Yoshitsuné's party escaped in safety. I cannot myself say how far this is true; but at any rate the truth cannot be very far from it, since Benkei's accompanying Yoshitsuné to Yezo is confirmed by the Aino legends. Such is a brief account of Benkei, whose image is said to have been stuck up on the doors of the Keitre country.

The second book, also in the same museum, is *Yezo Kunko-ki* ('Illustrious Achievements in Yezo'), a work published in 1853, and it gives an account of the brilliant exploits of Yoshitsuné and his party after their escape from

Koromogawa; but I cannot attach much importance to them, because the original plan of the work seems to be a romantic exaggeration of very small sources of information. But its introduction seems not altogether unworthy of credence, so I give an extract from it to show its character. It says as follows in connection with the narrative of the assault at Koromogawa: "There was one Kuniuji, a visitor to Yoshitsuné from Akita; he contrived the escape of the latter, himself guiding him and his twenty-three principal followers, such as Benkei, Kaison, [Hitachibo, another monk soldier,] Idgumi Saburo, Kamei Rokuro, following them, went to Yezo. On arriving there, the aborigines soon did homage to him. Some of them said, 'There are certain countries westward of Yezo, Shantung and Manchoo by name; these territories embrace several thousand miles of land. Why do you, my lord, not try to subdue them? If you once tried we should only be too happy to render you our best services.' On hearing this, he said, 'Well and good!' Then entrusting the affairs of the island to Kuniuji, planned an expedition. Benkei started first. The place from which he started is now called Cape Benkei. Then Yoshitsuné and his body guard embarked. This place is named Cape Kamui. *Kamui* means "God" in the Aino tongue. The followers of the native warlike chiefs amounted to several hundreds. They landed on the coast of Shantan from Karafto [Saghalien] and subdued those regions, and at last he became the king of Manchoo. Their descendants built a large temple in Cape Kamui, and dedicated it to Yoshitsuné and

his twenty-three followers. Their images were made of fine valuable wood, and clad in the same armour that they used to wear. All these accounts are current among them, and the temple is repaired by Mantchoorians periodically, and stands up to this time in a beautiful state of preservation. From this light we can see that Yoshitsuné not only crossed over the sea, but became the king of Mantchoo. If this be so the custom of shaving the head among Tartars might be an imitation of the shaven crowns of "Benkei and the other monk soldiers who accompanied him." The third book is illustrated, *Gem-Pei Sei-sui-Ki* ('The Narration of the Rise and Fall of the Gen and Hei'). This work was written in the latter part of the eighteenth century, by collecting and condensing from much earlier authorities. On our subject it says: "Another report states that Yoshitsuné, taking Musashibo [Saito], Hitachibo [Kaison], and others of his most excellent followers, went to Yezo and Chishima [properly Kurile, but vaguely applied to any island lying beyond Yezo], and reducing them beneath his power made himself their martial ruler, and that he is worshipped by them as the illustrious God of Ghikei. The meaning of Yezo is field cultivation, its natural features are very pleasing, and its products are abundant. Beyond the North Sea lay the countries of Eastern Ashiya [Asia], Orosha [Russia], and of Riusland [Russland]: these are called Moscobia Tahtar [Muscovite Tartar]. Mongul and Hamih are the region of ancient Yi-wu-Lu and the region of Yichau in the Tang dynasty, and those parts of Oran-Kai [upper

parts of Corean peninsula] belong to Shing [present dynasty of China]: these are called Chinese Tartars. Orosha [Russians] are called by the Ainos Akahito, and Mantchoo and Karafto [Saghalien] inclusive are generally called by our people Oku-Yezo [far-off Yezo]. It seems that as far as these parts all had been subjugated by Yoshitsuné." The vague description of these stories is owing to the existence of geographical knowledge of places beyond the limits of our own country having been almost next to nothing among our scholars, and their statements have no positive evidence of probability, so that we cannot allow them much value. They must, however, contain some lines of truth, as they are stated in a manner so positive.

The report brought back by the shipwrecked sailors appears to be the most important. This story I have heard myself when much younger, quite independently of the 'Evening Tales on Eastern Yezo,' and also many more legends. According to these legends, there are some stone monuments which are said to be the tombs of Yoshitsuné and some of his followers, and also there is a shrine, and both the style of building and the gate (Torii) is quite after the Japanese model of a temple; and there was among other decorations the crest of Sasarindo, one formed by the conventional arrangement of bamboo leaves which is the family crest of the Gen. I cannot decidedly tell how far these stories are credible, nor can I refer the readers to any book in which they are recorded, for the reasons before stated; and even were I to procure

the books I do not suppose they would contain much useful information as I cannot expect them to have given more than mere statements of stories as a curiosity, or to supply any comments or practical investigation. For this there are many causes which gave a peculiar character to our literary world, and I believe I had better state them here briefly.

From the time of Yoritomo up to the government of Taiko (from the end of the twelfth to the sixteenth century) was a period which we can call the chivalry epoch, and in this period every honour, ambition, hope, admiration, and fame were indissolubly connected with chivalrous deeds only: consequently literature was of no use to the general public more than it was in the middle ages of European chivalry, and if there was any class which could be called literary it was the monks or effeminate court nobles. This is the reason why monks or discontented court retainers were often employed in works of secretaryship, even for military purposes; however, there were several historical works written in this period by this class of persons, and some are, in many cases, far superior to Chinese historians, because they occasionally display such striking generalizations and reflections on the times which we never meet with in those of the Chinese. But, after all, their stories relate to what has taken place in the Imperial Court, or the rise and fall of some great family. No broad investigations have been ever carried beyond this circle. From the beginning of the Tokugawa Shogunate [the beginning of the seventeenth century], when the country

secured at last peace after its long disturbance, literature began to have some claims on the public. It is true that chivalry did lose in no wise its honour, but, on the contrary, rather increased; yet it became more like fixed polity and hereditary privilege rather than personal distinctions, and, therefore, the more secure the peace became the more interesting became the literature, and the government also did not fail to give encouragement. This state of things continued up to our own time, and the study of Chinese literature became quite common among the people, and the old spirit of our native language also revived to a considerable extent, though not so strongly or so generally as that of the Chinese classics. But the principal aim of the work done by the former was only twofold—that is, devoting themselves to the study and perusal of the etymology of the ancient language, and trying to make of their mythological stories real history, and to make their own birthplace the only country where everything is supreme above all others. Such being their object, no true historian ever came out from this school. The study of Chinese classics is nothing else but the perusal of Confucianism, which is, after all, a moral philosophy of negative principles, being extremely multiplied by the commentators of the Chuhé school. The expounders of this doctrine regarded the world as degenerating, and making the period of some obscure emperors of several thousand years ago their ideal of government and society, tell us to look back to them in every matter: and hence no forward looking, no new ideas, no enterprise.

Discovery and invention were not only discouraged, but considered in an evil light. There were some other schools which took a little more positive views of Confucianism, but were superseded by the former, and it formed one great cause of the stationary condition of China. This system of philosophy having been introduced into our country, was zealously encouraged, and in some respects insisted on by the Shogunate government, which had some interest in national literature, but their main motive for this was supplied by their constant hereditary policy, which only aimed at keeping the people peaceful and contented, and set its face against all tendency to innovation and improvement. This policy, aided by the peculiar circumstances of the epoch, succeeded so admirably in spreading such a heavy atmosphere over the whole aspect of general literature, that although many literary men arose, the whole labour of their lives consisted in a mere perusal and annotation of a few old-fashioned and half-dilapidated volumes of Chinese classics until they were worn out, and then purchasing second-hand copies, and in the end composing another commentary on previous annotators. If their pens occasionally turned to other subjects, it was some trivial prose composition on some pitiful subject, very seldom being more than a few pages, or else a small poem of two or three lines about the moon, flowers, or green willows. If there was any who ventured to write anything new and useful or exciting he could expect no other consequence than general contempt or indifference, and the more widely

literature spread the more widely this hebete condition of things prevailed. It is true they used to read in addition to the classics a mass of Chinese histories, but as these are merely a long and dreary catalogue of dry events, they afford no useful instruction. If we meet with any comments in any of these works, these are sure to be our old friends, moral philosophy, Confucianism and a reproduction of the same opinions, because in China even reflections on history never come out of the circles of these doctrines. Hence, if one has not some penetrating insight, the reading of history gives one no profit except making him familiar with so many thousand printed characters and tales of equivocal credibility. How can any great historian be looked for from such school?

But I do not wish to be understood to say that historical works have been altogether neglected in this time. On the contrary many were produced, notwithstanding the unpromising condition of literature above described. The style of historical writing, however, was actually divided in this period into two kinds, the one adopted for popular reading the other after the Chinese model. The works of the former, aiming principally at popular favour, naturally had a tendency to florid expression, and the author became conscious as it were that if he need not be too strictly faithful in his statements, nor investigate too narrowly any fact of doubtful authenticity, while the latter, being considered the more legitimate method of writing history, their authors began to imitate the Chinese style [as far as possible], and to give merely naked narrations of events regard-

ing them as lucidness of composition, but in reality producing an imitation of a bad original. Even *Dai-Nihon-Shi*, which is the largest compilation of historical facts ever produced in Japan, and which also had some important political object in its composition, is not free from this Chinese incubus. It was not very much more than sixty years ago that our national spirit began to move a little onward, as if nature had at last got tired of so long a slumber, and a new system of reading Chinese works with more positive views commenced among many scholars, and also more active consideration in regard to the decline of imperial authority, fermented among those of sister schools of native language; the connection between these two schools becoming at this period more closely and mutually intimate. This, subsequently followed by the introduction of some European ideas, has resulted in the revolutionizing of the present day, of the whole mode of thought and ideas. The famous *Nihon-Guai-shi* and *Nihon-Sei-ki* were also written about the time previously stated. The author of these works is really one of the few great historians of oriental nations. He, travelling much, reading many works, impressive in language, accurate and concise in style, and with a vast power for generalization, had every qualification necessary for a good historian; he has begun his work in quite a new style of literature, differing from all the antecedent oriental histories. But even this writer—his principal aim being to expose all the arbitrary actions of military usurpation against imperial sovereignty and popular security, and to

excite public attention to a hatred of military government—did not carry his investigations beyond the limits necessary for his immediate purpose. Such being the condition of our literature during many centuries, no efforts for the adventurous exploration of new fields of undecided facts were made, and all that they did was to content themselves with reading what had been handed down to them by their ancestors, and no more; and above all these considerations, the fact of the long exclusion of our country from the rest of the world made its people as a nation a most conservative and self-sufficient mass, which was the true aim of the government of the day, and none of our merchantmen ever sailed to the eastern coast of the continent (with the exception of some very small junks that used to go to Fusan Bay, in Corea), and a very narrow and limited intercourse existed even with Yezo itself. What discoveries can reasonably be expected from such a state of things? At any rate, this was just the case with the undecided fate of Yoshitsuné. Almost all the light thrown on this subject was the report of the occasional travellers of later date, who crossed to Yezo and brought back the legends they had heard, although these stories did not excite the attention of the public more than matters of mere curiosity. But it is quite certain that the more such stories became diffused among the people the more doubtful they became of the real fate of Yoshitsuné, till many were gradually convinced that he must have landed on the coast of Tartary; but they had neither the means nor desire for further inquiry,

only supposing that he died there, as they of course knew very little about the Mongol chiefs and the importance of their historical relations with us. At last the time came when we commenced intercourse with the Russian people in Siberia, and our consulate was established at Vladiostock. The late Mr. Sewaki, who was sent there as consul, was a man deeply interested in the investigation of such subjects, and he intended to have made a thorough inquiry during his stay, and I believe he would have done so in the most satisfactory manner if he had lived. Our great sorrow is that he became ill and died on board a steamer last year on his way to Hakodaté for change of air. I am afraid he was unable to carry out much of his intention, though I have read a short poem about Yoshitsuné's supposed tomb composed by him, which appeared in the *Kuagetsu Shinshi* (a periodical literary production), and the name of the place where that tomb stands was given in a short note attached to it. I did not attribute much importance to this when I read it, as I had not much interest in the subject at that time, and therefore the name, a rather complicated one, of this place has escaped my memory. Mr. Tomita, now Japanese Chargé d'affaires in London, also told me that Mr. Sewaki stated in one of his communications to our Foreign Office, that there is a cape called HANGUAN* which he thinks may be the place where Yoshitsuné landed, and that he was also informed that a shrine, said to have been built after the Japanese

* In a map attached to Howorth's history I noticed a name, 'Hanchan,' on the coast near Vladiostock.

style of architecture, is called Yawata or Hachiman (eight banners), the god of war worshipped in Sinto (religion); also that the account of the tombs supposed to be those of Yoshitsuné and his followers is true, and, therefore, he wishes to get permission from our Foreign Office to visit and examine the places. Yet, according to what Mr. Tomita says, Mr. Sewaki died before he did so. If this be so the short poem aforesaid might have been composed when he heard the account from the natives.

Putting, however, all the details of these various reports aside, *one thing is quite certain, that Yoshitsuné and his followers crossed the sea from Yezo to Tartary*. If this be so, can we believe that a man of such great energy and military ability would pass away without again striving to make his name and his actions famous to all posterity? At once I reply, Most certainly not! In him we behold, then, the future glorious warrior Genghis Khan! Here I will once more refer to Mr. Griffis. Although he does not declare himself as agreeing with this view of the matter, stating that a Japanese student once remarked to him that nothing but the extraordinary vanity of the Japanese people could originate such a report; yet he says: "The immortality of Yoshitsuné is nevertheless secured. Worshipped as a god by the Ainos, honoured and beloved by every Japanese youth as an ideal hero of chivalry, his features pictured on boys' kites, his mien and form represented in household effigies, displayed annually at the boys' great festival of flags, glorified in art, song, and story — Yoshitsuné, the hero

warrior and martyr, will live in undying memory as long as the ideals of the warlike Japanese stand unshattered or their traditions are preserved." Well then, how could we believe such a man could vegetate among the shepherds and their flocks in the barren deserts if he had ever crossed the sea in search of adventures. On the other hand, let us look at Genghis Khan. He was the greatest of all the great conquerors the world has ever produced, and conquered almost the whole of Asia and a considerable part of Europe. But there is much more than this to say of him. Thus, Mr. Howorth, in his 'History of the Monguls,' in the first paragraph of the account of Genghis Khan, wrote as follows: "Not only was he a conqueror, a general whose consummate ability made him break down every barrier that must necessarily intervene between the chief of a small barbarous tribe of obscure race and the throne of Asia—and this with a rapidity and uniform success that can only be compared to the triumphant march of Alexander—but he was far more than a conqueror. Alexander, Napoleon, and Timur were all more or less his equals in the art of war, but the colossal power they created was merely a hill of sand that crumbled to pieces as soon as they had passed away. With Genghis Khan matters were very different; he organised the empire which he had conquered, so that it long survived and greatly prospered after his demise. In every detail of social and political economy he was a creator. His law and his rules of administration are equally admirable and astounding. Justice, toleration, discipline, virtues that make up the modern ideal of a state,

were taught and practised at his court; and when we remember that he was born and educated in the desert, and that he had neither the sages of Greece or Rome to instruct him, and that, unlike Charlemagne and Alfred, he could not draw his lessons from a past, we are tempted to treat as exaggerated the history of his time, and to be sceptical of so much political insight having been born of so much unpromising materials." Well, my readers, it is indeed wonderful, as Mr. Howorth observes, if Genghis Khan was really a Tartar; but can you be so shortsighted as to suppose, even after you are in possession of the information which fairly contradicts it, that the barren deserts of Tartary should produce such a wonderful man? I shall at once reply, Certainly not. Such anomalies can never be possible. Certain it is that savage states have often produced the bravest soldiers, but no great general. Look at the Gauls and Britons: no braver soldiers than these could perhaps be met with; yet what single name of a great general among them has been handed down to our time? "When the world," a Chinese proverb says, "began to shudder, the great warrior comes forth." There is no smoke without fire, and just in the same way there can be no great general without previous bloodshed and baptism of fire *accompanying general advancement of material civilization in their general relation:* admitting that a great combatant might come out without this last circumstance, but a great organiser, never. This, I believe, is almost a philosophical maxim and universal rule throughout both ancient and modern

history. Alexander never sprang from the pasture, nor Hannibal from the desert. Taiko, the Japanese hero of foreign conquest and of later date, was only the fruit cast out by the convulsions of the great feudal contest; Napoleon, out of that of the French Revolution; so Cromwell, so Tomerlane was; even Cæsar, who entered on his great military career only late in life, was the outcome of the fierce struggles of contending factions, and the continual contest for supremacy in which his youth had been passed at Rome, sharing in all the excitement of foreign wars, and trained by the careful study of the Greek heroic models. Again, it might be said that Mahomet rose from rather an obscure position; yet the race from which he came was one peculiarly gifted, and the state of his country was one of comparative advancement; and in his case also, religious enthusiasm, with which he inspired his followers, was the source of his great success as a conqueror. Mahomet is therefore no exception to my assertion. Why, then, should Genghis Khan be the only exception? We know very well he was no exception. We know he had a previous career of contest and of glory. He was one Yoshitsuné, the very man whose early life and greatness we have spoken of before.

And now we come to the real question before us. What proofs have we of the identity of these two characters—one the ideal hero of Japan, the other the great conqueror of the world? Into this question, I intend to go thoroughly to trace out all the probabilities from several points of view.

PART III.

I WILL now proceed to the more important part of our labours, which will be to lay before my readers those facts and considerations which go far to prove the identity of the great conqueror, Genghis Khan, and the Japanese hero, Yoshitsuné. Yet here I must not omit to present a few preliminary remarks. I would observe, that in attempting to bring proofs in a subject of so much difficulty, and in referring to events which happened so long ago in a region so peculiar, and in a matter that was passed over without notice by many generations, it would be absurd, of course, to suppose that the nature of the evidence I shall be able to produce will be of that clear and unquestionable nature which we should expect in testifying to facts of yesterday—those clinching proofs which assert, and admit of no question, that such and such people came from such and such a place, and documents that plainly show such and such facts. This in the present case would be impossible. Yet a small link often leads us to a long chain of conjecture, and a few words often supply us with a large amount of historical information. Such were the hints which taught antiquarians the hitherto unknown facts of prehistorical periods, and similar are those slight indications that instruct the philologist as to the origin of the different races of mankind which

was before doubtful. The task I have now before me is not much easier than that of the antiquarian and the philologist, yet I hope the results will be similar to those of such branches of inquiry.

In prosecution of my design I must first of all tell you whether there is any authentic account of the early life of Genghis Khan, and about what time his career commenced. Now what I wish you particularly to bear in mind, and I must assert is, that there is no authentic account of the ancestors, and early life of Genghis Khan previous to the year A.D. 1202-3, when he is said to have been about forty years old. I mean the public career of Genghis began not long before this time; indeed, the war which he waged against Wang Khan, of Keraite, was a very beginning and first victory in his famous career, and the date of this war is placed by Chinese historians in 1203; and Abulghagi Khan, of Karazm, and author of the 'History of the Tartar Genealogy,' also states that he was about forty years old in 1202, and that before this time there was no decisive war, but at this date (1202) he fought a great battle against the confederate tribes and won a complete victory, which was soon followed by another victory over the Karaite, though Petis de la Croix placed this last event in 1193, when he is said to have been about forty years old. This discrepancy appears to have arisen from the fact that Chinese history considers Genghis Khan's age to have been sixty-six in 1227, when he is said to have died; and Abulghagi reckons it sixty-five in 1226, and that his death took place in this year, therefore the date of his age of forty

falls in 1202; while Petis de la Croix, making Persian writers his guide, states him to have been seventy-three years old at his death in 1226, consequently placed the date of his age of forty in 1193; yet, as the Chinese writers and Abulghagi however are considered more authentic than Petis de la Croix, we are constrained to believe the two former as far as regards the date of this last event, i.e., the year 1203 A.D., which is quoted in several later works relating to this subject, much more generally than the other, i.e., 1193.

The strangest thing is that we have so many accounts after this war given by different historians, which are, nevertheless, in accord with each other in their main particulars; but all accounts before this war were obscure and full of discrepancies, such wonderful and rapid achievements taking place after, while scarcely any of a striking character happened before. To this fact we attach the very highest importance. If he had really been a native of Mongolia we should most probably have had much more uniform and accurate information, and he must have accomplished a great many things that would have been handed down to this day: since it is almost impossible to suppose such a character as Genghis Khan displayed after this war, should have passed so long a previous life in a state of obscure inactivity, as represented by historians. True it is that the latter do give some account of his early life, but these are nothing but mere fabulous stories.

In the proper study of history there is, I think,

only one true method, in itself twofold, to believe what is worthy to believe, and on the contrary to doubt all that deserves to be doubted. If we believe indiscriminately all that we see and hear, this is fanaticism; if we doubt all, it is scepticism. This caution we must attentively observe in our perusal of history, because there is nothing which contains so many fictions which we must doubt, or so many truths which we must believe. This is simple enough in saying, but often neglected in practice.

It is just the same in reading the history of Genghis Khan, and all the accounts given of his ancestors, and all that is ascribed to him before the war with Keraite must be viewed as doubtful, while most of those accounts after the war deserve to be believed as substantially true; and this is so because all the former are merely apocryphal stories, irregular and impossible, while the latter are not quite so. Why, one may perhaps ask, do you come to such a conclusion? I reply, all the works I have read on this subject oblige me to do so.

If any genuine history might be expected, on account of family or political connection, we cannot look for Mongolian history from any nation rather than China, because China was the first country that attracted the notice of Genghis Khan, and refugees of the Kin, who were acquainted with the Chinese characters, were the first foreigners employed by the Mongols, and China was the land in which his grandson, Kublai, established a most powerful dynasty; and Chinese literature was, at any rate, the most advanced at

that period, superior to that of all surrounding countries to which the influence of Genghis extended; and, more than all, China being "the country," as the compiler of 'Ashley's New General Collection of Travels and Voyages' observes, "to which that of the conqueror is contiguous on the north, it may be presumed they were much better acquainted with everything that passed therein than those could be who lived at a greater distance." Yet these very Chinese historians have no authentic data touching the origin and early history of Genghis Khan. Thus, among several others, Choau Yih, the greatest critical historian of the seventeenth century, says, in his famous critical disquisition on the twenty-two histories, speaking at some length on the history of the dynasty of Genghis Khan, briefly as follows: "Yuen sprang from a northern desert, where originally existed no art of writing, nor since the beginning of the dynasty has there been any one who has endeavoured to record past events like Tsung-hung and others of the Kin. Hence documents are so scarce that it is stated in the *Yuen-shi* ('History of the Yuen Dynasty') that, *although he* (Genghis Khan) *performed so many splendid actions and brilliant achievements, we regret extremely the scarcity, and errors of records and information;* indeed it was only in the third year of the reign of Kublai (1261) that, on application to the Emperor by Wang-Kho, the historical bureau was intrusted with the task of procuring materials of history relative to the preceding Emperors."

"In the fifteenth year of the same reign (1273) the Imperial College of Pekin was also ordered

to collect facts from the past as data for historical composition. Some time after this Sah-li-man presented to the Emperor the so-called 'True Records of Successive Emperors,' but the Emperor himself objected to it, as being full of errors, saying that 'that of Ogotai (the son and immediate successor of Genghis Khan) may be so; that of Tulai ought to be, to some extent, remodelled; that of Kwei-yu scarcely any day (being so very short a reign); but that of Mogu (elder brother and immediate predecessor of Kublai) must be still fresh in our memory. Is it not so? Go, and ask the aged!'" All this shows us, therefore, that even the accounts given of his immediate predecessor and brother were doubtful and obscure. How then can we rely on those relative to his more remote ancestors? The criticism then continues: "Sching Tsung (Kublai's successor) called attention to many errors in the so-called true records of the reigns of Jagatai and Mogu, which were presented to him by Wututai and others. Such being the case the erroneousness of the works appears obvious. There was at that time, in a private cabinet, in the Imperial Court, a secret record, by name the *Tuh-pih-cheh-yen*, to which the Chinese title of the *Shing-Wu Kai-tien-Kih* ('An Account of the Origin and Career of Genghis Khan') was given by the Emperor, Jin-Tsung. When Wu-tsih was ordered to preside over the composition of the dynastic histories of the Sung Lioau and Kin, finding the materials of the history of the successive emperors of Mongolia who were connected with these histories, he begged to see the aforesaid secret document, and to become

acquainted with the true history from the time of Genghis Khan; but this was objected to, on the ground that this record was a book not to be shown to outsiders,* *nor did it ever come before the public.* In the dynastic history of the Kin, the accounts of preceding generations previous to its first emperor occupy as much as a whole volume. Yet in the history of Yuen, the ten generations from Buzensir to Genghis, contains only little more than a thousand words. This is enough to show a deficiency of materials. From the reign of Kublai only and from each successive emperor, there are so-called true records, which were composed at different periods. In the reign of the first emperor of the Ming dynasty (which succeeded that of Yuen), thirteen of these true records were procured; and making these their starting point, the history of Yuen was written, but the want of confidence in this work was expressed by its contemporaries; and even the history itself states that there are many misrepresentations in the earlier authorities. From this light we can see that the so-called true records cannot be authentic history. The history of Yuen was composed on these as a basis, and hence it need not be a matter of surprise if it does not satisfy the public; therefore, very soon after the appearance of this history, there was Kai Tsing, who wrote the treatise called 'The Correction of Errors,' and Chuyu, 'The Collection of Gleanings,' and eventually the revision of the history

* I read in another work that the same objection had been previously made to Wang-Kho, who presided over the compilation of the same history before Wu-Tsih.

of Yuen was ordered by the Emperor, which shows that he also had noticed the imperfections; yet we are sorry that *these three works have not been handed down to us.*"

It becomes manifest from this criticism that no blind credit should be attached to the history of Yuen in its present form, especially to that part which refers to the origin of Genghis Khan; on the contrary, in this and in other Chinese works we can trace rather a doubtful light, which tends to favour our view, which I will presently explain.

I have already dwelt upon the imperfection of Chinese history; and if this be so in the Chinese, it is still more so in those of other languages. Thus Mr. Douglas, of the British Museum, says, in his introduction to the life of this conqueror, that "in the same way Persian and Mongolian historians concern themselves principally with those portions of his career which, as it were, forced themselves into their national records, and treat cursorily his conquest of Northern China, where alone he consolidated his power. It is only, therefore, by combining the Chinese record with that which Persian and other historians tell us concerning him that we shall get a complete conception of all that this mighty warrior achieved." This is the best proof of the deficiency of those works concerning this history in other languages.

I can produce further evidence on this point. Abulghagi Khan was a prince of Tartar origin, and an able ruler of Karazm, and wrote a history of the Mongolian and Tartar Genealogy. He is said to have died in 1663, before he had quite

finished his work, and his son and successor completed what he had left undone in 1665. This work seems to have been regarded by most European authors as a first-rate authority on this subject, to be generally preferred to other subsequent works, since, as the compiler of the 'New General Collection of Travels and Voyages' says: "Abulghagi himself, being a Mongol by descent and living on the borders of Tartary, must be best able to select the genuine facts." But let us see what this very compiler, who himself preferred Abulghagi to other books, remarks upon it. He says: "This history, Abulghagi tells, was extracted partly from particular memoirs of divers Mongol tribes. The books he made use of were eighteen in number, which are the principal. He only mentions Khojah Rashed. This author is the first who wrote a history of the Mongols and Tartars in Persian, by command of Yazan Khan. He compiled his work in three volumes, from several original memoirs which that monarch had collected, by means of a certain nobleman skilled in the Mongolian language, who was sent to Tartary for that purpose and ordered to assist in the composition, which was finished in the year 1302 A.D. From this account, which Abulghagi gives of his history, *it does not appear that there is any authority for what relates to the times antecedent to Genghis Khan*, since the Mongols, being without the use of writing, could preserve the memory of the transactions of their ancestors by oral tradition only, on which there can be but little dependence; and this remark will be sufficiently verified by the defect in the history itself." And

then long details being given in successive pages about the unauthenticity of stories, absence of dates, contradictions, and confusion and improbability of the proportional lengths of the successive reigns of pretended ancestors of the great Khan; it continues: "Let us add to this that all the particulars relating to the history of their Khans are few, trifling, and fabulous. It cannot be denied that the Tartar history before Genghis Khan gives room to be suspected." Indeed, no one could ever be persuaded to believe these genealogical stories in this work when one sees how it commences. It commences with Adam, through Japhet, the youngest son of Noah, who, it is said, leaving the mountain of Judi, on which the ark rested, went and settled about the rivers Atil and Jaik. I have nothing here to do with theology; yet I need not add that it must be remembered that history and theology are very different matters. Nay, not only of events before Genghis Khan, but about Genghis himself the author knows very little, except those actions of the conqueror which took place in the west of Asia. On this the same compiler remarks thus: "But it is observable that the account of this author, however particular and exact it may be, with respect to the transactions of his grand ancestor in the west of Asia and countries neighbouring to Karazm, grows obscure and imperfect in proportion as the scene advances eastward; and he seems no less ignorant of the country of the Mongols themselves than of that of the Katay, Karakitay, Tanjout, and other tribes, of which he gives scarcely any details that may be

depended on;" and the compiler tries to supply this part of Genghis Khan's history, and to clear up the "Middle Geography" of Tartary by means of an addition from the Chinese historical records, of which the compiler himself is well aware 'that they were as much at a loss for memoirs relating to those transactions in the West of Asia as the Western historians were concerning what passed in the East;' failing to notice that even those of the Eastern transactions, recorded by Chinese, are not credited even by the Chinese themselves. Nay, not only the exploits of Genghis Khan in the east of Asia, but even the accounts of those immediate successors of this monarch in the regions of central Asia are very obscurely and often imperfectly given by Abulghagi; and this point also is criticised not only by this compiler but more minutely and at greater length by the compiler of 'Pinkerton's Voyages and Travels,' of which I will spare my readers any quotation.

Thus all those historical works on this subject which are considered the best authenticated are criticised as imperfect and suspicious, as I have endeavoured to show from several sources. Where then can we obtain better authorities? I am told that there are several treatises on this subject in the Persian, Turkish, Mongolian, and Russian languages; yet I have, of course, no means of perusing them. I do not, however, think any useful and trustworthy information could be got from them were I able to procure and read them. Why? I will explain.

In examining any treatise on any subject,

especially historical, we must first of all turn our eyes on the question, At what time, and at what place, and by what kind of people was it written? Otherwise the value of books cannot be truly estimated. Now, let us look at all those treatises on our subject, and consider, when, and where, and by whom written. When I do so I can hardly attach any value to them, except to those parts which deserve to be valued: they might all be valuable in what relates to events of which each had immediate knowledge, but no further. Look at these Persians, Turks, and Russians, they are generally far from the place where, and remote from the time when, Genghis began his career of conquest. No speedy intercourse, no newspaper correspondents of modern days, then existed; no authentic State documents could come to hand; and, above all things, imagine for a moment what was the state of civilization of the people and what the aspect of literature in those days. The people must have been extremely superstitious and credulous, always ready to receive with avidity different sorts of fables, and sometimes even to create them, unconsciously or even intentionally. In those times and regions those even who called themselves writers could not free themselves from this illusive atmosphere. One may think the Greek and Latin classical histories are fairly entitled to win our attention, notwithstanding the fables to be found in them; yet no one will venture to compare with these the legendary histories of the East. Perhaps no chroniclers of main facts can be found more exact than the Chinese, yet see what these chroniclers, even in modern

days, often tell us about so many miraculous stories attaching to many great heroes, especially the founders of dynasties. What then would have been the case with those of other languages, in every way less particular than those of China? I do not say all of these writings relating to our subject are altogether worthless, they may have some claim to public attention whenever they speak of those actions of Genghis which involve the interests of their own countries, by his invasion of them at the head of vast armies.

These are, as I said before, facts which may deserve to be valued. Yet how could we ever expect the information given by them concerning the origin and early life of this great conqueror to be true or trustworthy? All the information they give must necessarily be mere legendary reports, transmitted from generation to generation, and from language to language, by those credulous and superstitious peoples. For this reason, supposing Genghis had been a foreigner and a fugitive, more and more it would be difficult to obtain from them true or trustworthy accounts of his origin and early life, and it would be no wonder if such stories as are given were both inconsistent and contradictory; but had he been in the position of a native prince of Mongolia, however small, though there might exist wild and exaggerated stories of his early career, we should reasonably expect such accounts to agree in their substance and main facts, however much exaggerated, and however much they differed in minor details. Yet this is not the case, as far as

I can find from all those which have been accessible to me.

Such are the sources of authorities relating to the subject composed in different languages by foreign authors; and, therefore, I do not think any useful and trustworthy information can be got from them.

Taking all these circumstances connected with the history of Genghis Khan, previous to his actual appearance on the theatre of his great conquests, into consideration, the only conclusion we can safely come to must be also to regard them as obscure. If this be so, we must have something to clear them up. This is the first reason why I tried to prove the identity of this conqueror with Yoshitsuné, which, if proved, every doubtful matter relating to them would, I thoroughly believe, be made plain. There is, of course, no explicit statement in the works referred to, that Genghis Khan was a Japanese. This I will frankly avow, yet this is of no moment in my argument; because, supposing that there might have been some inkling relating to this point in the original traditions of the Mongols, was there any single author in Turkish, Persian, or Russian, who ever had any dreams of the existence of such an island as Japan or Yezo? I do not deny that Japan was known to the Chinese from earlier times, yet let us put ourselves for a moment in the position of the Chinese writers of the period, and fancy could we ever realise such an idea of Genghis Khan coming from such an outside island. It is most improbable, unless some indisputable proof or declaration to that effect had fallen into

our hands, which is also probably impossible. Let us next turn to the Mongols themselves. Though they lived in the same region where Genghis lived, their historical works, if they had any which can be properly so called, would be regarded by my eyes as no better than those of foreign writers. This I will explain in a few words by a question, that is to say: Can any correct history be preserved by oral tradition among nomadic and superstitious tribes of barren plains? Because I believe that there were none of these works but what were written in after generations. It may be true that they tell many stories on this subject, yet if we adhere to them literally, it will only blind us. An obvious example of this is Ssanan Setzen, who was a prince of the Ordus tribe of Mongols, as Mr. Howorth informs us, and was born in 1604, and completed his history of the Mongol Khans in 1662. Mr. Howorth says this was the only indigenous Mongol chronicle which has been made accessible. Its writer traces the line of Genghis Khan to that of the Thibetan blood royal, and through it from Hindostan, just as Abulghagi traced it to the Christian patriarchs; which former attempt also, as Mr. Howorth critically remarks, is only a fanatical chimera disseminated by the Llamas, and on the whole his stories are most fabulous and impossible, as far as I can fairly conjecture from those passages quoted by Mr. Howorth. How can we be foolish enough to put any reliance on such a work as Ssanan's, though it may be called indigenous? Besides, it is a human instinct everywhere, and especially among primitive states, that,

to use the words of Gibbon on this subject, the pride of victory and fame makes people adduce stories attached to such men and turn them into a more interesting shape, and to boast of their nationality; and this often tends to the fabulous and miraculous.

Stories such as these are manifestly presented to us even in those books which are highly respected by modern Europeans. This being so, why should Mongolian vanity not delight itself in this practice, and naturally be led to allow those truths which once might have been attached to such stories, to turn, in the course of time, into peculiar shadows of different appearance?

Now we arrive at a closer point, which is to prove the identity of Genghis Khan and our hero Yoshitsuné. In endeavouring to prove the identity of any personages, the comparison of their ages and the particulars of time to connect them must be considered as most important and fundamental. In these points *there is nothing more striking than the correspondence of the ages of Genghis Khan and Yoshitsuné.* The age of Genghis Khan is given differently, as I have stated before, by the Chinese, Abulghagi, and Petis de la Croix. That is to say, the Chinese consider his age to have been sixty-six in 1227, when he is said to have died. Abulghagi and Petis de la Croix say his death took place in 1226, and the former states his age as sixty-five, the latter seventy-three. Although there is this difference, taking these dates together we may fairly conclude that his age must have been somewhere between sixty-five and seventy-three at his death, which happened either in 1226 or 1227. Then turning our eyes

on Yoshitsuné, we see that he was a mere infant at his mother's breast in the beginning of 1159; therefore, if he lived up to the year 1226 or 1227, his age would have been about either sixty-seven or sixty-eight, which does not differ much from either limit above given. This is the reason that I say there is a striking correspondence between them as to age. With regard to the particulars of time, I have already affirmed that the very beginning of Genghis's triumphant tide of success was the war with the Keraites, which took place in 1203. Yoshitsuné's escape from Japan was in 1189, so that there is fourteen years between these two dates, viz., 1203—1189. This shows *sufficient agreement to point to a correspondence in the two characters with respect to dates to connect them.* Of course Yoshitsuné must have spent more or less time between leaving Japan and his arrival in Mongolia, and Genghis Khan also must have had a career longer or shorter previous to this war; and yet, were they identical, the duration of fourteen years would have been ample enough to take up all these intervals and incidents connected with them. In this view we may fairly conclude that there is no inconsistency, so far as regards the relation of time.

Nevertheless, I would not venture to put aside altogether all those stories relating to the early life of Genghis told by different historians, but will proceed partly to criticise their improbability and partly to deduce from them some favourable light, without prejudice to the opinions or criticisms of the different authors before referred to.

PART IV.

Before proceding, however, to examine and criticise the stories current of the early life of Genghis Khan, I will fulfil my promise, and give an account of those statements in Chinese which seem to corroborate my view. In doing this, I must first of all confess that I have had no opportunity of reading the *Seppu* (a Chinese collection of historical miscellanea). It is said to be stated in this work that Genghis was one Yuen Yee-king (源義經). These Chinese characters, expressing the name Yuen Yee-king, are the very same as those used by the Japanese for the name Minamoto Yoshitsuné, and are also pronounced in another way as Gen-ghikei. This is referred to in one of Mr. Griffis's notes, and appears very conclusive evidence. It becomes more so when we see that in Chinese literature the more miscellaneous works often give much truer accounts and possess more secret information than dynastic histories, since they pay comparatively less homage to national vanity than the latter. I have tried therefore to procure this book, and found a work in the library of the British Museum, entitled *Shwo Foo*, which is the same as the one mentioned; because *Seppu* is only conventionally so pronounced for *Setz-foo*, the ancient Chinese mode of pronunciation, which is still preserved in Japan instead of *Shwo-foo*; but when I found it, my great re-

gret was that it consisted of a few odd books out of a hundred, and I could not discover any part bearing on my subject. Doubtless, if it were perfect, I might obtain a great deal of interesting information from it, since it has been referred to by the famous Choau-Yih in his critical disquisitions on certain points relating to the history of the Yuen dynasty, and often mentioned by several other writers, which shows it deserves some attention.

The same Choau-Yih, in the course of his criticism on the history of Yuen, after censuring the hasty carelessness of composition and the confused order of this dynastic history, says: "There are such reports like those in the *Mon-tah-pih-luh*, an account of the Mongol Tartars by Man-Hung, that there was formerly a state Mongos, which flourished in the northern desert, but afterwards declined and became extinct. When Genghis arose, admiring the former grandeur of the said state, he adopted the name and called his state the 'Great Mongol.' This is the origin of the name 'Mongol,' but it is not mentioned in any way in the said dynastic history."

These remarks must be founded evidently on his disbelief in any connection of Genghis with former Mongol Khans. Moreover, Man-Hung, the author thus referred to, is undoubtedly a better authority than others on our subject, for he was himself a general of the Sung; and when the latter concluded an alliance with Mongolia, and made a joint attack upon the Kin, by which their kingdom was entirely destroyed, he was the commander-in-chief of the army of the Sung; conse-

quently he must have been personally acquainted with some of the Mongolian generals; and when the alliance between these two powers of Sung and Mongolia was dissolved he was the principal actor on the frontier, both offensive and defensive, on the side of the Sung. For these reasons I at once consulted Man-Hung in his *Mon-tah-pih-luh*, and I found that he, fully appreciating the genius of Genghis Khan in such words: "He (Genghis) is a man of surpassing bravery, quickness of decision, large minded, extremely affable with his people, reverent both to heaven and earth, faithful to his promises, and of great sincerity;" states briefly: "Neighbouring to the region where the present Mongol state arose were the Tau tribes in front, and such as the Shata on the right and left. In this region there was formerly a state 'Mongos' by name, some time in the days of the Kin; they attacked the latter, who opposed them, but were finally compelled to conclude a peace with bribes of gold and silk. The present Mongols are very simple, and have had no established institutions. I have oftentimes made inquiries there about the former Mongols, and heard that their state had declined and altogether passed away. Such things happen from the precarious condition of the countries of that northern region. Some may have a territory of thousands of miles, others of hundreds; yet there is no permanence in their condition, either of augmenting grandeur, or waning, or rising, or falling."

NOTE.—The proper names I quote from different works in different languages are always spelt differently in each, and consequently have often a distinct pronunciation. For the convenience of my readers I generally fix upon the longest established mode as far as possible, to which I adhere throughout.

"When Genghis first became distinguished there existed no art of writing in his country, and when any mandate was issued, or messenger despatched, some notched tallies were made their token. Within the last two years those subjects of the Kin who forsook their own country, not finding any settlement, begged to take service under the Mongolian Tartar, and began to teach the Chinese charcters; hence from that time these characters came to be employed in the communications with the Kin; and admiring the grandeur of the former 'Mongos,' Genghis first called his state 'Great Mongol.' I have had interviews with the viceroy, Mukuli. He always used to say, 'I am Tartar,' and also his counsellors and generals only say, 'I ———" not knowing what name Mongul is, nor what is the national name of their state."

The same author does not say that Genghis was a foreigner, but states that he was a man of mean birth, being the son of a head man of ten persons, and a captive in the land of the Kin in his youth, and after a slavery of more than ten years, escaped. Then he began his successful career, engaging successively in different wars, which at last elevated him to the throne. These statements, which were written by a contemporary who made some investigations at the time, will serve to show us that the earlier life of Genghis Khan was totally unconnected with any princely title or position among the Mongols, but that he called himself Mongol only from policy, and to draw the people to his standard; and also that whatever might be said to have been his birth,

he did not reside in the country in which his brilliant career began before the commencement of that career, which gives us no small probability of his being a foreigner, a comer from outside of the land of his fame. Indeed, even the *Yuen-shi*, which made him out to be a son of a certain chief of a Mongol tribe, never ventured to connect him with that former Mongol chief who had made attacks upon the Kin some years before.

In the *Yuen-shi* it is stated that when Ghenghis Khan attacked the Naiman, in the year 1202, combining his forces with those of Wang Khan, chief of the Keraite, one Shamuca, chief of a neighbouring tribe, who was an old enemy of Genghis, reinforced the Naiman with his troops; but, when he saw the latter worsted, he wished to sow dissension between Genghis and Wang Khan, and therefore addressed to the latter "a saying:" "We are white sparrows, but the other only a wild goose." The meaning of this being, that wild geese come when the time is suited to themselves, but fly away when the seasons change; while the sparrows are constant friends in all seasons. This metaphor was well understood by the Khan, who began to suspect Genghis, and, it is said, removed his troops. This was the cause of war between Wang Khan and Genghis, which broke out the following year (1203), and opened a brilliant path to the latter. Now, the author of this story could, of course, have no *arrière pensée;* we, however, must look at it with careful attention. Genghis and Wang Khan were old friends to each other—so

far history tells us; they combined their forces in the same cause, and fought side by side, and Shamuca was the very chief who reinforced the Naiman, therefore not only the old enemy of Genghis but also that of Wang Khan. It is no easy task for such an enemy to cause dissension between such friends as Wang Khan and Genghis; but Shamuca succeeded at last, by the aid of this simple metaphor, though there might have been some other circumstances which assisted in fomenting the quarrel; and on examining this saying, it appears to signify that the goose (Genghis) is not a native, and therefore cannot be trusted, though he might be a friend for a season; but the sparrows are old friends and constant allies, though they might happen to be for a time a little unfriendly.

If this does not point to the fact of Genghis having come from the outside, how can we understand its meaning? Let us imagine Genghis, a native of the neighbourhood of Keraite, as Shamuca was; he would have been much more like the sparrows to Wang Khan than Shamuca, who already had become an open enemy. How could Shamuca be so absurd as to introduce so unsuitable a metaphor?

There is also another interesting point in connection with the report brought back by the shipwrecked sailors when they returned from Pekin to Japan, to which report I have referred before, purposely passed over at the time, but which I think it is now the proper place to notice. It is this, when these sailors were sent home, the Tartar authorities gave them a letter from the Tartar

ruler, founder of the present Tsing dynasty of China, addressed to the government of Japan, stating himself to be the descendant of Yuen-Yee-King (源義經, Gen-ghikei, or Minamoto Yoshitsuné, in Japanese), and therefore of Japanese blood, and that on this account he desired to make the initiative of friendly relations with our country, and also some documents which proved this assertion were attached to the letter. Nearly at the same time Ching-Ching-Kung—the offspring of a Chinese father and Japanese mother, surnamed Kwoh-sing-ye (Papa, bearing imperial family name) from Chu, which was the family name of the Ming dynasty, given to him for his own free use by the emperor in recognition of his ability — being a gallant general, fought vigorously against the Tartar army, and maintained to the last the cause of the Ming against the Tartar power—sent missions to Japan asking for assistance; but, when these demands were made by these rivals, it was just at a time when our country and people, wearied of long internal war and former protracted foreign expeditions, were equally anxious to preserve the peace which had just been secured. Our Shogunate, therefore, resolved not to interfere in any foreign quarrel. For this reason, it is said, that the letter and documents of the Tartar ruler had been previously sent back with a courteous refusal, and when the requests of Ching-Ching-Kung were made they were also not acceded to. These circumstances were kept most strictly secret by our Shogunate, lest it might disturb the minds of the public malcontents. Yet they naturally found their way to the public ear, and

are now quite current among our people. I have myself read in the *Jiozan-Kidan* (a large volume of historical anecdotes, by Yuasa) the account touching the Shogunate Council held to decide on the request of Ching-Ching-Kung, though I have no idea what book is to be consulted concerning the story of the Imperial communication from Pekin. To examine the truth of the point whether the present dynasty of China is really descended from Yuen Yee-king is another matter; yet, taking into consideration the circumstances of the time, it becomes most probable that the Tartar invader would have desired the alliance of Japan, because this was the period of the zenith of Japanese military power. The long duration of internal convulsion had made the general mass of our people warlike as a nation; and, while this disturbed state lasted, many adventurous spirits left their native land, went to the south-eastern coast of China, and, combining vast numbers of native Chinese malcontents and revolutionists under their standard, established their head quarters at Foukien, and threatened the very existence of the Empire. This the Chinese historians call the war of Japanese invasion. Meanwhile, the internal factions of Japan were united under the command of Taiko, who rose from the lowest position to a military dictatorship, and his great ambition to conquer China led an enterprising expedition first to the Corea, which he subdued, and the force was only withdrawn after six years, owing to internal political changes in Japan at the death of Taiko. These two expeditionary movements cost the

Ming dynasty millions of men and money, and were really two of the chief causes of its downfall, which was actually accomplished by the Tartar invader, the present dynasty of China. Loochoo Islands, which are at present so much discussed, were also reconquered by our army at this time. Such being the facts, and so great the mischief, Japanese military fame was, even after the troops disappeared, a terror to the whole coast of Eastern Asia, and she was naturally looked upon as a useful ally and dangerous enemy, and therefore it would be not at all improbable that the Tartar invader of China should have sought an understanding with Japan, if not as an ally, at least as a friend. Yet, as I before said, "to examine the truth of the genealogy is another matter," and I would not venture to decide it positively so long as I cannot procure conclusive written evidence. My friend, Mr. Nanjio, however, a learned Buddhist priest, has sent me from Oxford a book entitled 'Shinshiu Miomokudzu' (a theological work), which was written by Taishiun, a Buddhist priest, and published by another priest in the year A.D. 1788, and in which the following extract was found:—

"The 'Tu-shu-Tsih-ching' (圖書集成, a kind of large encyclopedia) imported into Japan in the fifth month of the third year of Meiwa (A.D. 1766), consisting of 9,996 volumes, compiled under the superintendence of Tsiang-Tien-che by imperial command. Among these books there are thirty volumes of the 'Tsih-Kiun-Luh' (輯勘錄), and the preface in the last of these states

thus: 'The Emperor Kian Loong declares, My family name is Yuen (源), and a descendant from Yee-king (義 經), whose ancestor was Tsing Ho (清 和). The family name is Yuen, therefore we call our dynasty the Tsing (清).' The above passage occurs in the writings of Ito Saizo."

This last-named writer was one of five sons of Ito Jinsai, who lived in the end of the seventeenth century. Jinsai and his eldest son, Togai-Genzo, and another man, Sorai, were three of the greatest Chinese classical scholars ever produced in Japan, and whenever it is asked, What great scholars have you? the names of these men are always quoted in reply; just as an Englishman would name Hume, Gibbon, and Robertson, of the same period, when asked their best historians. Genzo had four brothers, Saizo being one of them, the youngest, all of whom more or less distinguished themselves, and were individually engaged at the courts of different Daimios in literary tasks, while the eldest, Genzo himself, succeeded to his father's school at Kioto, and they received the popular appellation of the "five Zos of Ito," as all their personal names ended in the word Zo.

Such being the status and reputation of Saizo, whose fame stands second only to that of his eldest brother, Genzo, it would be unreasonable not to concede fair credit to his statements. According to what he quotes from Chinese authority, mentioned before, the Tartar Emperor Kian Loong, appears to have made an assertion of his being a descendant of the Japanese Yoshitsuné.

By this testimony we can see plainly that the reports brought back by the shipwrecked sailors are probably no fiction. It is true that the above quotation does not mention Japan, but it could not be in any way denied that our Yoshitsuné was meant. Why? I will thoroughly explain this for the sake of the European reader.

In Japan all the names of persons and places (with very few exceptions) are written in Chinese characters, and all Chinese characters are read in two ways, one their translation into pure Japanese, as the Latin abbreviation, *viz.*, in English, which is read out "namely," and the other the original Chinese pronunciation, which was introduced with the characters themselves, as the French words boudoir and bouquet are read boodwa and bookay, and not as if the syllables were English. Yoshitsuné's family name is Minamoto in translation, Gen in pronunciation, its character being 源, which is sounded as Yuen by the modern Chinese. The Tartar emperor states that his family name is Yuen (源). In the same way the name of Yoshitsuné is a translation of Ghi-kei (義經), which is pronounced by modern Chinese as Yee-king. The Tartar emperor again says he is a descendant of Yee-king. The family name of Gen was first given to Yoshitsuné's ancestor in the eighth degree, who was a grandson of the emperor Sei-wa (清和), which is pronounced as Tsing-Ho by the modern Chinese, and therefore Yoshitsuné's family were popularly called Sei-wa-gen-ji (the Gen of Sei-wa); and the Tartar emperor also says

his ancestor was Tsing-Ho (清 和). Thus the genealogy stands correct, and the characters are exactly the same. How could any one venture to deny the result of this evidence pointing so conclusively to Yoshitsuné?

It is more so when we see that no such name could be of Tartar origin.

The Tartar emperor says his family name is Yuen, therefore his dynasty is called Tsing. This I will explain briefly, it is because Yuen means watersource, and Tsing, clean; but it is also conceivable that it has another secondary derivation from the first character of Sei-wa the emperor's name, who is said to be, and really was the remote ancestor of Yoshitsuné, which is pronounced as Tsing-Ho by modern Chinese, as beforesaid. The difference between Japanese pronunciation introduced from China and that of the modern Chinese arises from the fact that the ancient mode of pronunciation in Japan has been preserved to this day principally by the aid of the alphabet, while the Chinese, who have no alphabet, has undergone so many changes of pronunciation in the course of time, and, in fact, the modern Chinese have so many different ways of pronouncing their characters in different provinces that they are often unintelligible to each other. This is the reason why ancient Gen is pronounced Yuen, Ghi-Kei, Yee-King, and Sei-wa, Tsing-Ho.

Kian Loong, the Tartar Emperor, who is said to have made the above statement, is reputed one of the ablest rulers of the recent centuries by modern scholars of Oriental nations, and Chinese

literature also became more widely diffused and encouraged in his reign and that of his predecessors, who were not only good scholars themselves but great patrons of national literature. Such an Emperor of course would scarcely make a statement like this without some good foundation, nor could he have acquired any such notion from reading Japanese histories. Hence we can fairly conclude that Yoshitsuné was *somebody* in Tartary, and also that some documents must have been left behind. It is most doubtful if the present Chinese imperial family still maintain this assertion, nor can I clear it up demonstrably from extant authentic history, since by old-established custom in China they do not publish, nor allow to be published by any private individual, the memoirs of the existing dynasty; nor can I say whether they profess themselves to be connected by blood in any way with Genghis Khan; still I do not assert that there is no kind of writing by private hand which tells us something concerning the origin of the present Chinese dynasty. The 'Tung-whoa-Luh' is one of these. This book was at first strictly prohibited, but circulated widely in private MSS., until at length the government, having mutilated part of it and destroyed many passages, at last allowed it a free circulation in its present shape.

According to this work, the accounts of the origin of the present dynasty of China is no less fabulous than those of the ancestors of Genghis Khan, and even more so, and, consequently, such accounts have little or no historical value. I know that there is also some assertion that the

ancestors of the present emperor are remotely connected with those of the Kin. Sir J. Francis Davis, formerly Her Majesty's Plenipotentiary in China tells us, however, in his "General Description of the Chinese Empire," that "when the last of the Mongol descendants of Kublai, grandson of Genghis Khan, were expelled from China by the founder of the Ming, they sought a refuge among the Eastern Tartars, and from their intermarriages with the natives sprang the Boydor Khans or Mantchoo princes, who were destined to expel the Ming. It is in this way that the Emperors of the present dynasty derive their descent from Kublai Khan." If this information be true, Genghis Khan must be the forefather of the present dynasty. If it be thus, who could be Yuen-yee-King (Yoshitsuné), who is stated to be his ancestor by the Emperor Kian-Loong? The answer cannot be other than that Yuen-yee-King and Genghis Khan must be one and the same person; but I do not, of course, pretend to know how these genealogies came down, that is quite another question; nor do I know whether the present dynasty is really descended from Yoshitsuné, that is also another question which I will not pretend to decide. Yet, so far as regards the fact that Yoshitsuné was *somebody* in Tartary, it appears undeniable.

Such are the lights which Chinese literature throws in favour of our argument on the present subject.

Reserving for a future occasion all general observations on the circumstances of the time which necessitated Yoshitsuné to seek adventure

on the continent of Asia, and on the possibility of the success of such adventure, and the peculiar spirit of adventure which distinguished his family, I will at once proceed to examine those legendary stories attributed to the ancestors of Genghis Khan, and thus we see that even these stories, which, as I have before remarked, consist mainly of fabulous exaggerations, and cannot be admitted in their present shape as either history or argument, do, nevertheless, contain some admixture of facts and events which are too useful to be altogether omitted.

It is stated by Abulghagi and others that the family name of Genghis Khan was Kiat. This name is said to have been derived from one of his ancestors, who was called Kian. The meaning, he says, "of the word Kian is a torrent running down the rocks, and Kiat is its plural. The said ancestor acquired the surname of Kian, and thence his descendants obtained the family name Kiat." Yet Chinese history says the family name of Genghis Khan was Kian. From this light we can see that the application of the plural Kiat to Genghis Khan as a family name might be only an invention of certain authors for the purpose of making it out to be a family name, for which the singular form would be inapplicable. Now, the family name of Yoshitshuné was Gen, which means "head of river," or "mountain source of springing waters," which closely resembles the signification of Kian. I should therefore be surprised if Kian was not a corruption of Gian, and Gian from Gen, as such corruption is by no means uncommon; and the more so when

we find that in the Mongolian language G and K are often confused, and the difference between their sounds can scarcely be appreciated by foreigners—*i.e.*, Kirin and Girin, Keraite and Geraite, Khokan and Goukhan, Yezokai and Yezogai, and many others, the K character being the one more commonly employed by Europeans; therefore Gen, and Gian, and Kian might probably have been easily interchanged. It is true that the Chinese also represented the name phonetically by the sound Kian, as they also were foreigners who might not have appreciated any difference between the two sounds, or, even if they did so, were utterly incapable of representing it in the right way, since the modern Chinese have no sound of hard G in their language, and the K sound is usually employed in the place of G, and, therefore, the Chinese representation of this name by the sound Kian would not affect my argument. Here it might be asserted by some that the word Kian, meaning "torrent," may be an original Mongolian word. It may be so; but if it is so it is a remarkable coincidence. I will not, however, be restricted to admit that this was an original Mongolian word, since there is another writer, namely, Petis de la Croix, a recognised Oriental scholar, who states that the word signifies "a smith" in that language.

Then Abulghagi, stating the origin of this family, says that the two families of the Khan of the Tartars and that of the Mongols always waged incessant contests against each other, and at last the Khan of the Mongols was totally defeated, and he himself and all his family were

slain on the field, except Kian, the youngest son, and a nephew. They fled into an unknown land, and altogether disappeared from their native country. Kian is said to have received this name from his robust strength, and is called the founder of Genghis Khan's family.

The first thing in this story which strikes me is, that it strongly resembles that of the terrible defeat of the Gen family in Japan, which caused the death of the father and brothers of Yoshitsuné and the escape of himself and other elder brothers. Then the author goes on to say that their posterity increased in their new country, and that four hundred years expired in this way, and then they determined to return to the land from whence their ancestors were driven, but being at a loss to find their road they melted down a mountain which consisted of iron ore, by setting fire to an enormous mass of wood and coal, so as to form a pathway for their exodus, and made a sally into the region of Mongolia and demanded submission from the people; whereupon, the Tartars being alarmed at so unexpected an inroad, assembled their forces and went out to battle, and were entirely defeated. Thus the Kian family, which once disappeared completely from the Mongolian region, made itself again master of the territory. This account is criticised by some western writers as improbable, on the ground that the disappearance of the Kian family from their native country during so many years, and their enormous increase in numbers from two individuals, and their sudden sally after such a lapse of time is simply incredible; but I

will say, notwithstanding, that some truth exists in these very remarkable legends. I repeat, these stories show us that the Mongolians, though they claim the Kian family as their own, recognise the fact of their being absent from Mongolia during four hundred years. This gives no small strength to the opinion that the family of Genghis Khan came from the outside.

From this event to the miraculous story of Alanku nothing is accounted for. Alanku, who is said to have married her own brother, is considered to have been the ancestor of Genghis Khan in the eleventh degree. This lady had two sons by her husband. After his death she lived a retired life, nevertheless some time afterwards she appeared to be *enceinte*, at which the friends and relations of the deceased husband murmured, and "she was," says Petis de la Croix, "at last compelled by them to appear before the chief judge of the tribe. It is true," he says, "she made no scruple of obeying, but desired the judge to give attention to what she was about to relate, and she stated thus the circumstances of her pregnancy: that a white light had three times shone upon her body, and that her having conceived was a prodigy, thus satisfying the judge, and she was for the time released. When the time for her delivery came, three sons were brought forth, as she had foretold, which silenced the calumnies raised against her." Buzengir, who stands last in order of these three, is said to be the ancestor of Genghis Khan in the tenth degree, and it is also said that the descendants of these wonderfully born children were called,

according to Petis de la Croix, Nouran-youn, which name was afterwards generally corrupted into Niron, the meaning of the word being "children of light;" and this story has caused some authors to call Genghis Khan, Petis de la Croix goes on to say, "the son of the sun." "It is certain," he adds, "that the Mongols look on this as sacred truth, and that it is held as a great miracle among them." He also says, "as almost all empires and illustrious families have their mythical stories and false prodigies to grace their beginnings, the Mongols have not failed to have theirs, and have chosen rather to corrupt their history than to let it pass unadorned." Whatever may be believed by the Mongolians, no one would permit this story to pass as a fact. I should not be at all surprised if this miraculous legend were a confused distortion of the real facts connected with the history of Tokiwa and her three sons before related, who appeared before the court of the Hei, and was released. And in the name of Nouranyoun, given to the family of Genghis Khan, no less curious than the word Kian, because both its pronunciation and meaning have a somewhat marked resemblance to the word Nihonjin (the Japanese), which literally means "sun's origin men," and the word Niron to that of Nihon or Nipon. From this mythical story down to that of Yezokai, who is said to be Genghis Khan's father, scarcely anything is given us, and it is attributed to the latter that he fought some battles, and reduced some neighbouring tribes under his dominion; but I am not obliged to adhere to this account, because

there are some contradictions to it, even in Chinese as well as Western authors. I have already referred to Manhung, a Chinese contemporary of Genghis Khan, who ignored all these connections with a princely family or origin, and Petis de la Croix and Mr. Howorth also touch upon some account that relates Genghis Khan to have been the son of a smith and himself a smith; both of these last authors do not approve of this view, yet at the same time it cannot be denied that some such opinion existed. For this reason I first of all reject the stories about his father, and when I try to derive some light from them, have come to the conclusion that this story of Yezokai might be a corruption pointing to the conqueror coming from Yezokai, the literal meaning of Yezokai being the sea of Yezo; but the word kai is also applied to the region itself as a sort of suffix for land, commonly by the Japanese, and often by the Chinese. Thus Yezo is vaguely called Yezokai, which was changed by the present government to the official name Hokkai, northern sea, with an additional suffix of *do* (road). From these considerations I concluded that the story relating to Genghis Khan's father being Yezokai, was a corruption of the reports of Yoshitsuné's having come from Yezokai; such change of the names of places into those of persons, and vice versa, are not at all uncommon. Examples of this kind are plentiful enough in the early history of every nation. We are told by D'Osson that Yezokai in the Mongolian language means the ninth, but I cannot see any reason why the said father of Genghis takes this numerical appel-

lation; and though it may be true that the word Yezokai means ninth in Mongolian, I cannot admit, until I obtain some information concerning the reason why Genghis Khan's father was so called, this explanation to be any proof that the word Yezokai was necessarily a personal name, or that he was a Mongolian.

The story which relates that Genghis Khan was the son of a smith and one himself, might be a perversion of a report of the early life of Yoshitsuné, that is to say, when he was taken by a dealer in iron from the convent on the mountain to Oshiu, which adventure formed the real starting point in Yoshitsuné's career.

The circumstances which transmute the truth into all these confused accounts may be these: If Genghis was really Yoshitsuné, he and his party, when they crossed over to Mongolia, might not have accurately stated where they came from, but rather gave a doubtful version of their travels; or they might have said they were originally of the same stock, but had been absent from the country for a long period, and, having resolved to return, they at last came back; or they might have stated that they were "children of the sun," taking Nihonjin "son's origin people" as their title. Such devices are very often used by adventurers who arrive among a people inferior to them in civilisation. So even Columbus is said to have told the native Indians that he was sent by God, and so persuaded them that he was worshipped by the natives as a divine being.

NOTE.—Yezo, both in the name of the island and that of the supposed father of Genghis Khan, is also spelt Yessu.

In the course of time, as Yoshitsuné got into power, he or his party might naturally have occasionally conversed, in some way or other, about the stories connected with the fortunes of his house and his own early life. These stories being overheard by the people, and becoming in time a kind of legend, they lost the original truth in them and became more and more exaggerated and corrupted by credulity and vanity, and were turned into such long periods of time as to fill up the course of many generations, and many names of strange characters being introduced among them, especially by mischievous priests and writers; some tracing his descent even up to Noah and even to Adam himself, and others to the royal blood of Thibet, and Raschid, a Persian writer, who is said to have had access to the *Altan Dester*, or Golden Register of the Mongols, deposited in the Imperial Treasury, connects it with that of the old Turkish royalty.

It is also said by Abulghagi that the Mongols have an annual feast in which they kindle a great fire, putting into it a piece of iron; and when it is red hot the Khan gives the first stroke with a hammer, then the heads of tribes and officers of distinction follow his example, and after them the commoners give each a stroke in turn. The same story is also given by Petis de la Croix, stating that every Mongol family celebrates this feast on the first day of the year, during which they erect a forge with its bellows, in which a fire is lit and a wedge of iron heated. This they beat with a hammer and conclude the festival with prayers. The origin of this feast is accounted for in a very

unsatisfactory manner, both by Abulghagi and Petis de la Croix. The former says this ceremony originated in perpetuation of the memory of their miraculous sally upon Mongolia, that is, their melting down the ironstone mountain by fire. Yet no one would be persuaded to believe such absurdity. Petis de la Croix says that the word Kiat, the family name of Genghis Khan, signifies a smith, and was first adopted by the grandfather of Genghis, to make himself distinguished from the other Khans of the tribes of Niron; the origin of this word was derived from a certain people who lived at the most remote part of Mongostan, which were called Kiat because their chiefs had heretofore erected a foundry for ironwork in a mountain, which gained them great reputation and made this branch of the Mongols highly esteemed, from the great advantage all the Mongols received from this invention: and the ancestor of Genghis Khan being akin to these by alliance, some mistaken writers have published that this prince was the son of a blacksmith and had been of that trade himself. And he continues to attack these writers by saying: "These writers, doubtless, not knowing the meaning of this ceremony, and ignorant of the reason why the surname of Kiat was given to Genghis Khan's family, were convinced that this great warrior had been a smith, and that in thankfulness to God for having raised him to the throne they established this ceremony. Thus, having searched no deeper into the history of the ancient Mongols, they made Genghis pass for a mean person, whose elevation to

the empire was owing to nothing but his good fortune."

Although Petis de la Croix makes such attacks on previous reports, his own reasoning appears to me much more vague and inaccurate than the stories he thus attacks. How can we feel satisfied with such sort of explanations, both of Abulghagi and Petis de la Croix? Therefore, I said that the account of the origin of this feast is very unsatisfactorily explained by these two writers. On the other hand the opinion that states this ceremony to have arisen out of thankfulness to God for Genghis Khan's elevation to the throne appears to me more simple and consonant to historical facts, and I hold that there might be some truth in it. According to my view it might have been originated by Genghis Khan himself, in commemoration of Kichiji the iron dealer, who took Yoshitsuné from Mount Kurama to Oshiu and became his devoted follower.

It must be here understood that Kichiji was also a manufacturer of iron, for in those days the labour of manufacturing and selling was not so distinctly divided as at present; and this journey of Yoshitsuné with Kichiji was the all-important event in the life of Yoshitsuné, and really the ladder to his after elevation; and the recollection of it of course could not be forgotten by him under any circumstances. Besides, it was the characteristic of Yoshitsuné to pay great attention to his faithful followers; for example, when the elder Satow died of his wounds in the battle of Yashima the most tender respect was paid to his honour; so much so that Yoshitsuné offered

his favourite steed, which had been given him by the Prince of Oshiu at his departure, and which was his darling companion in battle and danger at the river Woozigawa and in the valley of Ichinotani, to the church where Satow was buried; and also, when he entered a second time into Oshiu, a grand Buddhist feast was most carefully celebrated in honour and memory of those faithful followers who had fallen in battle fighting in his cause.

I therefore deem it very probable that Yoshitsuné after his landing in Mongolia should, in a similar manner, have celebrated a great feast in memory of his momentous journey with Kichiji into Oshiu; and, if we regard events in this light, the stories given by Abulghazi and Petis de la Croix, otherwise unintelligible, become clear, accountable, and probable, and that account also which makes Genghis Khan to have been the son of a smith comes very near the real circumstances in the life of Yoshitsuné; and thus both these apparently contradictory accounts would be reconcilable by the theory that Yoshitsuné and Genghis Khan were one and the same person.

Such are my observations on the whole course of the history of Genghis Khan's ancestors and his own origin.

I would not pretend to say that all these stories relating to the Khans of Mongolia previous to the time of Genghis Khan were positively false; this of course I cannot decide. There might really have been such successive Khans, and also the stories attributed to them might have been facts, though very problematical, and their

resemblance to the history of Yoshitsuné's family might be some strange coincidence, but they would not necessarily be conclusive that Genghis Khan was of the Mongolian royal blood, since their pretended succession is almost without foundation, as criticised by many Western writers before quoted.

Having thus analysed these stories about the ancestors of Genghis Khan and his birth, I will now proceed to examine the history of his own life.

PART V.

We come now to the personal history of Genghis. As we have repeated more than once, there are no reliable and uniform accounts of his origin; and those which have been handed down to us differ and contradict each other. Some say he was born a prince, others that he was a smith or the son of a smith; others, varying from both these statements, say he was really a man of humble birth, whose elevation was due to his extraordinary merit only; and again, the accounts given in favour of these several stories differ greatly on several important points. This being the case, if we take up all these various stories and compare and contrast them, they appear mutually to destroy each other, and nothing to remain on which we are able to rely; and the very fact of the existence of such a striking variety of accounts appears to me a most convincing proof, not only of the uncertainty that hangs over his origin, but of the confusion and obscurity in which all the stories given by different writers are involved. There seems to me only one reasonable solution for all these discrepancies, the fact, namely, that Genghis, being a foreigner who appeared conspicuous on the scene of his conquests only about the age of forty, nothing was known certainly by the Mongols of his real origin and antecedents; and without touching other

matters, the fact that every old author, though he does not state Genghis himself to have been a comer from outside, traces the origin of his blood to some foreign country, appears to me to give no small additional strength to this solution.

But he who chooses a weak contest is no true hero, and, therefore, I will put aside all other stories and criticise that which represents him to have been a prince, and which is really the best supported.

Now it is true those authors, and among them Abulghagi, say he was born a prince, but even these never represent his father as reigning over more than three or four thousand families; even the history of Yuen, which also strives to trace his birth to a noble source, never attempted to connect it with that of the so-called Mongos, which was a name adopted by a Mongolian prince for his tribes prior to Genghis Khan. From these facts it appears to me that, whatever may be said of his origin, even if we take these statements for granted, he cannot be looked upon as being anything more than the son of a chief of a small and obscure tribe. There can, therefore, be very little consistency in tracing the rise of his wonderful authority to the influence of birth or position, and consequently it would not necessarily follow were we to say that the elevation of Genghis was accomplished by his being a native of Mongolia, and a prince of the country.* Now let us see what was the name of his supposed father. It was

* It must be borne in mind that he is said to have been called Temug'n, and not Genghis Khan, before he became powerful. To those names I will give special consideration hereafter.

Yezokai. This, I have a strong belief, was only a corruption of some tradition of Yoshitsuné having come from Yezokai, *i.e.*, the sea of Yezo. It is stated, then, that this supposed father died when Genghis was thirteen, some say fourteen years old, which is the only allusion positively made to his age before his fortieth year by any writer, and two-thirds of the tribe under his father revolted and went over to his enemies; so, if we make a calculation of their number, only about a thousand families remained in allegiance to him. How insignificant a number! How then could his wonderful success in after life have been due to his being native born, or to the aid derived from such paltry numbers; or what use would such a position have been in the making of his fortune? If this be so, and a great work can be accomplished without the aid of birth, position, or great numbers, provided there is talent and capacity, there is no reason that a foreigner so endowed could not perform such great works in the country of his adoption. My opinion touching the statement of the age of Genghis at his father's death, is that this might also be a corruption, and its true meaning be that the space of time since Yoshitsuné left Yezo was thirteen or fourteen years to the date of his becoming famous, which is a fact that we can establish by a comparison of dates, remarking that the very beginning of the victorious career of Genghis commenced exactly in the thirteenth or fourteenth year from Yoshitsuné's second and new life, namely, his escape from Japan. Misinterpretations of such nature are most common in legendary histories.

We next see that Genghis Khan, according to the account given, had to contend with his revolted subjects, but Abulghagi says nothing more than, "It is true he did his best to remedy this evil at its commencement, and fought a sanguinary battle with them, though so young, but was obliged to temporise till about the fortieth year of his age, when he having learned that his confederate enemies, such as the Merkit and the Tartars, intended to surprise him, encamped with thirteen hordes, consisting of thirty thousand men, placing his baggage and cattle in the centre. In this posture of defence he awaited the enemy, and, having engaged them, gained a complete victory." Then the author continues to show that, gaining another great victory over the Khan of Keraite, in the following year, he made himself master of that country.

In one of these battles, it is said, five or six thousand of the enemy were slain, and many prisoners taken. He ordered the principal leaders of the revolt to be thrown headlong into seventy cauldrons of boiling water. This action, to use the words of the Conversations-Lexicon, was the first example of his cruelty, which put all Asia under the terror of his power. Of course this story is very problematical, as Mr. Howorth says, and there is much room to doubt its exact truth. However, it is an unquestionable fact that every author regards this period as the outburst of the triumphant impulse of Genghis Khan's victories, and there would be great wonder if something of the kind did not occur at all, as Gibbon, noticing this story, says: "In a state of society in which

policy is rude and valour universal, the ascendancy of one man must be founded on his power and resolution to punish his enemies and recompense his friends;" and this would be still more the case if that "one man" were not a native of the land in which he began to figure as a conqueror.

Thus Abulghagi accounts for no career of Genghis previous to his age of forty, but merely says that he was obliged to temporise. This age (forty) falls in the year A.D. 1202, which is just between thirteen and fourteen years after Yoshitsuné's escape from Japan.

Again, looking into the history of Yuen, though it narrates short and obscure stories about Genghis Khan's early life, it does not make any reference whatever to his age, or to the date of any event, before A.D. 1202, the first ever given. This year he defeated the Naiman, and in the next the Khan of Keraite, who came to attack him, and this was rapidly succeeded by many other wonderful triumphs. This is the reason why, in a previous chapter, I drew attention not only to the obscurity but to the scantiness of the details of the early life of Genghis Khan, and also to the fact that the period in which his public career began "shows sufficient agreement to point to a correspondence between the two characters, with respect to dates, to connect them." (*V.* p. 53.)*

Turning to the pages of Petis de la Croix, who is now considered far less authentic than many

* Since I wrote the former part of this essay I have read the so-called 'Secret History of Yuen,' translated from Mongolian. It begins with the statement that Genghis's ancestor was the issue of a miraculous wolf and dog.

others, we see that he also describes Genghis's triumph over the Keraite as the first battle. Nevertheless, he gives many more particulars than any other writer, but their real substance appears to me nothing more than the spinning out of a few events into such length that they spread over many years in order to make out the early life of Genghis, which if he were Yoshitsuné, was never passed in that country in the same manner as we read the first chapters of Chinese or Japanese primæval history, where we find one mystic or allegorical personage often occupying several hundred years of life so as to make up all the primitive state of the nation with a few individuals. To summarise what Petis de la Croix says, he (Genghis), on his father's death, fought against the revolters with good success, but fortune finally turned against him. He was beaten and fell several times into the hands of his enemies, but always had the luck to escape. Next year, which, from the data afforded us by this writer, we found to be Genghis Khan's fifteenth, a powerful party of the inhabitants of Merkit, having learned that he was absent from his kingdom on an expedition, invaded his land to plunder it, and carried off his wife, Burta Cougin, whom he had espoused in the previous year. This wife, who gave birth to a son during her captivity, was restored to him by Wang Khan, of Keraite, to whom this lady was presented by the plunderers.

This story of the first wife of Genghis ought not to be passed over without some attention. The word Cougin is spelt Fudgin by several authors, like D'Osson and others, and is asserted

by them to be the Chinese title for a "high lady," and also this said lady had the pre-eminence among all other wives of Genghis. Now, in looking into the Chinese history we find this word is only represented phonetically by Chinese characters, which are not the same which have the meaning of a title for a lady, and it is not recognised as being derived from Chinese. Therefore, if Genghis was Yoshitsuné, and this title was given by himself, the question as to its origin becomes easily answered, because in Japan the title Fudgin, as in China, is often affixed to the names of ladies of high rank and position. Hence I conclude that this title of Genghis's wife was not derived immediately from the Chinese but from Japan; and also, this marriage, if it really took place, seems to have occurred at rather an early age; but if we at once admit the fact that Genghis was Yoshitsuné, the above assertion and story become intelligible. After this event the author immediately continues his account: "And now, although Genghis had continued to support a war for seven or eight years after his father's death, yet of necessity he must at last sink under the weight of so many enemies, and therefore it was no wonder that in the end he was taken prisoner by the tribe of Tanjout; but what was more grievous to him than his prison was that his own tribe of Niron, seduced by his enemies, revolted at the same time, and took up arms against him. He had, however, the good fortune to escape from them, and then he began wisely to consider that, though he had again escaped, he must now yield to necessity

and provide a retreat for himself, and after trying in vain to effect a reconciliation with his enemies, at last resolved to seek an asylum with the King of Keraite."

These stories seem to me incredible, because, first of all, to continue a perpetual war among wild tribes, where the tide of fortune daily turns, according to its direction, the eyes of the people from or towards their idols, and to preserve the chieftainship for so long a duration as seven or eight years, by one so young, is most improbable.

Again, the repeated captures and escapes of Genghis are also highly improbable. I say improbable, because, if he so often fell into their hands, and so repeatedly escaped, why did his enemies not put him to death? him, their worst antagonist, and the chief cause of the war amongst them, a war which had caused them so much blood and effort? Or, at least, why should they not have kept a stricter guard over him when they again made him prisoner, so as to prevent him from repeating his escape. Or, if this story of repeated imprisonment and escape was really true, how was it that his subjects remained so long faithful to him during his captivity, and maintained their organisation without a leader against the inroads of a victorious enemy? Such a state of things is rarely met with even in peoples of higher civilisation, and I am convinced that they are almost impossible amongst such fierce and barbarous tribes.

Returning to our author, he shows that he (Genghis Khan) at last went to the court of Keraite and was received as a royal guest. This

event is mentioned neither by Abulghagi nor in the history of Yuen, though Manhung, a Chinese author alluded to before, says pretty much the same thing; but then, both circumstance and locality are quite different. He merely says Genghis Khan was, in his youth, captured by and served as a slave under the Kin for more than ten years; and thus every author gives stories so widely differing in important particulars of his life that they have very little historical value. However, I will not stop here to compare all these varying accounts, but continue by giving what Petis de la Croix further says. Genghis took refuge with the King of Keraite, which, according to this author's data, happened at the early age of twenty. Here he soon acquired such unlimited power from the King that he was honoured by being called his son, and by being placed even above the princes of the King's own blood, and, finally, the conduct of the royal army was entrusted to him in a war carried on against the King of Tanjout.

Genghis made his courage appear on this occasion, and some Mongul Khans, who refused to pay the tribute they usually paid to Wang Khan, also felt his valour. He behaved on all these occasions with so much prudence and wisdom that Wang Khan undertook nothing without first consulting him. All this success, says our author, and the confidence Wang Khan had in him, seemed to secure him the King's favour for ever; but his virtues created him enemies, enemies more dangerous than those who caused him to fly from his own kingdom. Here is a romantic story re-

lated by this author, who says: "The daughter of the King, charmed with the valour and person of Genghis Khan, fell in love with him and rejected the offer of Shamuca Khan, of the tribe of Jagerat, who had asked her in marriage with some earnestness. The King gave her to Genghis, and this marriage was celebrated with as much pomp as if it had been the King's own. Shamuca could not patiently endure this, he saw himself slighted and rejected. His love and honour, both injured and affronted, enraged him so much that he resolved to revenge himself, first on his rival, and next on the King himself." If this were a fact, it is a very important one in the life of Genghis Khan, but we find no mention whatever of this marriage either by Abulghagi or the history of Yuen, and such marriage is totally denied by some other later authors.

On the contrary, there is a story both in Abulghagi and the history of Yuen, that at a much later period after Genghis Khan had already become powerful, there was some intention between Wang Khan and Genghis of a reciprocal marriage between their sons and daughters, which, however, never took place. Discrepancy between these authors, on such an important fact in his life, seems ridiculous, and more and more tends to convince me of the inaccuracy of all their accounts of his early life. To continue, however, with what the same author says: "Shamuca, now despairing and desperate with love, easily found people disposed to join him; a thousand envious wretches offered themselves to assist him in his revenge. Yet, notwithstanding they were all combined against

Genghis, and their impatience to ruin him great, it was many years before they could bring it to pass.

"The credit of this young prince, whom the King had made his first minister, the great number of his friends, and the services he rendered the monarch, defeated all their schemes and their villanous designs for a long time; but Wang Khan, who lacked nothing but a mind firm and proof against sycophant whispers, at last suffered himself to be influenced by calumnies, but before he gave ear to Genghis Khan's enemies many great events had happened."

"The Khan of Merkit," the story continues, "the head of those tribes who had before fought to ruin Genghis Khan, seeing their attempt did not succeed, broke friendship with Wang Khan, who had given protection to Genghis, and joined with the Khan of Tanjout; and they, leagued together, had so formidable an army that they doubted not of overthrowing the father and son-in-law together, Wang Khan and Genghis;" and, according to the same author, Petis de la Croix, it is stated that about eight years had elapsed from Genghis Khan's coming under the protection of Wang Khan to this time.

The length of this period is also incredible. In the first place, it is most improbable that such an energetic character as Genghis would have passed so long a time without displaying some great and independent action; and, secondly, it is most surprising that, if he were really a Mongolian prince, and spent so long a duration as seven or eight years, and even more than double this

number, if we include the years after this time which I am going to notice, such a fact would be totally unnoticed by other writers, Abulghagi and the history of Yuen, &c., &c.

To proceed with the same author. The King and Genghis Khan, having received intelligence of all this hostile confederation, prepared for war, and, to anticipate their enemies, Genghis Khan asked to go against them in person. Half of the army was given him; to this force he joined his own Mongols, whom he had taken with him to Keraite, and, having set up his standard, he marched to the border of Tanjout. While he was on this expedition the Naiman, one of the confederate tribes of his enemies, taking advantage of his absence and the diminution of Wang Khan's forces, invaded his dominions, deposed him, and put his brother on the throne. The former being thus totally defeated, Wang Khan fled to his *so-called son-in-law*, Genghis, whom he found on the point of going forth to battle with the Tanjout and their allies.

From this event to the restoration of Wang Khan to his throne, more than two years is asserted to have elapsed, yet all that this author accounts for during this time is simply to this effect, that Genghis Khan was greatly amazed when he saw the King in his camp, and comforted and consoled him with hopes of revenge. In pursuance of this they fought a desperate battle, which was animated by the appearance of Genghis Khan in the van of his army, who, encouraging his soldiers by his words and example, severely defeated the Tanjout. But this great victory did

not satisfy Wang Khan's revenge, he must regain his throne, and punish the rest of his enemies.

He commanded Genghis, therefore, to levy more troops, which was immediately done. Genghis issued forth his commands, and by his care had assembled in the following year a formidable army in Keraite. The confederate Khans were not idle on their side, and the Khan of Naiman advanced in person at the head of his troops. These Genghis met with his army. Placing himself at its head, a very obstinate, and, it is said, perhaps the most sanguinary battle that history has ever recorded took place, and a great victory being gained, the king was restored to his former throne of Keraite. Thus two more years were added to the seven or eight, making the number altogether about ten since Genghis Khan took refuge under the Khan of Keraite up to the date of the above event.

To this length of time I attach great discredit. Moreover, this event is told in very different ways by Chinese and other authors, which is only naturally to be expected, as their stories of previous events are different. But however variously this event is narrated, it is true that the battle fought by Genghis Khan with the Naiman is related in the history of Yuen, the date of which is placed in 1202 A.D., as stated before, and which is really the first date ever given in the early life of Genghis Khan in this history. This date falls in the fourteenth year after Yoshitsuné's flight from Japan. Our author, however, continues to this effect, that the year after this victory Shamuca, who was the in-

stigator of the war, still being an enemy of Genghis, and still holding correspondence with the confederate khans, obtained leave to return to the court of the king by the mediation of Prince Sancoun, the king's son; and then the author goes on to show how this Shamuca intrigued with the envious courtiers, and especially with Prince Sancoun, and endeavoured to destroy the credit of Genghis with the monarch, who was at last persuaded to seize him.

This dates about ten years after Shamuca began his second plot to destroy Genghis; and now affairs became critical, and, to quote the same author, "At this time Genghis was encamped with his troops by the king's orders, who had sent him from court under the pretence that his presence was necessary with the army, but in reality to separate him from his own guards, for all his soldiers adored him, both on account of his brave exploits performed in the field, and his liberality to them on all other occasions, of which they had a grateful sense." When the day on which Genghis was to be attacked in the night was determined, information of this was given to him by two of the king's slaves, by whom it had been overheard. Now Genghis had no other alternative but to prepare to meet, with a much inferior force, the large army of the attacking body, headed by Prince Sancoan and Shamuca. This was done most skilfully, and they were totally defeated. This battle soon made Genghis Khan master of Keraite, and the author thus speaks of it:—"This first battle was a presage to him of a great many other victories. 'When divine pro-

vidence,' says an Arabian poet, 'throws down to thee the cable of good fortune, all creatures shall combine to render thee happy; even thine enemies shall contribute thereto.' This was what befel in the end Genghis Khan; those who strove to abase him were the cause of his rising."

This battle took place, the author asserts, when Genghis was about forty years old. And thus he must have spent altogether twenty years in Keraite.

Such are the stories related by Petis de la Croix, who gives the most detailed account of the early life of Genghis. These are yet most inconsistent and contradictory when compared with those of other authors; so their minuteness adds nothing to their credibility. Moreover, the length of time assumed in connection with these events is very open to question and doubt, as I before pointed out. However, as matters of history are often uncertain, it might turn out that, after all, other writers are less, and Petis de la Croix more, close to facts; yet, even in that case, there is no sufficient reason to suppose that those few events, detailed in the narration but scant in number, would necessarily occupy so large a space of time as thirty years, assigned to them by Petis de la Croix. Were Genghis Yoshitsuné, the thirteen or fourteen years of interval would doubtless amply suffice for such few events. Moreover, according to the same author, whatever may have been the origin of Genghis, his uprise was most certainly not effected at his birthplace, and his subsequent greatness was not owing to his hereditary advantages, but to the

affection of the soldiers and the people of an alien country whose very monarch he had destroyed. This being so, what objection is there to suppose Genghis Yoshitsuné, a comer, as Napoleon was, from the outside, instead of a neighbouring prince; or, as our Yamada, who went to Siam as an adventurer, was engaged as a general, subdued the king's enemies, and was made a prince of that country? It may be said, though Genghis was not a native of Keraite, he was able to succeed in his enterprise because he happened to be the prince of a neighbouring region; but were he Yoshitsuné he would have been a foreigner, a man quite strange to such people, and would not have been able to perform such a grand work as he has done. But this does not at all follow necessarily. In my opinion, such a difference between nearer and farther is of very small consequence in the matter, provided one had suitable talent and ability. Nay, I would rather say, those who come from the greater distance often have greater advantages and more astonishing success. Such instances often occur in our daily social life in every country, where talented foreigners meet with a higher favour and quicker appreciation than the natives with whom we are accustomed to live, and to whose merits we are sometimes blind.

This equally, or even more, applies to military genius, and when a country is in peril the prejudice of nationality is easily overcome, or counts for nothing in the matter. Such examples are too numerous and too well known, both in Oriental and European history, to need producing

here. I will merely mention that in China, in the Tæping rebellion some years ago—a country unique in its detestation of foreigners, passing over the fact of the Government side employing European auxiliaries—it became well known afterwards that the rebel party had also engaged the services of foreign adventurers, some of whom actually escaped to Japan. Another recent example is that in the rebellion which broke out last year in southern China, foreigners were also said to have been employed, and much the same things are now occurring in Europe itself. If, therefore, Yoshitsuné did go to Mongolia, what difficulty is there in supposing him to have been engaged by some prince or people of the country by whom his military talents had been recognised; or, if not so engaged, would have distinguished himself by his great qualities, and become, eventually, a leader? Another may again say, all such instances may apply to a country which is more or less advanced in civilisation, but not to wild tribes. I say, however, that this point also makes very little difference. Nay, I will say, if one were successful at first, that success would become continuous and more permanent in a less advanced than in a higher state of civilisation; for if he once become famous or prove his ability among the former, they follow him more blindly and devotedly—a following which would daily increase, like a swarm of bees gathering round their queen. This was just the case with Genghis; for even assuming that he was originally a small Mongolian chief, his vast army,

which became the terror of the world, was composed principally of Turks and others, the number of Mongols being comparatively very small.

It might also be asserted that the regions of Mongolia and Tartary could not be so barren as I have described them, since the Tartars were always a restless and aggressive race, from whose incursions China has often suffered.

It is true, I admit, that they were a restless and aggressive race, but they were never a fixed and consolidated nation, but nomadic even to the present day, nor had they any fixed process of civilisation. Their periodical inroads were nothing more than the exodus of an undisciplined mass of people accidentally coming together for this reason. Their only want was a leader of ability trained in a system of civilisation and discipline superior to their own. Such a one was found in Yoshitsuné. Of course there were certain parts of Tartary near the *great wall* which were a little superior to those I refer to; yet the locality whence Genghis is said to have issued forth was remote from these parts, and was most inferior in state, and where no such great organiser as Genghis could be produced, as I have before strongly asserted.

Anyhow, I assert that Genghis was a comer from outside. Hugh Murray says, in his 'Accounts of Discovery and Travel in Asia,' that "this daring chief (Genghis) appears to have been originally little more than a private individual among the Mongols. His countrymen being engaged in a war with their neighbours, elected him their commander." And I believe this state-

ment, though apparently simple, is consonant with facts, and I firmly believe that if Genghis was Yoshitsuné, his first appearance in Mongolia could not be very much different from that of a private individual, and this being the time when the Mongols were threatened by intestine conflict, it is most probable he was engaged as their general. This fact will be confirmed, not by any single point of evidence, but by the general tenor of a number of scattered but significant facts, of which I give the bearing and tendency.

At the ceremony of the coronation of Genghis, the display of white banners formed a conspicuous and essential element, and it is also stated by Manhung that the march of Genghis was always preceded by a banner of pure white; this point also deserves our attention. This, even the most sceptical of our readers would admit, is, at least, a startling coincidence. The family flag of the Gen (Yoshitsuné) was pure white, distinguished from the red banner of their adversaries. No evidence perhaps could be stronger than the conspicuous use of the pure white flag by Genghis. Wherever a military adventurer might wander, and into whatever distant lands he might stray; whenever he again stood forth as a general, there we should expect to see the traditional flag of his family waving over himself and his troops.

One may object, however, that any general might choose any colour he wished for his flag, and the identity between the flag of Genghis and that of Yoshitsuné might be merely accidental. Such identity taken alone might be

possible but improbable, but when viewed in connection with many other points it becomes a very strong piece of evidence.

Moreover, the colour white is associated in most countries with peculiar sentiments. Thus in Europe the white flag is held sacred, and became a sign of conference or surrender. In China white is the colour for mourning; hence, also, in the battle field it is held sacred. Therefore, I should argue this colour would probably be the very last to be chosen for the flag of a "parvenu" general, but when looked upon as the family flag of Yoshitsuné, its use becomes natural and a matter of course.

It must be remembered, too, that Genghis was not called Genghis till after he had attained his greatness, but Temugin. These names and the circumstances of their adoption require our further attention. According to the statements of many writers, these circumstances of the adoption of this name Genghis are surprising and various. It is asserted that he adopted it on being proclaimed emperor, some say it was certain years before this time, when he was elected military chief or ruler. Ssanan, called the indigenous chronicler, tells such strange tales, as that when Temugin was forty-eight, 1189 A.D., and was proclaimed Khokan on the banks of the river Keruton, for three mornings before the ceremony, a fine coloured bird came and sat on a square stone in front of the royal yard, and screamed out "Genghis! Genghis!" which he, therefore, adopted as his middle name, his title in full being Sutu Boyda Genghis Khokan. Another

author, whose name I now forget, says that in A.D. 1206 he was acknowledged by assembled armies, Mongolian chiefs and generals, as their sovereign at the head of the river Onon by a general cry of "Chingis!" A note on this work runs as follows: "Kingkitse, or rather Chingkiz, is the Mongolian word expressing the cry of a bird to which is ascribed extraordinary qualities, which makes its appearance a presage of good luck. This seems to be some fabulous bird like the Chinese Fong whang." Again, Abulghagi says: "In the year 1202, A.D., Genghis Khan being forty years old, all the Mongol tribes submitted to him, acknowledged him for their Khan, and a great feast was given. At this solemnity one Kokyza, surnamed 'the image of God' because in winter he went barefoot and very thinly clad, pretended that he was sent from God to inform Genghis Khan that thenceforth he should assume the name Genghis, and that all his posterity should be Khans from generation to generation. He also gave out that a white horse came to him from time to time and carried him to heaven, where he conversed with the dead." Petis de la Croix writes thus: "Temugin, A.D. 1205, conformed to his friend's recommendation, having more plans in his head than he communicated to his Mongol subjects. Besides the methods he had already made use of to gain their hearts, he had recourse to revelations, telling them that God had assured him that he should become master of the world, but that it was his pleasure that he should change his name to Genghis."

Then he goes on to show that there are other authors who state this revelation to have been pretended and made by another person, but this story I shall not repeat, as it closely resembles one already related. So much inconsistency, so much obscurity involves the circumstances of the adoption of this title, that I can attach but little importance to all these stories. Nevertheless, as these authors most probably could not be conversant with the true meaning of the adoption of this name, they have been obliged to invent some import belonging to it, and give some reason for the change; and it was interpreted by Abulghagi to have meant "most great" in the Mongolian language, which explanation we find adopted by many other writers. Of the word Khan they say nothing, considering it a mere title common in the country. Whether the word Genghis really means "most great" is, in my opinion, open to question; because, though Abulghagi may be said to have been of Mongolian blood, he was not himself acquainted with the Mongolian language; hence, if he was ignorant of the real origin of the word, yet tried to give it a meaning, he might have been easily led into erroneous opinions on the subject, and unless we dive into the real roots of the Mongolian tongue we shall be unable to determine the point. Some say Genghis means ocean, in the Mongol tongue, this meaning being probably derived from its sense of most great; yet ocean may be called Genghis without this meaning, and it would not follow to say that Genghis means most great. Thus the stories concerning the adoption of this title are most

shadowy and unsatisfactory, but if my view of this matter be adopted the question will be soon resolved.

It is true that the name Genghis Khan is spelt in many different ways by different writers, as are all other Mongolian names; as Mr. Howorth says, "there are scarcely two authors of those I have consulted who spell names in the same manner, and very often the spelling is so different that it is almost impossible to recognise the names under their various forms." And again, "The way in which Mongolian names are pronounced at Shiraz or Teheran is no doubt to be gathered from Persians, but hardly the way in which they are pronounced in Mongolia itself."

For this same reason the name Genghis is spelt in many different ways, viz., Zenghis, Chintchis, Kinchiz, &c., but which among them is the correct method is disputed. Yet, after all, it must have been a sound resembling in degree the spelling I have adopted here, which is the most commonly used, especially among Japanese scholars. Now, concerning this name Genghis Khan much consideration is given by the scholars of our country, viewing it as being identical with Genghi Kei, which is no more than another way of pronouncing Minamoto Yoshitsuné. This assertion, I believe, is far more probable and explainable than those obscure statements given by those authors. It is really no matter of surprise if the sound of Genghi Kei has been corrupted into that of Genghis Khan or something similar, which was the cause why different authors spelt it in so many different ways. It is true that G in the

name Genghi Kei sounds hard, while that in Genghis Khan is commonly supposed to sound soft, yet this difference of sound matters very little to my argument, because the sounds of the letters G, K, J in the Mongolian tongue are said to be very intimately associated, and are freely interchanged by foreigners. It is also true that the latter word in Genghis Khan is not Kei, but Khan, and therefore foreign writers hold the opinion about this word Khan to mean the Khan, a Mongolian title; but this is of small consequence, since it is not at all improbable that writers meeting with the name Genghi Kei, which might have been indistinctly heard, knowing the existence of the Mongolian title Khan, have corrupted the latter half, namely, Kei, into the familiar term Khan. Here it may not be irrelevant to remark that the title Khan itself is not one which would attract or satisfy the ambition of a great leader. The title Khan in these countries, Mongolia, Tartary, and even Persia, is a very common one, implying no particular or pre-eminent distinction of rank; it may be used by a prince, but at the same time by one who is no more than a kind of knight, hence it is not likely that such a title would be assumed by so great a conqueror; yet, according to the statements of historians, this title in connection with Genghis was first adopted by him after he was proclaimed Emperor, or about that time. This strikes me as a strange fact, I cannot comprehend what charm or temptation could exist in such a title. Those of contrary opinion say, the Khan in Genghis Khan was not merely Khan, but

Khokan, meaning the Great Khan, and therefore it was adopted by Genghis for his imperial title; but, for the sake of simplicity, people, or rather writers, express it as Genghis Khan instead of Genghis Khokan. Well then, they might omit Khokan altogether, and call him simply Genghis. Yet why, if they use any title at all, should they mutilate that one which was given to him as a special distinction, and give one which is scarcely any distinction? Moreover, it is rather surprising that people always employ the expression Genghis Khan just as if it, in fact, formed but one name of this great conqueror; which, if a corruption of Ghenghi Kei, it would be, never Genghis Khokan, and seldom Genghis alone.

It may be asked, "If Genghis were Yoshitsuné, why did he not at once adopt or renew the name Minamoto Yoshitsuné, instead of Genghi Kei?" This, I am convinced, was because Minamoto Yoshitsuné is pure Japanese, and rather long; therefore he preferred what, after all, was only another way of pronouncing the same characters. This is a very common practice with many Japanese, who have to associate with Chinese or Coreans, because in writing, if we wish our names to be pronounced as pure Japanese, we must employ different characters, and more in number, and even then it becomes very difficult to make out. Not only this, but the names of many heroes are often read out, not by pure Japanese, but by another pronunciation derived from old Chinese. Thus the very name of Yoshitsuné is often read out as Ghikei; such practice of reading out names in their simpler sounds has

become extremely common at the present day. The readiest example of this is my own personal name, which is, in pure Japanese, Norizumi; yet no one, not even myself, pronounces it in this way, but always "Kenchio." This same practice most probably affected Yoshitsuné's choice of a name, therefore there is no mystery at all in his expressing it as Genghi Kei, instead of Minamoto Yoshitsuné.

Even conceding, however, that Khan in Genghis Khan was really meant to be a title, and adopted by himself, it is also not very improbable that he did so because, the ending "Kei" in his name Genghi Kei being nearly similar to that of Khan, he has done so purposely, changing Kei into Khan, and took the name Genghi Khan. Such words have doubtless been used both before and after his time, and in this case the adoption of the title Khan would not be so absurd as it otherwise would be. Or we might even produce another argument, and say the title Genghis Khan might be meant by him to signify the "Khan of the 'Genji,'" and this because Genji in Japanese means "the Gen," a name which can be equally applied in the singular to one, or collectively to many.

Whichever of these three views may be correct, they all equally point to the identity I am endeavouring to prove; indeed Genghis did not call himself, when he first appeared on the scene, Genghis, hence we may question, "If Genghis was Yoshitsuné, and the name being identical with Genghi Kei, why did he not call himself so from the first?" I would answer thus: Because he was

a fugitive from his country, and therefore in all probability he did not like his real name to be made public, and so assumed the temporary appellation of Temugin; but in the course of time, when he came to be powerful, he once more assumed a name which had a connection with his family and his clan. Now, if Genghis were Yoshitsuné, this would be most natural, since every unfortunate wanderer, exiled from his country, and compelled by circumstances to take another name, would, on becoming successful and famous, desire to return to his true name, or at least one which had some connection with his family. This seems to have been exactly the case with Yoshitsuné, who used the temporary appellation of Temugin, and thus the obscure circumstances relating to the adoption of this name will be at once cleared up.

Now, with regard to the earlier name of Genghis, viz., Temugin, some do not give any derivation, some say it was given to him by his father, Yezokai, because he was born when the latter defeated his enemy called Temugin, to perpetuate the victory; but this story is valueless, as such stories are easily invented by after generations, and this becomes more so when even the very existence of Yezokai is disputed. We have said that this was only a temporary appellation adopted by Yoshitsuné; and to inquire into the reason why he came to adopt this, it may be possible that there was a Mongol chief called Temugin, and, having defeated him, he called himself after that name, not to perpetuate the recollection of the victory, as asserted, but to assimilate himself

with native names. Yet, what we hold most probable is different from this. We think it is derived from the Japanese word Tenjin, as it is referred to in a note by Mr. Griffis, meaning in Japanese the "heavenly god," which was a title of great reverence, and applied to a great statesman after death. It seems that Yoshitsuné and his party assumed this title for him when they entered Mongolia, partly from their not liking to publish their real name, partly it may be in jest, but, at the same time, with the object of exciting the respect of the inhabitants.

While I was writing the above, I obtained a long abstract from the diary of the late Mr. Sewaki, Japanese Consul at Vladiostock, which was given me by Mr. Tomita, Japanese *chargé d'affaires* in London, who had kindly written to Japan for it, and to this diary I shall refer more particularly hereafter, but in this place I shall only quote so much as applies to the present part of my subject :—

"Ban Nobu-Yuki [a Japanese scholar who lived half a century ago] states in his work, *Chiu guai keii Den*, deducing arguments from various sources, that at the time Yoshitsuné crossed over from Yezo to Muh-kuh, anciently called Soo-shun, he changed its name to Mantchoo, a name taken from that of one of his celebrated ancestors, and by his ability and popular favour made himself master of those regions. His successors, also inheriting his bravery, at last invaded China, and became Emperors, and called his dynasty Yuen or Gen, taking the pronunciation of his family name."

This passage requires a little explanation. The family name of Gen was given, as before mentioned, by the Emperor Seiwa to his grandson Tsunemoto, who had eight sons, from whom different branches of the Gen family sprung. The eldest of these was Mitsunaka, generally known, by another pronunciation, as Mantchoo. The branch of Yoshitsuné's family belongs to this descent; this is the reason why the author referred to says that the name Mantchooria was derived from Yoshitsuné's ancestor. Next, coming to the second part of the quotation, that is, the dynastic name, every one will remember that the name of the dynasty descended from Genghis, and established in the Chinese Empire and Mongolia, was called 元 which is pronounced Yuen by modern Gen by ancient Chinese, and always the latter by the Japanese.

I have yet more to say on this point. Though the character representing the family name Gen, and that of the dynastic name, are different, it is remarkable enough that both these characters are intimately associated with each other in their literary use. Not only is their pronunciation exactly the same, and therefore belongs to the same stem of *in* [sort of rhyme for poetical use], but both are employed for conveying the same idea; that is to say, the character by which the dynastic name is represented signifies origin, or source, root; and that of the family name, strictly speaking, watersource; yet it also means origin, source, &c. For this reason, either of these two characters is applicable, and used for the same purport, and are often interchanged, and therefore the adoption of this name for his dynasty by

Genghis's grandson cannot naturally escape comment. Moreover, the circumstance of the adoption considerably strengthens our opinion. Previous to the Yuen dynasty there were in China no less than twenty of the so-called legitimate dynasties, and a still greater number of usurpations and pretenders, yet there was none which did not adopt their own dynastic name from the title of nobility borne before their accession, which is commonly derived from the name of some province or district, or at least from the name of the place where they sprang. Even the "Kin"—a peculiar name, meaning gold—the name of a dynasty before that of Gen, and which sprang from the Loautung, was adopted because that family arose on the banks of a river named Ngan-Chu-hu, signifying gold in the native tongue. Now, in the case of Yuen, there is no such connection whatever either with place or circumstance. Before the adoption of this title, the dynasty of Genghis Khan was called Mongu or Mongol, because the success of Genghis took its rise from the region of Mongolia. but the name Yuen is totally unaccountable. It is true Chinese authors say this name was adopted at the suggestion of a literary officer, and taken from the word kon-yuen [heavenly cause] in the sacred book *Yih-king*. This suggestion might possibly have been made, yet unless there had been some deeper reason for the choice than the mere suggestion of a scholar, it is almost impossible to suppose such a universal and long-established custom to have been departed from on this occasion, and the existing name to have been done away for no weightier

reason than caprice. It must be remembered that the name Mongol was adopted by Genghis merely from policy, and hence it must so have come down to his grandson Kublai, who also, in all probability, must have had some information concerning their real family name, and was led into this idea of changing it. But it appears very likely that he, not liking to excite popular remarks by stating his real reason, used for a pretext the suggestion of the scholar, and pretended to have taken it from a sacred book of Confucianism, highly esteemed by the Chinese, and thus the different characters, but alike in sound and meaning, came to be used for the name. Or it may be that the real character and origin of Gen was unknown to Kublai, but only the pronunciation and phantom-like traditions concerning it, and therefore he was induced to adopt that character.

It may not also be totally useless to remark that Genghis's first son was called Fuji, which is the name of the most celebrated and also almost sacred mountain of Japan. Again, two great generals of Genghis, who, by his command, invaded Persia and southern Europe, Suida and Hubbé, otherwise spelt Subtai and Shuppi respectively. Two conspicuous followers of Yoshitsuné were Saito Benkei and Whashinowo Saburo. Saito being originally a monk, his name is not read in two ways like other Japanese names, because all monks assume names peculiar to themselves, which are always pronounced in the ancient Chinese way only; therefore, if he had been with Yoshitsuné in Mongolia, he would still have pro-

nounced his name as Saito, while the name Washinowo, being the pure Japanese pronunciation, in another way of reading would be Shubbi. There is no great improbability, therefore, in supposing an identity between the above-mentioned generals of Genghis and the two devoted followers of Yoshitsuné.

In the same diary of Mr. Sewaki it is also stated that "Siebold [the well-known Dutch botanist, who lived half his life in Japan] told certain Japanese that when he visited Russia he saw swords and bows of Japanese make in a collection of antiquities brought from Mongolia, and also that there is a gateway Torii, after Japanese style, before a shrine on the banks of the Olga (?), which was said to be that of some remote ancestor of the Yuen dynasty, and that therefore these things may have some historical association with Yoshitsuné, whom he had often heard had crossed over to Mantchooria from Yezo."

These remarks also claim our attention, and if they are borne out by facts there cannot be a moment's doubt in the mind that our attempt to identify Genghis with Yoshitsuné cannot be viewed as an unsupported theory.

PART VI.

I NOW proceed to make fuller observations on the 'Diary' of the late Mr. Sewaki. He was not a man who was endeavouring to prove, as I am doing, the identity of Genghis Khan and Yoshitsuné, but simply tracing the ultimate fate of the latter, and also any vestiges left of the Japanese in Mantchooria. According to the statements which he has jotted down, just as he received them from the natives and Chinese residents, and information also obtained through other Japanese residing in Vladiostock, and from his own personal observations, putting aside any special point, it is most authentic that the Japanese had many connections with these regions at different times, and traditions are current about their coming into this country. The remains of fortifications and burying grounds, which are positively ascribed to the Japanese, are to be found everywhere; and it is also said that some of these old tombs, and most of the writings which were found in several shrines or other ancient sacred places, were removed to the Russian capital when that part of Mantchooria was ceded to her; and even commonly among the people allusions are constantly made to their connection with the Japanese, and the name of Japan always seems the most pleasant subject of conversation. They

even commonly go so far as to say that Mantchooria was once a Japanese dominion.

Now, it is true accounts are made in our history that in the middle of the sixth century an expedition was sent by our country and invaded Soo-shun, which name, it must be remembered, was anciently applied to a considerable part of modern Mantchooria; and from the beginning of the eighth down to the tenth century of the Christian era, the kingdom of Puhhai, which lay anciently close to the northern extremity of the Corea, extending over a part of Mantchooria, always acknowledged the supremacy of Japan, and embassies were sent from time to time to our country, and sometimes from Japan to theirs; and the origin of this was their being on bad terms with China. This is plainly recorded in our history, and even the documents of communications between the two governments are still preserved, showing the relative position between them. Yet, so far as this history goes, we do not see that we ever had any actual sovereignty over them; and, therefore, it would be rather strange, if, after so many years had passed away, and no such kingdom exists, the people should generally retain the impression that this territory was once under Japanese rule; and my opinion therefore is, that there must have been a time when certain Japanese who came there actually held dominion over them, leaving its remembrance powerfully impressed on the popular mind up to the present day, and this was done by Yoshitsuné.

But to give more particulars recorded in the

'Diary.' There is an old castle called Suchung, about one hundred and fifty miles from Vladiostock, which is said to have been built by a Japanese general. Concerning this castle he narrates a story, told him by Liu Ponchung, a native of Fungyeechung, Tamchiu, in Shantung, China, who resided in the town, which is built on the site of the ruins of this castle, "that an able Japanese general, escaping from the imminent peril of his life in his own country, came there, and erected this castle, and called it Suchung, *i.e.* Castle of Resuscitation, from his having escaped a fearful danger. Near the ruins of this castle there is a cave, in which that general is said to have lived on his first arrival, and stone monuments and fortifications. This cave also being considered sacred, entering it is believed by the natives to be of bad omen and the cause of misfortune. Notwithstanding this, some fifteen or sixteen years ago seven Chinese sceptics, not paying any attention to this idea, laid down in this cave, in order to spend the night, but at midnight they were all pitched out by some invisible power. There are also some families in the said town which claim descent from this Japanese general. About three hundred years ago, these families made copper coin with this inscription, 'Fungyung Tung pau,' *i.e.*, circulating money of Fungyung, which money is still current in several of the surrounding localities."

Now, looking into this story, this first part exactly coincides with the career of Yoshitsuné; but Fungyung, pronounced Kuanyei by Japanese, is the name of the years between, 1524 and 1543

A.D., therefore if the said families were descendants of Yoshitsuné, and had no ulterior communications with Japanese, there is no reason why they should know the Japanese name of the year; but the author of the 'Diary' goes on to state that he and many other Japanese, who were at Vladiostock, actually saw the coin, saying that they were exactly the model of the Japanese coins made at the above date, the only difference being that they were smaller in size. There is no doubt, therefore, that this coin was in some way or other made after a Japanese model, and he concludes that the general referred to above must have been Yoshitsuné or one of his followers; and that the coin which is said to have been made by these families, must have been an imitation of Japanese coin of the period, which may have been presented to them by some other Japanese who came there by some chance, in after times; or he says it might have been given by those shipwrecked sailors, of whom we have spoken before.* And again he says this very Japanese family may be descended from one of these same sailors, who might have remained behind in the country. Though this comment seems rather vague, I presume it may not be in disagreement with fact; because, as it appears in the above narration, the general in question must have come there some centuries before the

*According to his statement, quoted from Yezoshi, by Arai Hakusheki, a celebrated Japanese scholar, who lived about the middle of the eighteenth century, the place where the sailors are said to have seen the images in Japanese armour, whom they concluded to be those of Yoshitsuné and Benkei, is said to have been Tu lu kan, which place Mr. Sewaki says is to be found in a Corean map, between the rivers Amour and Tweephoon.

year 1524, and the time of the coinage must have been after the above date, and therefore belongs to quite a different period. I would even say that this coin might have been fraudulently made in Japan and taken to Mantchooria by some adventurers who settled there.

To conceive that there might have possibly been such adventurers, is by no means extravagant, and these might have made their own money there, if they did not take it from home. And my reason for this opinion is this, that, as I have stated before, in the fifteenth century the Japanese were extremely mischievous to the eastern coast of Asia, and this was followed by our commerce, which extended to Annam, Siam, and even the Phillipine Islands, and it was by a Japanese ship that a mission from a Japanese prince, sent to the Portuguese court and to Rome, were taken to Mexico *en route*. All these facts show how active Japanese navigation and shipbuilding was at this period, which was only discouraged and repressed by the selfish policy of the Tokugawa Government. Why then might not some adventurers have gone to the coast of Mantchooria? This indeed was not known to us, owing to the entire absence of any regular commercial intercourse with this particular place; yet these adventurers must not be confused with that general who made himself previously a powerful ruler over this region.

This will become more evident from what follows in another place in the 'Diary,' where he gives a narration, told by one Wang Chin Kiu, also a Chinese and a native of the province

of Shantung, who resided more than twenty years in the same town. It runs thus:—"In olden times, according to native tradition, there came into this country two Japanese generals, one Kinuchu by name, the other Fung Yung—the castle is said to have been built by one of them—but which came first, or at what precise period they arrived is unknown. Fung Yung became the chief of this region, and is said to have been succeeded by his descendants for the space of nearly three hundred years. His tomb still remains in the precincts of the castle, with an epitaph inscribed on it, and a daughter of Kinuchu is said to have built another castle, called the Castle of Tungkin (?) The coffins both of father and daughter are reported to be still preserved in a certain spot on the banks of the river Mootang." (?)

Now, in this narration too few particulars are given about Kinuchu, whereas more are supplied about Fung Yung. Nor are there any comments or observations by Mr. Sewaki himself, on this very name. Fung Yung is only a name for a Japanese period of years, and hence cannot be in any way a personal name. Therefore, there must have been some circumstances which led the people to imagine such a name; this, I think, arose from the fact that they, seeing the name of this year, 'Fung Yung' on the coin, mistook its signification for a person; but, with regard to the name Kinuchu, which was written by the above-mentioned Chinese as 金烏諸, there is no trace whatever of any Japanese name, either in the characters or pronunciation. But, after all,

this representation by Chinese characters seems to be phonetical, used by these Chinese, and apparently adopted previously by other Chinese, who might have taken an interest in these matters, to represent the Mongolian native sound of the name, which was probably like Kinuchu. Now, from these considerations, my conclusion cannot be otherwise than that it is the identical name, Genghis, because. as before stated, this name "Genghis" is pronounced in many different ways, some being, for example, Kinkitz, and Chinchïtzu, which are similar to Kinutsu or Kinuchu. This narration, indeed, does not detail what sort of achievements this Kinuchu performed; yet a statement is made by Mr. Sewaki, in another place, that a common tradition exists that a Japanese general who came there, combining great numbers of the natives, made a great attack upon China, and a powerful empire was finally established by his descendants. From this we can see that this Kinuchu must have been this general, and the empire must have been that of the Yuen dynasty; and, therefore, Kinuchu was identical with Genghis, who was one and the same with Yoshitsuné. The derivation of the name Kinuchu seems to be this, that Genghi Kei or Genghi Khan being a name adopted by Yoshitsuné, it was afterwards corrupted into many different sounds, partly by oral tradition and partly by the difference of native intonation; and one of these different modes of pronunciation, something resembling Kinuchu in sound, was preserved in these countries where Mr. Sewaki got his information, and was phonetically repre-

sented by the Chinese characters given above, by the Chinese with whom the latter gentleman discussed the subject; and when we examine the matter from this point of view, a name which is said to be Japanese, but which apparently bears no trace of a Japanese derivation, becomes quite intelligible. Again, the reason why no exact date of this man's career is to be found in native traditions ought not to be a matter of surprise, since the natives of those regions, being in a low state of civilisation, all such points would probably be handed down to them only orally; and, therefore, the exact dates became rather confused, and the distinction between his career and that of him whom they miscall, or whom they have altogether imagined, became faint and undefined. Hence the fact why that Chinese, who must have known well the history of Yuen, did not give any indication to identify this Kinuchu with Genghis, also ought not to be a matter of suprise, because in the history of Yuen, although the name of Genghis is represented by the Chinese characters sounding 'Ching-Ki-Tzs,' which does not much differ in sound from that of Kinuchu, he is considered as a native, and their notions about him must have been formed accordingly; and therefore, though they were informed by natives about the story of Kinuchu, they naturally would not be able to conceive the idea that Genghis was identical with Kinuchu; and, even supposing they had any such ideas they would not have rashly stated them, partly perhaps to avoid possible error, and partly perhaps not liking to admit they were once ruled over by a Japanese dynasty. However, taking all

accounts given both by Chinese and natives into consideration, the result of such inquiry would be arrived at, and the identity of Genghis and Kinuchu, who cannot be other than Yoshitsuné, appear unmistakably confirmed.

In endeavouring to identify any great characters it will be most important to show the similarity of ideas and sentiments in the minds of both, especially in their notions of religious matters, legislation, and military tactics, for a strong resemblance in such points will furnish a powerful presumptive evidence in favour of this identification.

Now, examining the characters of Genghis and Yoshitsuné under these points of view, we find such a similarity most strikingly manifest—a similarity which could scarcely be the result of an accidental coincidence, because, when we find certain great men agreeing remarkably in some one leading trait of character, it is rare that they do so in more than one; and I would say never in all the three, namely, religion, politics, and military tactics. There is, in all cases, some obvious difference and discrepancy which make two great men different and easily distinguishable. First of all, let us look at the religious opinions of Genghis, and other circumstances connected with this subject, which will serve as a corroborative testimony in tracing him to a Japanese origin. It is a well-known fact that Genghis was most liberal in his views of religion. To quote the words of the 'Conversations-Lexicon':—"He acknowledged no particular creed, he gave the preference to none; at his

court all men of merit, without reference to their religious opinions, were welcome. He allowed many Thibetian, Persian, and Arabian books to be translated into Mongolian, an example imitated by more than one of his successors, and by which the Mongols acquired a rank by no means unimportant among the civilised nations of Asia." To quote Mr. Howorth, "Genghis counselled his sons to tolerate all creeds, telling them it mattered little to the Divinity how they honoured Him. He himself believed in a Supreme Being, and also worshipped the sun." The same views as these are also stated by Petis de la Croix, and as the writer in the 'Conversations-Lexicon' says, they were by no means confined to Genghis alone; and we are told by Marco Polo that Kublai Khan informed him of his opinions on this matter, saying: "There are four aged prophets, revered and worshipped by four different classes of mankind. The Christians hold Christ as their divinity, the Saracens Mahomet, the Jews Moses, and the idolaters Sago Mambra Khan, their most venerated idol. I honour and respect all the four, and seek aid from them, as any one of these may be supreme in heaven."

From these quotations it is easy to see how Genghis was distinguished by an indifferent liberalism in religious matters which is quite antagonistic to European views, and this was imitated by his descendants. First of all, it is striking to find in this indifference to any particular form of religion the characteristic feature of the Japanese mind. I would not by any means be understood to assert that our people are

irreverent. As a rule they are strict in morals, faithful, and sincere, but they do not care about names or forms. The variety of individual religious opinions makes no difference in the amenities of social intercourse. They would not be so barbarous as to put their fellow creatures to death because their convictions were not the same as their own, nor do they deal out hopeless damnation to them because their creeds are contrary to their own bigoted notions.

We learn from Petis de la Croix that when Genghis entered the city of Bokhara, and saw two doctors of the city, he asked them what their faith was. They replied, they believed as did all Mahometans, there was but one God, and that this God did create all things, and had no equal. Genghis told them he believed the same; then he asked them what was their opinion of Mahomet. They answered that God had sent this prophet to his servants with his seal and order to instruct them in the laws they must follow. Genghis approved this answer, and said, "I believe it, since I, who am but the servant of God, daily send ambassadors into divers countries, and even to my own subjects, to make my pleasure known to them." After this they conversed with him on the subject of prayers, and the times in which it was their custom to pray daily. Their institutions in these matters he also approved, and also that of fasting, which the Mahometans observe in the month Rhamadan. Commenting on this, he told them it was but reasonable they should use some abstinence for the space of a month, since all the

rest of the year they ate and drank what they pleased, and passed whole nights in debauchery. Nay, even in this month of Rhamadan, although they called it, out of respect, the venerable. He also approved that a man should distribute a part of his goods to the poor. But when these doctors told him that the Mussulmans were obliged to build temples in which to worship God, and that these mosques were called "the house of God," where they had to pray and render Him homage, he told them that the whole world was the house of God, and that He heard the prayers of men in all parts of the world. He also asked many questions concerning their customs. After this they returned to their homes, affirming that Genghis had sentiments very comformable to theirs, and that he might be reckoned in the number of faithful Mussulmans; nevertheless, they were not pleased with his remarks concerning the Mosques.

This conversation is exactly similar to that which our intellectual class might hold in modern days with any foreigner; however, if I only say that the religious opinions of Genghis were liberal, and therefore representative of those of Japan, it may be objected that these are views any great man might hold, and therefore I will produce some instances of religious devotion performed by him, which is a common practice in Japan, and this also from Petis de la Croix. When four hundred and fifty Mongolian merchants and ambassadors were treacherously assassinated by order of the King of Karazm, in A.D. 1227, Genghis was so hurt by this act of barbarity that

he wept, and would take no rest until he had got all things in readiness to revenge them. He went to the top of a hill, where, uncovering his head, he prayed to God to prosper his undertaking against a faithless prince, whom he was trying to punish; and he remained three nights and three days on this spot, without taking any sustenance. In the middle of the third night a monk clothed in black appeared to him in a dream, and bade him fear nothing, for he should be successful in all his enterprise. This practice of remaining in holy places, situated on the top of a mountain, for the purpose of devotion, and often rigidly abstaining from food, some for a week, some even for a fortnight, is a common religious ceremony among the Japanese. Kichiji, who came to Mount Kurama, and made there the acquaintance of Yoshitsuné, and took him down to Oshiu, was one of such worshippers, who spent some nights in devotion on this mountain; and it is also a custom, almost universal among the Japanese, to invoke the aid of the Deity before undertaking any difficult enterprise.

Several authors give a description of what took place on the entry of Genghis into Bokhara. They say that when he came before a mosque he stopped to gaze upon it, and asked if that were the Sultan's palace, and on being told that it was the house of God he respectfully dismounted, and proceeded towards it on foot, and ascended into the gallery. This might seem a circumstance of small importance, but it reveals the liberality of his religious feelings, and we alone can see that this took place in exact accordance with

the Japanese customs. In our country it was considered the proper and polite act of every gentleman to descend from his carriage or his horse whenever he came within a certain distance of a temple, and the proper place to dismount is even indicated before any important temples, and this practice is still continued in our own day. Now, it would really seem very improbable that a great conqueror like Genghis, said to be born in a region where no religion existed, entering a city he had just taken, would have thought of performing such an act, without it had been done under the impulse and guidance of strong and early habits.

Gibbon, speaking of Kublai, grandson of Genghis, says: "Yet this learned man declined from the pure and simple religion of his great ancestor. He sacrificed to the idol Fo, and his blind attachment to the llamas of Thibet, and bonzes of China, provoked the censure of the disciples of Confucius." In his notes he also says: "The attachment of Kublai Khan, and the hatred of the mandarins to the bonzes and llamas, seem to represent them as the priest of the same God of the Fo, whose worship prevails among the sects of Hindostan, Thibet, Siam, and Japan. But this mysterious subject is still lost in a cloud, which the researches of our Asiatic Society may gradually dispel."

It would almost appear from these words of Gibbon that the attachments shown by the descendants of Genghis Khan to the worship of Fo was a surprising fact in his mind; but the theory which I am now attempting to establish

at once removes all this difficulty, and dispenses with the assistance of the Asiatic Society.

It is a well-known fact that the religion of Buddha now prevails among the Mongolians and Tartars, and it is our task to show at what time this religion was introduced into this part of the world. In a journey into Eastern Tartary by Ferdinand Verbrest, a Jesuit, in 1682 (see Ashley's new general collection of 'Voyages and Travels'), this statement is given: "All Mongols, according to Gerbrillon, are of the religion of Thibet, that is worshippers of the idol Fo, called in their language Fucheki. A Mongol prince, well versed in the history of his ancestors, on being asked the question by Gerbrillon when the religion of Fo was first introduced among them, told him that in the reign of the emperor Kublai, there came llamas into the country of the Mongols, who planted the religion; but that these llamas differed much from modern ones." This opinion seems to be correct. I was favoured by my friend, Mr. Nanjio, with the following extract from an important Chinese work entitled, 'Origin of Fo religion under the Yuen dynasty': "When Kublai was still a mere prince, being informed that there was a famous priest, Tso Lih cho, in Thibet, he at last went to the country of Seelyan, and despatching a message to the king Kwotan, of Thibet, requested him to send to him this famous priest. The king replied that this holy man had already disappeared; but added, "Here is his nephew, Paspa by name, he is now sixteen years old, yet well versed in the doctrine of Fo, I beg to offer him to you;" and

also it is stated in the same book, that Paspa served under the emperor Kublai, and was honoured with the title of Pope of the "Central Field." This fact, namely, the appointment of Paspa as religious instructor by Kublai, is also related in Chinese history; we can therefore fairly conclude that the introduction of this religion into Mongolia began at this time. Now, if it be so, we must reflect how it happened that Kublai came so much to favour this particular religion, seeing that he came from a land where no such religion existed at all before, and that he lived afterwards among the Chinese literati, to whom the religion of Fo was an object of intense dislike. My opinion is that since Genghis Khan was Japanese, the name of the religion of Buddha might have been the subject of their conversation among families; and thus it happened to come down and be impressed on the mind of Kublai, who being anxious to know that religion, came voluntarily to invite the priest from Thibet, and honoured him with such title, notwithstanding the ill feeling of the Chinese among whom he lived. An example of this kind, is the first introduction of Buddhism from India into China. It is stated in Chinese history that Buddhism was first introduced there at the time of the emperor Ming, of the after-Han dynasty, who dreamed that a golden angel flew into his palace gardens. Asking his courtiers what the interpretation of this dream might be, he was answered that some of them had heard that there was a holy Buddha (sacred image and doctrine) in the westward land. He sent for two priests

from India, and this is considered the first introduction of Buddhism into China; but it must be understood that the emperor Ming must have been informed beforehand about this religion, from the fact that a golden image was carried back to China by a general named Hoh, who made war on the frontier of India, and therefore, making pretence of a dream, formally introduced it. Just so was the case with Kublai, who, similarly, must have been informed concerning it beforehand while he was a prince in the court of Mongolia. I become more convinced of this opinion when I find it even stated by some author, I think Mr. Howorth, that Buddhism was known to Genghis. We have seen that according to Gerbrillon, who is said to have travelled altogether nine times in Tartary and Mongolia, the Fo is called Fucheki, in Mongolia. Another opinion asserts that Fo is called Fucheki among Tartars, and Boyhan, or Buychan, in Mongolia; in whichever it may be used, whether in Mongolia or Tartary, is of small moment, the word Fucheki is an argument in itself. In my opinion this word came direct from Japan, being a corruption of Hotoke, which is the common term for Fo in Japan, and has been in use for centuries among our people before the time of Kublai. In Mongolia, also, there were, and are still, deputy llamas, which are called Khutukutu, and in a note in Ashley's new general collection this word is said to be written Hotoget in Strahenburg. This last manner of writing is very similar to that of Hotoke in Japan. Now Fucheki, Khutukutu,

and Hotoget cannot be words produced by a mere interchange of sounds, because Khutukutu is distinctly sounded in four syllables, which is evident from the Chinese representation of the word sounded Khu-tu-ku-tu; therefore we cannot see any possibility of interchange between these words; and above all, also, the introduction of the word Khutukutu appears to be quite of recent date. The first Dalai llama, I am informed, was born A.D. 1389 or 1391, and died 1473 or 1476. He was not, of course, styled Dalai, that being a Mongolian word, and the Mongols not having yet had any intercourse with the Thibetians. It was during the supremacy of the third Dalai llama, from A.D. 1543, that llamaism was so widely spread among the Mongols. Although there may be some difference of opinion with regard to the exact accuracy of these dates, we may fairly conclude that the establishment of a formal system of hierarchy in llamaism cannot possibly vary much from the dates given, and Khutukutu being a name for a rank of this hierarchy and deputy of Dalai, must be a word employed after the establishment of this system.

Now, looking into Japanese Buddhism, the word Hotoke was in common use many centuries before this epoch, and therefore long before Genghis Khan. To strengthen my opinion concerning the origin of this word I wrote to my friend Mr. Nanjio, and made inquiries on that subject. According to his information, the commonly accepted origin of this word among Japanese Buddhist priests is this:

in the year A.D. 552 a king of Corea presented the Buddhist Bible and image of Fo to the Japanese emperor; the opinion of his ministers was divided, one party being for the reception, the other for the rejection of the religion; the Emperor therefore gave the image to Inamé, one of his ministers, who favoured its acceptance. He had his own house consecrated as a church, wherein he placed the image, which was the first Buddhist church ever founded in Japan. This year a great pestilence prevailed over the empire, and hence the oposition party, Okoshi and other, considered this to be the consequence of the introduction of this new religion, and having presented a petition to the Emperor, set the church on fire and threw the image into the river. In A.D. 684, one Sayeki brought back another image of Fo from the Corea. Umako, son of Inamé, a minister of high rank, built a chapel on his own premises, and placed the image there; and, making Yeben a Corean Buddhist, and Simatah a Chinese, and his daughter, a nun, his priests ordained a festival.

In the following spring, however, the pestilence again broke out; for this reason, Moriya, son of Okoshi, and others, impeached Umako as a heretic and deceiver, and once more the flames were put to the church, and the image, like its predecessor, was cast out of the fire into the waters of the Naniwah river, and the priests banished. At this time Moriya's party said the Hotorike, or fierce heat of the pestilence, was entirely the result of the baneful heresy; hence they adopted the idea that Fo was the

demon god of pestilence, and gave it the appellation of Hotokè, an abbreviation of Hotorikè, instead of Fo, or Bood. The authority for these accounts may be gathered from a hymn, in Japanese, about a Buddhist image, composed in the year A.D. 1262, by Shinran, the founder of a reformed Buddhist sect in the year A.D. 1262.

Thus we may see the word Hotokè was of very ancient use in Japan. Mr. Nanjio, however, in his own opinion, thinks there is another possible derivation of this word. He says the word Hotokè may be a corruption from Buddhé; to explain it more accurately, the word Buddhah was translated phonetically into Chinese with two Chinese characters, which were sounded Butta or Futo, in ancient Chinese pronunciation.

In the course of time, the Chinese took off the last syllable, and came to represent it with one character, which generally sounds in later Chinese, Fo, and in this way the word Fo came to be used just as if it had been the original name for Buddha, long before the time of the Yuen dynasty. About one thousand years ago, when the intercourse between China and Japan was most extensive, many scholars, among others Buddhist, used to go to China to prosecute their studies. The Buddhist scholars must have studied the original Sanscrit, and noticing that the title of the founder of their religion is not merely Fott, but Buddhah, Buddha, Buddhé, and such differences of form being the Sanscrit declension of the word, they must have naturally thought these phonetical representations of Fott

or Fo, in Chinese, were not sufficient to represent the word, and therefore they might have added há or hé to the Chinese Fott, making Fotthá or Fotthé. Now, as the Japanese has no sound of f, the sound of this letter is always changed into that of h, so Fo would become hó; again, the h and k sounds being very intimately associated in pronunciation among Oriental nations on the continent of Asia, and this because the h in Sanscrit, Chinese, and others, is a strong guttural or throat sound, while the same aspirate in Japanese is uttered far more softly, as if it did not come from the throat at all, and therefore the h sound in the languages of the continent generally resembles the k sound to the ear of Japanese. Hence hè might have been changed into kè, when these scholars learn Sanscrit in China, and thus hè became kè, and so the word Hotokè became established in Japan, while Fo became the common appellation of Buddha in China. Although this last account seems to be rather far-fetched, I cannot regard it as altogether an indefensible explanation; but, however these two opinions on the derivation of the word may differ, it is most certain that the word Hotokè, no matter whence derived, was established in our country long before the date of Genghis Khan. Now, looking at the fact that the word Fucheki and Hotoget is employed either among the Tartars or Mongolians, I cannot but feel convinced that these two words, Focheki and Hotoget, and that of the Japanese Hotokè, must have been originally the same word, and that either the Japanese, Mongolian, or Tartar word

must have been derived from either the one or the other. If it be so, we must admit that the Mongolian or Tartar must have come from the Japanese, because the word was used in Japan long before it was known in Mongolia or Tartary; if this were the case then, who could have introduced it? This must have been done by Yoshitsuné, whom I regard to be the same as Genghis Khan, and by his followers. This becomes more probable when we see that Buddhism began to be known in Mongolia about the time of Genghis Khan, and was formally established there by his grandson, Kublai Khan.

Since I have given so long consideration about religion, I ought now to direct my attention to the matters connected with legislation and military tactics. To portray the military character of Yoshitsuné in a few words, he was a general of great quickness, and so also was Genghis. Thus Mr. Howorth states, in his history of the Mongols, that in the time of peace he counselled his soldiers to be as quiet as calves, but in war to dash on their enemies like hungry falcons swooping on their prey. This appears exactly to describe the tactics of Yoshitsuné. Genghis often used to lead his army, putting himself in its front; and so often did Yoshitsuné, who never feared to face overwhelming enemies with interior numbers; and so Genghis, whenever he was necessitated to do so. Genghis used to maintain a most strict discipline among his soldiers, so much so, that they were prohibited to plunder on pain of death without the direct permission of the commander; so it was done also by Yoshitsuné.

Genghis organised a system of information and espionage, by which he generally knew well the internal condition of his enemy, and intrigued easily with the discontented, and used to seduce them by fair promises; so did also Yoshitsuné, and he also was always well informed of the movements and intentions of the enemy. Touching particular instances of the tactics employed by them, we see many examples of similarity between the two, sufficient to establish their identity; but after all, these matters are only of secondary consideration in the establishing the identity of the two characters. I will not give these stories here, though interesting indeed, but rather too detailed. Suffice to say that, so far as history goes, the military tactics of both exhibit in every point the same similarity.

And now with respect to legislation and politics: these subjects are always more or less affected by the country and the period; and it is almost an impossibility that a country which is only nomadic and wild, and without settled institutions, should produce spontaneously a man who should give a new and organic social system and law. Yet Genghis did this. He was, further, the organiser of the Mongolian nation, and he was first giver of law to the people, and introduced many new ideas into their social life. This alone is sufficient to strike us with astonishment, and I can never concede that such a man should arise spontaneously from such a place and people, without previous knowledge and experience; and besides, we see many instances of Genghis's ideas in politics and legislation, are

very similar to those of the time in which Yoshitsuné lived in Japan. Such are the observations which strike me in considering the politics, religion, and military tactics of two historical characters, whom I conclude to be one and the same.

CONCLUSION.

We have now carefully laid before our readers all the facts, arguments, and considerations which convince us that the Japanese hero, Yoshitsuné, and the mighty conqueror, Genghis Khan, were one and the same person. The effect of this evidence will vary, and its value be differently estimated by different minds, as they take the same or opposite views to ourselves. But the question is one which is very interesting to the Japanese student of history, and not altogether unattractive to the general reader. It may not, therefore, be unadvisable, in concluding our subject, to give a short summary of the principal reasons and arguments we have adduced in support of our theory.

In the first place we have shown, and we hope clearly, that there is no obstacle or difficulty in regard to the dates and personal ages of these two historical characters. They flourished at the same epoch, and were as nearly as possible of the same age.

We have seen that Minamoto Yoshitsuné was one of the greatest generals and strategists that Japan ever produced. He was a younger brother of Yoritomo, the founder of the Shogunate, which commenced at the end of the eleventh century, and continued to the year 1857. Previous to the Shogunate Japan was governed by Imperial

authority, but after its establishment it became the virtual ruler of the country, and the feudal system was firmly established. In effecting this great change in the political order of the State these two brothers, Yoritomo and Yoshitsuné, played the most conspicuous part, though their characters and views were different both in object and tendency, Yoritomo devoting his energies to political organisation, whereas all military operations were practically carried on by Yoshitsuné, though nominally under the authority and direction of his brother.

After the final defeat of their common enemy, the Hei, the two brothers became estranged, and misunderstandings took place between them, arising more from the envious feelings of Yoritomo's mind than from any fault of his brother, and matters at last came to such extremities between them that Yoshitsuné, after a false report of his death had been published by his friends, was compelled to bid an eternal farewell to his native land. He first crossed over to the island of Yezo, and thence to Tartary, which last fact is now established by the most conclusive evidence.

The date of Yoshitsuné's flight from his country took place in the year 1189 A.D., at about thirty years of age. It is clear enough that, on arriving in this new territory, a man of Yoshitsuné's antecedents and talents, accustomed as he had been to exercise authority and military command, would not have sat down idly in his new home, but must almost necessarily have engaged in some enterprises of a nature consonant to his former pursuits. We have,

therefore, little difficulty in supposing that under such circumstances he would either have adopted some independent undertaking, or placed his great military talents at the service of some native prince. But no intercourse or communication existed at this remote period, nor indeed since has existed between Japan and those regions. What, therefore, these enterprises and undertakings may have been, is altogether unknown to our earlier historians. On the other hand, we find that about this period, in the regions of Tartary, a great general became conspicuous amongst the wild tribes who inhabited the territory. This great general, whose name is variously represented, and as variously pronounced, is commonly called Genghis Khan, whose fame and ability in political and military science forms the theme and excites the surprise of every author who has attempted to write any account of him, that such a wild and uncivilised region could ever have produced a man of such discipline and experience, whom even the heroes of the civilised world have scarcely equalled; and this man I have endeavoured to prove is one and the same with our famous hero, Yoshitsuné, an opinion which has not originated with myself, but is held not only by many of my contemporaries, but by some Japanese *literati* of previous times, as shown in the course of our former pages. Genghis Khan's age was, according to statements made by what are considered reliable writers, sixty-six—some say sixty-seven, others seventy-three—at his death, which is said to have taken place in 1227 A.D.; others, again, give this date 1226.

Striving for distinction, he, with a rapid and marvellous success, made himself the chief of a vast empire; but there is no authentic information about his origin and early life before he attained the age of forty, when he suddenly burst forth on his meteor-like career, and left numerous and ample accounts of his after life and deeds. First, then, in regard to their ages, there is little or no difficulty to reconcile, since Yoshitsuné was a mere infant at his mother's breast in the beginning of the year 1159, and therefore, if he lived to the year 1226 or 1227, his age would have been about sixty-seven or sixty-eight, which does not differ much from either limit of Genghis Khan's age at the time of his death; and, next, Yoshitsunés flight from Japan was in 1189, so that it is just thirteen or fourteen years previous to the date when Genghis Khan began to burst forth, which was about 1202 or 1203; hence, we find no discrepancy of age or time.

Now the fact I have again and again dwelt upon as most important, and which I repeat here, is that, concerning the family and early life of Genghis, according to the criticisms of several Chinese authors of repute, as well as writers of other nations on this subject (see Part III.), nothing whatever is certainly known; but a multifarious mass of legends and traditions contradictory and irreconcilable in any way with each other is given of these matters, all of which appear upon careful scrutiny nothing more than a vain attempt to supply, by fictitious and romantic biographies, facts of which all were equally ignorant, or to conceal the absence of any trust-

worthy data by an ollapodrida of miscellaneous and marvellous stories, which is only natural under the circumstances and in such times, if the man was a foreigner and his antecedents unknown. On the other hand there are many details which supply us with hints, favouring our view of this question. Among these we find that the family name of Genghis is said to be Kian, meaning torrent; Gen, the family name of Yoshitsuné, means springing water; the similarity in the sound of G and K often causes their interchange in Mongolia, G and K, both guttural sounds, being articulated almost undistinguishably. *Seppu*, a Chinese historical work of miscellaneous nature, states that Genghis Khan was Yuen Yee King or Gen ghi Kei, which is expressed in the same characters as Minamoto Yoshitsuné.

The party, or rather tribe, of which Genghis Khan was said to have been the head, were called Niron youn, meaning children of the Sun. This seems to have been a corruption of Nihonjin—the Japanese—"sun origin men." The reputed father of Genghis is generally said to have been named Yezokai, but this name appears to me to point out clearly that he came from Yezokai (Sea of Yezo), and the tradition of Yezokai being his father is derived from this fact. The title also of the first wife of Genghis was Fudgin, which is evidently taken either from Japanese or Chinese, but not being recognised by the Chinese as derived from them must have come from the former, where it is used as a title of respect for ladies of high position.

The flags and banners which figured so conspicuously in the ceremony of Genghis Khan's coronation, and in the advance of his armies, were pure white, so were the family flags and banners of the Gen (Yoshitsuné); the very name Genghis Khan was not assumed by him until he became famous and powerful; the reason of its adoption and the circumstances connected with it, and its derivation, as explained by the generality of writers, is most ridiculous. Viewed, however, as we view it, in the light of a corruption of Genghi Kei, another common way of pronouncing the name Minamoto Yoshitsuné, or of Gen-ji Khan (the Khan of the Gen) it becomes natural and satisfactory. The probable reason why he did not use this name previously seems to have been because he was an exile and a fugitive. Consequently, in the earlier and more obscure period, when he was carving out his road to fortune, he would not venture to employ his own proper title, but used the temporary appellation of Temugin, which is also of Japanese origin; and again, the reason that the proper sound of Gen' was not always accurately preserved, but often changed into the similar sounds of Jen, Zen, Chin, appears to be natural, from the fact that the native tongues of Tartary and Mongolia do not possess the correct sound of G (hard).

When Genghis first created his empire, he adopted the name Mongol for his state from mere policy, as appears from the author Man-hung, though he had no connection with the Mongols, but it was changed into Yuen, Gen in Japanese,

by his grandson, Kublai, which in pronunciation is identical with Yoshitsuné's family name Gen', also pronounced Yuen by the modern Chinese; and the words being also identical in meaning, being often interchanged in practice to convey the same idea, must, therefore, in some way or other, have been derived from Yoshitsuné's family name. It becomes more conclusive when we see that previous to this dynasty no less than twenty legitimate, and many more usurpers besides, adopted their dynastic name from the title of nobility borne by them before their accession, or the name of the country where they sprung; but that of Yuen has nothing whatever to do with such an origin; unless our theory of its derivation be adopted. And, again, the name Mantchoo, which first began to be substituted for an older name of that region from about the time of Genghis Khan, seems to have been derived, according to Mr. Ban, from the name of a celebrated ancestor of Yoshitsuné, who was the founder of the family; and according to Mr. Sewaki, there is a common tradition among the natives of Mantchooria that an able Japanese general arrived in this region and made himself leader there, and having attacked China, a powerful empire was consolidated by his descendants. The name of this general was Kinuchi, which I strongly believe to have been identical with Chin-kitz, or Khinkitzu, a corruption of Genghis.

The report about the images in Japanese armour, seen by the shipwrecked sailors on the doors in the city of Mantchooria, and asserted to

be those of Yoshitsuné and Benkei, also the Japanese swords, bows, and other antiquities seen by Dr. Siebold, in Russia, having been brought thither from Mantchooria, and also the Japanese gateway (Torii) before a shrine dedicated to a remote ancestor of the Yuen dynasty, on the banks of the Olga, of which the same author speaks, form altogether links of no little strength in the chain of our evidence.

These may be viewed as the more direct evidence for the theory I am advancing, but there are also many other circumstances of a more indirect character to which I shall make only a brief allusion.

I have cited, in Part IV., all traditional accounts of Genghis Khan's family, and pointed out the resemblance they bear to the well-known incidents of Yoshitsuné's early life, which I need not reproduce here. Among these traditions the family of Genghis is represented to have altogether disappeared from the region of their supposed native country, and suddenly returning after the lapse of four centuries to have made themselves masters of the territory by force of arms. This gives additional force to the opinion that the family of Genghis came from the outside. The tradition concerning the melting down of the ironstone mountain, impossible in itself, and the ceremony of striking the red-hot iron, and the report which represents Genghis Khan to have been connected with the profession of smith, also leads us to conclude that these are only distorted accounts of events of Yoshitsuné's youth. It must also not be forgotten, that though we have no positive

assertion that Genghis was Japanese, it was clearly implied in the metaphor used by Shamuca of the sparrows and the wild goose, that he was a foreigner.

And then, again, let us call to mind the letter said to have been given to the Japanese sailors when they were sent home by the Tartar ruler, and founder of the present Tsing dynasty, who desired to establish friendly relations with our country on the ground of his being a descendant of Yuen Yee King, and therefore of Japanese descent; and to this must be added the assertion in the *Tsih Kiun Luh*, where the Emperor Kiun Loong declares that he is a descendant of Yuen Yee King, an assertion, we must recollect, the most out of the way and unaccountable if we do not suppose that such declaration was consistent with certain unquestioned facts. There is, indeed, I admit, much room for tracing out and discussing the above genealogy. Yet, so far as the fact goes, that is to say, the establishment of Yoshitsuné as a chief and a leader among the Tartars, it must be admitted to be undeniable.

I also said that there was a striking similarity in the characteristics of these two great men, who I maintain to be one, and not two, in three remarkable points, namely, religion, politics, and military tactics, which also does not fail to supply corroborative testimony to their identity; and above all this, the circumstances and particulars of the introduction of Buddhism into Mongolia, and the derivation of the word Fucheki and Hotoget deserves our careful consideration,

of which I have given a detailed account in Part VI.

First, then, having, I think, clearly shown the possibility of my theory in respect to ages and dates, I have next produced a large amount of proofs from the nomenclature of the family, localities, and individuals connected with the dynasty of Genghis; and this, supported by a multitude of independent facts and assertions, and by the unquestionable testimony given in the diary of Mr. Sewaki to the fact of the existence of Japanese monuments and relics in Mantchooria, together with traditions of a famous general of our nation whose name, given in his report, may be easily recognised as a corruption of Genghis and therefore of Gen Ghi Kei. (See Part VI.)

Independent of all these matters it may be asked if Yoshitsuné was indeed a character likely to accomplish such great success, and we at once reply in the affirmative. He was, as we have said, the greatest hero our country ever produced, the theme of our ballads and our romances; besides he was absolutely compelled by his misfortunes to perform some great exploits in the land of his exile, and, moreover, such adventurous military spirit was the distinguishing characteristic of his family in a remarkable degree, so that nearly every hero whose name is kept alive in popular memory belongs to this race; among them Tamêtomo, the uncle of Yoshitsuné, who, after he was banished from the capital in his extreme youth, on account of his turbulent and refractory disposition, subdued, with the aid of his bride's father, nearly the whole island of Kiushiu under his

power when only thirteen years of age—a remarkable instance of precocious talent and physical vigour—and only submitted to the imperial authority when the Government arrested and threatened to punish his father as a means of bringing him to subjection; and who afterwards took a leading part in a war between two rival claimants of the imperial crown, and ultimately crossed over to Loochoo, where he founded the dynasty of the late royal family. This Tamê-tomo was the ideal model of Yoshitsuné; and again, his brother Yoritomo, whose talents for organisation were so distinguished, created in reality the entirely new political system of the Shogunate, with whom Yoshitsuné acted in concert at the commencement of their famous career.

This shows what qualities have characterised the family, and also his individual aspirations and ambition. What wonder then if Yoshitsune himself became afterwards the founder of a famous and powerful dynasty?

Demonstration, as we have said, must not be looked for in such cases, but we think, or at least we hope, that we have adduced such a weight of probability in support of our view, so many particulars and small links, individually weak perchance, but which united together form such a strong chain of evidence, that no candid or impartial mind will be able to resist its basis. And if our theory is established, that Genghis Khan, neither was nor could be the outcome of wild and nomadic states, in the lowest state of civilisation, the philosophical maxim,

that no great general nor organiser can be produced without previous baptism of bloodshed and fire accompanying the general advancement of material civilisation in its general relations, is again confirmed.

FINIS.

Printed by W. H. and L. Collingridge, 128 and 129, Aldersgate Street, London, E.C.