



19.7.4  
(1-24)







\* 3

John Crawford \*

# THE HORSE:

Its History and Uses.

---

THE horse—the noblest conquest of man over the lower animals, although not the most difficult, for in this respect it must yield to the elephant, as in utility it must to the ox—is at present nowhere found in its original wild state, although the ass and the ox unquestionably are so. A true wild horse was supposed to exist in the mountains of Thibet; but a specimen of this animal has at length been brought to England, and is now to be seen in the gardens of the Zoological Society. It is, however, of the family of the asses, somewhat taller than the true wild ass, lighter in the shoulder, longer in the neck, with shorter ears and a more horse-like head. It is, in fact, I am assured by an eminent naturalist, my friend Dr Falconer, the Djiggatai of the Moguls, and hunted by them for its flesh—considered by Tartars to be better venison than that of any deer.

In the domesticated state, the horse has immemorially existed in every region of the Old World, the Arctic excepted. His disappearance from the absolutely wild state is probably to be accounted for from his natural habitat being the open plain; from the facility with which he would hence be captured, and when captured, tamed, domesticated, and made useful.

As we now see him, the horse consists of an almost infinite variety, differing in size, in form, in colour, and even in disposition. Much of this variety has, no doubt, been the work of man, but it is so great that it is difficult to believe, when we consider the insuperable difficulties to intercommunication which existed in early times—always rude times—that all the widely differing races could possibly have sprung

from a single species, or that time, soil, and climate could have produced so prodigious a diversity. To account for it, then, I think we must come to the conclusion—and I am not the first that has come to it—that there must have existed originally a great number of closely allied species capable of commixture, and of producing a fertile offspring. Such is certainly the case with the ox and the dog, and probably even with the human race itself.

For this inference a good deal of evidence might be produced. Thus language countenances the theory. In every original tongue of countries in which the horse appears to have been indigenous, as far as I have been able to discover, it has a peculiar and distinct name. Thus, it has a distinct name in Greek, in Latin, in German, in the Celtic tongues, in Persian, in Arabic, in Sanscrit, in the languages of the South of India, in the Hindu-Chinese tongues, and in the languages of the Malayan Islands. Sometimes it has two names, a native with a foreign synonyme, as in Irish or Gaelic and in Javanese—in the first case the synonyme being Latin, and in the last, Sanscrit. In countries in which the horse had unquestionably no existence, it naturally takes its name from the language of the people who introduced it. In South and Central America, and the Philippine Islands, the name is Spanish, taken from the Latin; and in North America and Australia, it is English.

There are two broad distinctions in the horse—the full-sized one and the pony—which seem to point, at least, at two distinct aboriginal races or osulating species. No change of climate or skill in breeding, supposing there be no crossing, will convert the one into the other. In most countries both exist together; but in some, one of them only exists. Thus, in the intertropical countries which lie between India and China, and in the islands of the Indian Archipelago, the pony only exists, and the full-sized horse is as unknown as the ass or the camel. In the languages of these countries, consequently, there is but one name for the horse, while in the languages of Hindustan and Persia there are distinct terms for the horse and the pony. In Arabia the horses are all comparatively small and do not materially differ in size; so there are no ponies, and, consequently, in the copious Arabic language, no distinct terms for horse and pony. It may be suspected that the same was the case in some of the poorer and remoter parts of the British islands, for in the Celtic languages the pony has no other name than “little horse.”

Soil and climate, independent of the care of man in feeding and breeding, of which, in the ruder states of society, the horse receives little or none, seem to have very little influence on its size, form, or disposi-

tion. In the temperate western parts of Europe it is found of a size never seen in any part of Asia or Africa: it thrives even in countries in which nature had not originally planted it, and this applies to every region of America, from the equator to Terra del Fuego. Over this wide region, with some allowance for patent neglect, it is still the Spanish horse introduced about three centuries ago. In the absence of powerful carnivorous animals, and with abundant pasture, it there multiplies much faster than it could at any time have done in any part of the Old World,—so fast indeed as, in many cases, to have regained its liberty and to have returned to its wild state, yet ever retaining that variety in colour which marks its once subjection to man.

Like America, the Philippine Islands were found without the horse. The Spaniards introduced it, but in this case they introduced the Spanish horse from South America, and, along with it, the pony of the neighbouring Malay Archipelago, and the result is that the breed of horses of these islands is a kind of galloway intermediate between the two races. Here, too, under conditions as favourable as in America, it has run wild.

The Southern hemisphere opposes no obstacle to the successful multiplication of the horse, since we find the different breeds of the English horse thriving nearly as well in Australia, New Zealand, and the southern extremity of Africa as in the country from which they came. In countries to which the pony only is indigenous the full-sized horse thrives perfectly, as is seen from its introduction, in very recent times, into Java and the country of the Burmese.

The notion that all the different races of the horse have proceeded from one original stock has no warranty from history. As long as the horse receives no special care in breeding, he undergoes no change, and such care he only receives in a considerably advanced state of society, or where, as in the case of the Arabs, he is an object of special and peculiar importance. The half wild and neglected horse of South America does not materially differ from his progenitors introduced by the Spaniards above three hundred years ago, and our own Shetland and Welsh ponies most probably differ in no respect from their predecessors of the time of the invasion of Julius Cæsar. The squab, strong, and enduring Tartar horse of the present day is, in all likelihood, the same kind of animal by help of which Attila, and Gengis, and Timur effected their conquests,—the same with which the Tartar tribes subdued China twice over, and against whose incursions a wall of 1,500 miles long was no security. It is the same, too, which the



allied armies will encounter in their march on Pekin—a shaggy rough galloway, under fourteen hands.

Through the care of man, it is needless to add that vast improvements have been effected in the horse. This care, as is well known, has been long bestowed by the Arabs. It is certain, however, that in Arabia, as in every other country, a native race must have existed to afford the materials for selection. In sacred writing Solomon is represented as purchasing his stud, not in Arabia but in Egypt, from which it has been very hastily inferred that the last of these countries, and not the first, is the parent country of the high-bred Arab as we know him. For this notion, however, I can see no good foundation. The Egyptians of the time of Solomon were a civilised and wealthy people, with abundance of horses, and the Israelite king naturally went for his to the best or most abundant market, which was Egypt. The Arabs of the same period were a rude, nomadic, and isolated people, and so they continued for a long time after, until, indeed, Mahomed, in the seventh century of our own time, “breathed,” as Gibbon expresses it, “the soul of enthusiasm into their savage bodies,” and made them an united, a conquering, and in many respects a prosperous people. It was most probably then only that they began to pay special attention to the breeding of the horse, and the result of which has been the production of that animal which, in so far as form, bottom, and beauty are concerned, is considered the perfection of the blood horse. He is, however, in size what we should call a mere galloway, and when in perfection seldom exceeding fourteen and a half hands high. He cannot be said to be master of a weight exceeding ten stone, and yet there is some adaptation of his strength to the usual class of riders he has to carry, for the man of Asia is much lighter than the man of Europe. In India it has been ascertained that on an average the Indian trooper is lighter than the English light dragoon by no less than two stone and a quarter. The difference between the Englishman and the Arab is probably not so large, but still it must be very considerable.

The Arab horse has been justly praised for its gentleness and docility, qualities generally ascribed to their rearing and tuition. I am, however, satisfied that this character is far more owing to the natural temperament of the race, for it sometimes happens that an Arab is vicious, and when he is, he is exquisitely and incorrigibly so. There is one quality in which the Arab horse perhaps excels every other, endurance of continuous labour. A little Arab of 14 hands, for a bet of £500, rode 400

miles in five consecutive days, or at the rate of eighty miles a day, carrying 10st. 7lb. The feat was performed on the race-course of Bangalore, but 13° distant from the Equator. The horse was Jumping Jemmy, and the rider, as meritorious as his horse, Captain Horne, of the Madras Artillery.

I will give you, however, the description of a genuine Arab, more lively as well as more amusing than any other that I am acquainted with. It is that of Evelyn in excellent quaint English. In the year 1683 the Turks, under their Grand Vizier, invested Vienna, and the Emperor of Germany and his ministers fled. John Sobieski, elective King of Poland, came to the rescue. The Turkish army was entrenched, and the Grand Vizier, in Turkish fashion, was taking the matter coolly and quietly, for he was seen from a neighbouring height smoking his chibouk and sipping his coffee. Polish blood could not stand such a sight, and the Polish cavalry, lance in hand, cleared the entrenchments, entered the Turkish camp, routed the army and pursued it to Hungary and beyond it. For this service, in less than a century, the Poles were requited, after a peculiar fashion, by having their country partitioned, and a large slice of it taken by the descendants of those who but for them might have been now crying "Bismillah" instead of being in league with the Pope. Some Arab horses were among the spoil, and were brought for sale to England, and exhibited before Charles II. The following is the account given of them in the Diary. "Dec. 17th, 1686, Early in the morning I went into St James's Park to see three Turkish or Asian horses, newly brought over and first shown to His Majesty. There were four, but one of them died at sea, being three weeks coming from Hamburgh. They were taken from a Bashaw at the siege of Vienna, at the late famous raising of that leagner. I never beheld so delicate a creature as one of them was, of somewhat a bright bay, two white feet, in all regards beautiful, a blaze: such a head, eyes, ears, neck, breast, belly, haunches, legs, pasterns, and feet,—in all regards beautiful and proportioned to admiration, spirited, proud, nimble, making halt, turning with that swiftness and in so small a compass as was admirable. With all this so gentle and tractable as called to mind what Busbequius speaks of them, to the reproach of our grooms in Europe who bring up their horses so churlishly as makes most of them retain their bad habits. They trotted like does, as if they did not feel the ground. Five hundred guineas were demanded for the first, three hundred for the second, and two hundred for the third, which was brown. All of them were choicely shaped, but the two last not altogether so

perfect as the first. It was judged by the spectators, among whom was the King, the Prince of Denmark, the Duke of York, and several of the Court, noble persons skilled in horses, especially M. Faubert and his son, Provost Masters of the Academy, and esteemed of the best in Europe, that there were never seen any horses in these parts to be compared with them."

The present races of the English horse are, with the exception of the ponies, a very mixed breed. Our draught horses are in a large degree derived from the horses of Flanders, and it is by no means improbable that our Saxon forefathers brought with them some of the heavy horses of Holstein and Sleswick. An indigenous full-sized horse, however, certainly existed in the time of the Roman dominion. It was this, most probably, that was used in the scythed chariots of the Britons. It was, at all events, possessed of such good qualities as to be much sought after on the Continent. From this horse and the blood of the Arab has sprang our famous race-horse, far exceeding in fleetness all others. The Arab, for breeding, seems first to have been introduced in the beginning of the seventeenth century in the reign of James the First. In about a century's time, or ending with the time of Queen Anne, all the benefit derivable from the Arab blood seems to have been completed. It is certain, however, that the original unmixed English horse, from which the race-horse derives its size and strength, must have possessed excellent qualities, for we have in proof the fact that Flying Childers, supposed to be the fleetest horse that England ever produced, was the immediate offspring of an English mare by the Darley Arabian, a genuine Arab of the Desert,—that he was, in other words, a half-bred, a fact which seems to be implied by his portraits, for although his other points appear unobjectionable, he has a large coarse head, such as a true Arab never had. The celebrated Eclipse traced his pedigree not very remotely to the Godolphin Arabian, which has been supposed by some to have been a Barb, but I fancy only from the fulness of his crest. If the account I have heard be true, that he was a present from the Sultan to Louis the Fourteenth, the probability is that he was a true Arab, as the Sultan could easily have got one without going to the mixed blood of Barbary.

Although, however, no account is given of the dam of Flying Childers it is likely that she may have had some Arab blood, for the horse was of the time of Queen Anne, before which Spanish, Barb and even Arab horses had for 100 years been introducing into England.

If, then, the Arab blood be the only true one, there is no such thing as a thorough-bred English horse. Our race-horse with all its perfection

is, in fact, a factitious breed. That it is mostly derived from the Arab, however, will probably be inferred from its corresponding with it very perfectly in colour. With the Arab, the prevailing colours in the order of their frequency, are, grey, bay, and chestnut. It is never sorrel, roan, or piebald, and very rarely black, and such also is the case with the English blood-horse.

The superior speed of the English racer over the Arab has been frequently determined, as might well be expected from an animal on an average by two hands higher, with every racing point at least equal. In 1814 a second-rate English horse, Sir Solomon, ran a race of two miles on the course of Madras against an Arab, which, giving heavy weights, had beaten every other Arab in India. This was the Cole Arabian afterwards brought to England. He was under fourteen hands high, and received a stone weight. The English horse, an ill-tempered one, ran sulkily during the first part of the race, and there was every appearance that he would be distanced, but in time he ran kindly, overtook the Arab and beat him handsomely. His success was followed by the acclamations of thousands of Natives who were assembled on the course. This statement I had from an eye-witness. In 1828, the English horse Recruit beat easily the Arab Pyramus, the best at the time in India, giving him two stones nine pounds. The distance, ran on the race-course of Calcutta, was two miles.

A few years ago a match was run between an English blood-mare and the best Arab in Egypt. The race was ten miles long over the Desert. For the first mile the horses went neck and neck, after which the mare ran a-head, and before the race was over the Arab was left behind and out of sight. In fact, the difference in speed between the English racer and the Arab is something like that between the hare and the antelope.

The European cavalry horse of the Middle Ages was of necessity a powerful animal, since he had not only to carry a rider covered with armour, but had armour of his own to bear. The same kind of horse seems to have been continued even down to the Revolution, as we see it represented in the equestrian statues of Charles the First and William the Third. Sir Walter Scott, in his "Crusaders," gives a very graphical account of the war-horse of the Middle Ages, as contrasted with the Arab, in his imaginary duel between Cœur de Lion and Saladin in the Desert. Sir Walter, by the way, was himself a cavalry officer, having attained the rank of full major in the East Lothian Yeomanry. Gibbon, I may here add, was also a military man after a way—a major of militia—

to judge by the accounts we have of his person, probably not a very active one on parade, and he was never tried anywhere else. He informs us himself, however, that his training as a militiaman contributed largely towards enabling him to write "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire."

With such horses as I have now described, the style of horsemanship and the kind of exercises in vogue towards the end of the seventeenth century, may be judged by a passage from the "Diary of Evelyn," dated the 13th of December, 1685. "I went," says he, "with Lord Cornwallis to see the young gallants do their exercise, M. Faubert having newly railed in a menage, and fitted it for the Academy. There were the Dukes of Norfolk and Northumberland, Lord Newburgh, and a nephew of Duras, Earl of Feversham. The exercises were, 1st. Running at the ring. 2nd. Flinging a javeline at a Moor's head. 3rd. Discharging a pistol at a mark. Lastly. Taking up a gauntlet with the point of a sword;—all these performed in full speed. The Duke of Northumberland hardly missed of succeeding in every one,—a dozen times, as I think. The Duke of Norfolk did exceeding bravely. Lord Newburgh and Duras seemed nothing so dexterous. There I saw the difference of what the French call *belle homme à cheval* and *bon homme à cheval*, the Duke of Norfolk being the first, that is a fine person on a horse, the Duke of Northumberland being both in perfection, namely, a graceful person and excellent rider. But the Duke of Norfolk told me he had not been at this exercise for these twelve years before. There were in the field the Prince of Denmark, and the Lord Lansdowne, son of the Earl of Bath, who had been made a count of the Empire last summer for his service before Vienna."

The Arabs occupied Spain for seven centuries, and the African shore of the Mediterranean they have possessed for twelve, and to the intermixture of the blood of their horses with that of the native races has been derived the jennet and the barb. A good native horse, however, probably existed in both countries, and indeed with respect to Barbary, it may be considered certain when we know that the Numidian horse formed the best cavalry of Hannibal, and contributed largely to his victories over the Romans. The Persian horse is said to have some Arab blood, but it cannot be large, for the modern horse does not materially differ from that represented with great spirit and seeming truth in a celebrated mosaic pavement of Pompeii, which is, at least, by seven centuries older than the conquest of Persia by the

Arabians. The horses of the mosaic are, in fact, very ordinary animals, without the smallest show of blood, and so is the modern Persian horse.

But, besides those already named, there are horses in various parts of Asia which seem to be endemic in the countries in which they are found, and to have received no admixture of foreign blood. Such a race is the squab, strong, and sure-footed little horse of Butan, called the Tangan, frequently imported into Bengal. The small horse of Tibet is another instance. Like the shawl goat, and all the other animals of the elevated and dry region which it inhabits, it has a double coat of hair, a long shaggy outer one, and at the roots of this a fine woolly one corresponding with that which in the goat is the material of the Cashmere shawl.

The horses of the plain of Hindustan are of ample height and considerable activity, but wanting in strength, and above all in bottom, and very often vicious. It is remarkable that the best breeds are found towards the south, and especially in Central India, and the worst towards the East, including Bengal and Orissa. As no remarkable care in breeding is anywhere bestowed by the Indians, the superiority of the horses of such countries as Mysore, Cattewar Gujrat, and Malwa, may be attributable to a peculiar suitability of soil and climate, and probably to the introduction, in remote times, of some portion of Arabian blood. In general, the Indian horse is what the Irish, and sometimes the Scots, call a garron, that is a vulgar hack. At all events his inferiority is declared by the necessity we are ourselves under of going to the Persian and Arabian gulfs, to the Cape, and to Australia, for a better. One flagrant misnomer which Europeans apply to the common Indian horse may be noticed. He is usually known to them under the appellation of Tazi, meaning jade, and almost "screw," whereas the word, which is Arabic, properly signifies a true Arab.

Proceeding south we have the Burmese or Pegu pony, and among the Islands of the Indian Archipelago, from Sumatra to Timur, a great variety of races, for every island possessing the horse has, at least, one race, and the larger several. Among these the most remarkable is the horse of a certain volcanic island called Sumbawa, and more especially of a district of it called Gunung Api, which literally signifies "fire mountain," or, in other words, "the volcano." The Sumbawa horse is generally below twelve hands, and its most

frequent colours grey and bay, occasionally sorrel, but, as with the Arab, rarely black, and never piebald. It has the legs and the blood-head of the Arab, its spirit, bottom, good temper, and proportioned to size, more than its strength. Of these I remember that the late Sir Stamford Raffles presented a set of four to the Princess Charlotte, which she drove in Windsor park. With relays of these Insular ponies, I have myself, as did many others of my contemporaries, ridden 100 miles an end, at the average rate of ten miles an hour. The weight carried was full thirteen stone.

The most current name for the horse of the Indian Archipelago is the corruption of a Sanscrit one, and from this circumstance it might at first sight be supposed that the animal was introduced from India. For this, however, there is no foundation, for the Indian name is but a synonyme, for in the language of Java, where the horse is most numerous and which is the chief seat of Hinduism, the current name is a native one. In one of the principal languages of the great island of Celebes, the horse bears the Javanese name, while in another it is known by the odd one of the "buffalo of Java." In Celebes, which contains extensive grassy plains, and no tigers, the horse is found in the wild state, and he is hunted with the lasso and reclaimed as in America. From these facts, we may be disposed to infer that the Javanese, long a civilized people, taught the people of Celebes—a very rude one, even when first become known to Europeans—the art of domesticating the horse. It may be added, in corroboration of this view, that the horse of Celebes differs materially from that of Java, being larger, stronger, and better bred.

Proceeding eastward and southward, the horse is found, for the last time, in Timur and Sandalwood Island, each of which has a race peculiar to itself. In no island of the North or South Pacific Ocean was the horse found. Going northward, after quitting Borneo and Celebes, we find a native horse, for the first time, in the Japanese Archipelago. This would seem to be a peculiar race, if the horse of Japan was not imported from the rude countries on the Gulf of Okotsk, which, considering the state of Japanese navigation, is not very probable. Here we have no longer the mere ponies of the Indian Archipelago, but the full-sized horse which old John Adams, a mariner, born and bred in Wapping, and a mighty favourite of the Emperor of Japan of his day, writing from the spot in 1613, thus describes:—"Their horses are not tall, but of the size of our middling nags, short and well trussed, small headed, and very full of mettle, in my opinion far exceeding the Spanish

jennet." My friend Mr Oliphant, in his interesting narrative of Lord Elgin's Mission, confirms this statement, and gives the following curious account of the *manège* of a people as numerous as ourselves, and of whom, for 250 years, we have known nothing but their lacquer-ware and curious porcelain:—"As Lord Elgin had not yet seen much of the town, I accompanied him on shore on another tour of exploration. In the course of our walk we came to a large enclosure, and on entering it found fifteen or twenty men on horseback, galloping and curvetting about a considerable area, apparently used as a riding school. This, we understood, was the constant afternoon amusement of the 'young bloods' of Nagasaki. They were all men of fortune and family, princes and nobles of the land, and this was their Rotten row. They rode fiery little steeds, averaging about fourteen hands in height, and took a delight in riding full gallop, and pulling up short, after the favourite manner of Arabs. The saddles were constructed on the same principle as they are in China, but with less padding. The stirrup-leathers were short, and the stirrups like huge slippers, made of lacquer. The bit was powerful, and the reins made of muslin, but strong, notwithstanding. When we appeared, two or three good-looking young men pulled up near us, and most good-naturedly pressed them upon us. I took a short, uncomfortable gallop upon one with a propensity to kick, and was glad soon to relinquish him to his smiling owner. We were much struck with the gentlemanlike and unconstrained bearing of these young men, who evidently wished to show us all the civility in their power."

From all the facts now detailed the great probability seems to be that in many countries there existed distinct races of the wild horse, which, in due time, their respective inhabitants reduced to servitude. Scattered over the greater part of the Old World, and consisting of widely different varieties, and considering the extremely rude state of the intercourse, and more especially of maritime intercourse, of the early nations, most of whom were even ignorant of each other's existence, it is difficult even to imagine that all the horses of the world were derived from one single stock. Neither the Hindus or Arabs had carried their horses to the islands of the Malay Archipelago, although they communicated to them their religions and a very considerable portion of their languages. The Malays and Javanese did not succeed in conveying their horses to the islands of the Pacific, although they did a considerable portion of their languages. Close to them was the Philippine group, and to the inhabitants of this they communicated a considerable



portion of their languages, and even a smack of their religion; but it remained to the Spaniards to bestow the horse upon them. The large and fertile island of Formosa is but eighty miles distant from the populous coast of China, but the Chinese had never occupied it until Europeans showed them the way to it only two centuries ago. They have ever since then occupied it, colonized it, and drawn large resources from it, but down to this day have not introduced the horse.

Attempts have been often made to trace the first domestication of the horse to a particular country, but the inquiry seems to me an idle and unnecessary one. Wherever the horse existed in its wild state it would very easily be domesticated, and, consequently, in many different and independent localities. It was not found domesticated in America, or Australia, or the Isles of the Pacific Ocean, because in these parts of the world it did not exist in the wild state, and, in a rude state of society, it could not possibly have been conveyed to them from countries in which it was indigenou. The case was different with the dog: it existed, most probably, in all the countries in question in the wild state, and was consequently found in the domesticated in all of them.

The era of the first domestication of the horse must have been very remote indeed, for it required but a very small amount of civilization in the men who achieved it. This is sufficiently proved by the fact that some of the rude tribes of America had, within fifty years of the discovery of the New World, domesticated the horse, already become wild,—and that they have ever since continued to make use of it; and, by so doing, been able to maintain a rude independence, assuming, in some degree, the nomadic habits of Arabs and Tartars.

The domestic, but not the wild or the feral horse, is a frequent subject of representation on the monuments of Egypt, estimated to be of an antiquity of some forty centuries; but this is very far from carrying us back to the first domestication of the horse, for when the Egyptian sculptures and paintings were executed the Egyptians were in possession of many of the useful arts, and had even invented letters,—were, in fact, an ancient civilized people, and, for aught we know to the contrary, the horse may have been domesticated in Egypt four thousand years before the time in which it was represented on its monuments. If this reasoning be valid, the probability is that the horse was just as early domesticated in other parts of the Old World, from the British islands to Japan, as it was in Egypt.

The first use to which the horse would be put must have depended on the characters of the people and country in which it was domesti-

cated. Riding must have been the first use to which it was put, for it is not easy to suppose that it would have been tamed and broken in without having been mounted. The purposes to which it would be put would be war, travel, and pleasure. It is only in very advanced periods of society that it is applied to agricultural and other useful labours. In this it is anticipated or superseded by the ox in most countries, and by the ox in conjunction with the buffalo in others. It is only in very advanced periods of society that it is used for draught, and this chiefly in modern Europe—a matter, however, which seems to be in some measure determined by the superior size, weight and strength of the races of this part of the world. Throughout all Asia, and indeed throughout the whole of Eastern Europe, the horse is nearly unknown for draught, either in plough or carriage, while with ourselves it has justly superseded the slow and heavy ox—clear evidence of a superior intelligence and civilization.

In the ancient monuments of Egypt, the horse is almost always seen in draught only—a pair drawing a two-wheeled chariot, with a pole, in the manner of a curricule. A pompous display would seem to have been the only object. One or two samples only occur of a man on horseback, and then sitting not astride, but sideways, without bridle or saddle, and in mere frolic. But in due time the Egyptians had a cavalry, for when the king of Egypt pursued the Israelites, after their escape from bondage, he did so with horsemen as well as with chariots, and this is supposed to have happened about 1500 years before the birth of Christ. The ancient Britons had their war chariots, while Gauls, Numidians, and other cotemporaries not more advanced, had cavalry, but not chariots. Whether cavalry or chariots were used in war was probably a matter of chance. I may here remark that the mere capacity to construct a wheel carriage, however rude, is a fact which shows that in the days of Julius Cæsar we were not such arrant savages as we have been sometimes represented. We had not only the skill to construct chariots, but even to arm them with iron scythes. The iron, no doubt, must have been rather scarce, for we used it at the same time as our only money, and probably valued it as highly as the Roman conquerors did silver.

So much for the origin of the horse, and I may now offer a brief comparison of his utility to man in the work of labour, as compared with that of other domesticated animals, a fuller account of which must, however, be delayed for another opportunity. The camel, unsuited for draught, is the beast of burden of the Desert and of dry lands. It is wholly unfit

for wet soils, and for countries with periodical rains: in the mud it slips, flounders, falls, and lacerating the ligaments of the hip-joint, never rises. It is perhaps the only quadruped that cannot swim. In a civilized country, with good roads, it would not be maintained at all, and it must be pronounced to be the beast of burden of the barbarian only. So delicate is its constitution that in the Affghan wars it has been estimated that 50,000 of them perished.

The services of the elephant are, at the utmost, limited geographically to some thirty degrees from the equator, and are indeed unknown, except in India and the countries between it and China. Even in India the cold is so little congenial to it that it is only by degrees that it can be moved northwards with safety. Although preferring the plain the elephant climbs hills and precipices with a success little to be looked for from its huge bulk and unwieldy form.

Yet, although the native of a warm climate, Hannibal succeeded in taking a number across the Alps, a fact which may lead us to suspect that his passage was an enterprise less arduous than is generally imagined. Of the number of thirty-seven which he brought into Italy, one only, however, survived the first battle, for even in the plain a heavy fall of snow had taken place which destroyed them. But the elephant, although a floundering and awkward swimmer, is a bold one, and swims across the Ganges and the Jumna without difficulty. One is therefore surprised to find the difficulty which Hannibal encountered in transporting them over so comparatively small a stream as the Rhone. The elephants, however, were African, a distinct species from the Asiatic, and the natives of a higher latitude and a drier country than the intertropical parts of India and its neighbourhood, the country of the Asiatic elephant; and this may possibly account for their antipathy to the water, and their capacity to sustain a degree of cold which enabled them to be taken across the Alps—implying a cold under which the elephants of Chittagong, Burma, Siam, and Ceylon would have quickly perished.

The elephant, naturally a timid and cautious animal, never could have been of much service in war: had it possessed courage equal to its bulk and strength, it would, of course, have trodden down whole battalions. But it is formidable only to the eye, while it is itself a huge target to be shot at. To ride it for any distance is, at least, a very severe exercise, for, although it has no other pace than a walk, the jolting of that walk is equal to that of a carriage without springs, on what the Americans call "a corduroy road." I have never heard

of the elephant being employed for draught except in Ceylon, where one is yoked to a huge car for hauling materials for the construction of roads and other public works. In towns, and on frequented highways, the elephant, from his unwieldy size and uncouth form, becomes a public nuisance, and it may safely be anticipated that, with good roads, its use will eventually be discontinued.

The horse is the universal hero of labour, suited for all kinds of work, and for their performance in every climate. His almost exclusive employment in labour is in itself evidence of a high civilization. With ourselves, by careful breeding, we have been able to produce races adapted to every assignable purpose—some that can draw three times as much as the elephant can carry, and some that are fleetier than the antelope. He is the only animal that enters the field of battle with us. He even partakes “the rapture of the strife,” and without him no great decisive battle could be fought, or, in fact, ever has been fought. “The glory of his nostrils is terrible. He paweth in the valley and rejoiceth in his strength, He hurries on to meet the armed men,—he mocketh at fear,—he turneth not his back from the sword. The quiver rattleth against him—the glittering spear and the shield. He swalloweth the ground with fierceness and rage ; neither believeth he that it is the sound of the trumpet calling a retreat. He saith among the trumpets, ha, ha ! and he smelleth the battle afar off, and heareth the thunder of the captains and the shouting.” That passage, as you all know, is taken from the Book of Job. I cannot help thinking that the animal so well described in it, with glory in his nostril, and pawing with impatience for the charge, must have been no other than a true Arab. In fact, the scene of the Book of Job is laid in Edom or Idumea, which is now, and always has been, a portion of Arabia, although in contact with Syria. The patriarch was in reality a powerful Arab sheik, or independent prince, in possession of sheep, camels, and asses, by thousands ; and the mention of the sword, and the “glittering spear,” implying a knowledge of malleable iron, shows that his subjects were by no means such barbarians as were the Mexicans and Peruvians when first seen by Europeans. In the enumeration of the Patriarch’s stock, it will be seen that horses are not named. Most probably they were rare at the time, and the luxury of the chieftains, and would no more be named than their wardrobe or jewellery and trinkets.

You will have observed that in the passage I have quoted from the Book of Job, I have omitted that part of the description of the horse

which makes his neck to be "clothed in thunder." It is now considered to be a mistranslation, for it appears that the same word signifies in the Hebrew, "thunder" and a "horse's mane." The translation ought to have been "flowing mane." The interjection, "Ha! ha!" too, appears to be a mistake, for that simply expresses wonder or surprise, which is by no means consonant with the feeling attributed to the horse at the moment of action. It ought to have been, "let us advance," or, "let us go on." These corrections of our version we owe to M. Ernest Renan, a distinguished French Orientalist, to whose translation of the Book of Job my attention was directed by my learned and accomplished friend the Dean of St Paul's.

A comparison of the powers, for labour, of the different animals which man has employed to assist him is not only a subject of rational curiosity, but one that throws a broad light on the condition and progress of society. These are the dog, the ox, the buffalo, the horse, the ass, the elephant, and the llama.

According to Captain Lyon, quoted by Sir John Richardson, an Esquimaux dog will draw in a sledge a load of 160 pounds, going at the rate of a mile in nine minutes, or near seven miles an hour. An English dray-horse will easily draw a ton on a good road, going, however, at not more than the rate of three miles an hour. In this case, the draught power of the horse is equal to that of fourteen dogs, while the pace of the dog is near seven times that of the horse; but the dog must have ice or frozen snow to travel over. On an ordinary road, he would probably be over-draughted with a load of twenty-five pounds, while his speed would hardly equal that of the horse. In this case it would take ninety dogs to equal one horse, and the cost of keeping them would be as great as that of keeping four packs of fox-hounds.

In India it has been ascertained that the average burden of an ass is 100 lbs.; of a bullock or mule, 200 lbs.; of a camel, 400 lbs.; and of an elephant 800 lbs. One elephant, then, is equal to two camels, to four bullocks or mules, and to eight asses. The respective merits of these animals as beasts of burden, cannot however, be measured by their mere capacity for bearing a load. The first cost of the elephant, for example, is ten times that of a camel, and his keep costs as much as that of eight camels. This is, indeed, in some measure, compensated by the better constitution and higher longevity of the elephant, whose length of life is full ten times that of the camel—equal, indeed, to that of man himself; that is, three score and ten, or even four score. Had his life, I may add, been proportioned to his bulk, it ought to have been

a great deal longer, for it has been ascertained that the average weight of an Indian elephant is equal to that of twenty-four men, each of ten stones, or to a subaltern and his whole section of light infantry.

In Tibet, but there only, a variety of large sheep is used as a beast of burden, although it might well be supposed that its own immense double fleece would be an all-sufficient load for it. In the New World there was but one beast of burden, the llama, a diminutive species of camel, by the structure of his foot and by his constitution fit only for mountain regions. His average load is sixty-five pounds. One camel of the Old World, then, is equal to six of the New. It will appear, from the facts now stated, that an English dray-horse, on a good road, will draw the united burdens of two elephants, one camel, and five oxen. His power of transport is superior to that of five of the best camels that Arabia ever produced, and to that of thirty-four of the camels of the New World.

For riding, the superiority of the horse is equally great. The elephant, walking his only pace, will travel at the rate of four miles an hour, but it would distress him greatly to continue it for twenty miles. It would take him five hours to perform this journey, which the horse would perform in one hour. Of [the domestic animals the dromedary, or common camel, is the one that, in speed, approaches the nearest to the horse, and its pace is probably equal to about one-half that of the horse. The messenger camel will travel, it is said, one hundred miles in twenty-four hours; but an English blood-horse has been known to perform a journey of double that distance within the same time. But in the case of the camel, the pace is "a killing" one, not to the animal, but to the man; for it is said that the life of the professional camel-rider, the Shuter Suwar of the Persians, does not exceed five years' duration.

But the horse has been at length surpassed, although by no means superseded—indeed, in no degree even displaced, for it has increased in number—by a new power. A few years ago, a meritorious operative, a heaven-born engineer, invented, almost created a machine, which in speed eclipses Eclipse, and leaves Flying Childers "nowhere,"—which can draw with ease the load of a thousand, or if need were, of ten thousand elephants, and which, in one-fourth part of the time, without fatigue to itself or to the rider, can perform the feat which saved Turpin's neck by proving an *alibi*. That machine is now at work in the native country of the slow camel and slow and ponderous elephant, a creditable tribute to George Stephenson and the nineteenth century. The son of

this man of genius, almost the equal of his father, was lately laid in the spot which Nelson thought was equivalent to a dukedom. Perhaps you will be of opinion that the remains of the father ought in justice to repose alongside those of the son.

Much has been written on the comparative merits of cavalry and infantry. In the well organised army of a civilised people, it is enough to say that both arms are indispensable. It is the infantry, however, that constitutes the main force. It was the phalanx that carried the Greeks to the banks of the Indus—the legion that enabled the Romans to conquer the best part of the known world, and the British battalion that conquered and reconquered India. But among rude nomadic nations the cavalry is the main force. It was their cavalry alone that enabled the Tartan hordes to effect their wide-spread, although but temporary conquests from China to Europe. It was by it that Jeniz Khan and his successors conquered all China, and a large portion of Russia. But the Tartars will never be able again to make such conquests. Gunpowder has arrested them. The last of their mischievous heroes was Timur, who flourished at the end of the 14th and beginning of the 15th century ; so that we have been rid of these pests of civilization for near 500 years.

The civilized nations have, indeed, now turned the tables on the Tartars, and the only people in proximity to them, the Russians, have made extensive territorial conquests over them. A Tartar cavalry, however, still exists, confined to Russia and China. These are the celebrated Cossacks, and with the first of these powers they have proved useful, not, indeed, in fair fighting, but in harassing an enemy, by cutting off supplies and stragglers, and completing a rout. They are a light cavalry, meanly mounted and meanly equipped. In a disorderly retreat it becomes formidable. In his retreat from Moscow, Napoleon, in his famous bulletin describing it, said, "Even the Cossacks, that contemptible cavalry, which under ordinary circumstances could not have penetrated a company of voltigeurs, became formidable." It is an inferior description of this cavalry that the allied French and English army will have to meet on the plains of Pecheli, should they attempt a march of 100 miles on the Chinese capital, for that is the distance from the coast to Peking.

The wild American tribes of the Pampas, Llanos, and Prairies are all mounted. The chief force of the northern nations who conquered India, and held it in obedience from the eleventh to the eighteenth century, consisted of cavalry ; and it was by its cavalry that the Mahrattas, one

of the rudest nations of India, effected conquests which extended from Delhi to Calcutta and to Bombay, 1,000 miles east and south. In the middle ages of European history, cavalry was the principal force, and the infantry little better than a hastily levied rabble. Fire-arms restored the infantry to its just position, and at present, what with rifled small-arms and rifled cannons, to say nothing of Armstrong and Whitworth guns, which would mow down a cavalry when it was only visible with a spy-glass, an unsupported cavalry would be annihilated. During the battle which my valued friend Lord Clyde fought with the rebels at Cawnpore, the scene of the too-famous massacre, a serjeant's party of rifles was in skirmishing order in advance, when a body of Indian cavalry, seeing them scattered, came down to cut them up individually; the serjeant ordered the bugle to be sounded, the men formed, and by a cool, well-directed fire quickly emptied many a saddle. The horsemen fell, said an amateur, like an undermined wall. In an Indian battle, known under the name of that of Luswari, fought in 1803, the English cavalry, headed by the commander-in-chief, a brave old man of sixty-five—the future Lord Lake—charged a Mahratta infantry protected by seventy-five pieces of artillery, and was defeated with heavy loss, but the infantry coming up, routed the Mahratta infantry and captured the guns. The infantry that did this consisted chiefly of one regiment, her Majesty's 76th.

One of the first occasions in modern war that cavalry and infantry were fairly opposed to each other occurred in 1704. Charles the Twelfth, in his victorious career of conquest in Poland, which he himself compared to a hunting party, was in pursuit of a Saxon corps of infantry commanded by the celebrated Marshal Schulemburgh, the same man that had defended Corfu against the Turks, and, for that act, the Republic of Venice erected a statue to him. Schulemburgh received the charge of the veteran Swedish cavalry in three lines, the front rank kneeling, and defeated it: he then retreated in hollow square, pursued by the Swedes, under the King—passed through a wood, forded a small river first, and in the course of the night, by boats, crossed the broad Oder. Charles, who expected in the morning to compel him to surrender at discretion, saw him safe and inaccessible on the opposite bank of the river. It was the Swedish hero's first check, and he exclaimed with generosity, "Schulemburgh has defeated me to-day." It is Voltaire that tells the story, in a book as pleasant as any romance, and perhaps in some degree partaking of one.

You will observe that the Saxon infantry was drawn up in three



ranks, and so has infantry been in all the armies of Europe ever since, except our own for the last forty-five years. It was the Duke of Wellington who first thought two enough, being of opinion that British pluck would supply the place of the third, and the anticipation has proved true. With the same force we present the same extent of front with one-third fewer men, or we make, in other words, two Englishmen to do the same service as three Frenchmen, Germans, or Russians. The fine heavy cuirassiers of Napoleon, at Waterloo, repeatedly charged the squares of British infantry without making any serious impression on them. An officer of engineers, still living, told me that he was in one of these squares when assailed, and that one trooper only broke through the line, his horse being shot in the act, and himself dismounted and made prisoner. When the Russian cavalry attempted a charge at the corps of Lord Clyde, at Balaklava, he told me himself that he did not think it worth while to form square, and only three back a wing of his single regiment to receive them. The Highlanders gave them a volley and they sheered off.

As to the best national cavalry, it ought to be that of the people who have the best horses, the best riders, and who can best afford to maintain it. We are that people ourselves, and all that seems necessary to insure it is adequate discipline and riddance of military coxcomby in dress, arms, and equipment. Our heavy cavalry overthrew that of the Russians in the Crimea on the Russians' own chosen ground, but our light cavalry was sorely punished when on the same field it madly attacked infantry and artillery.

Between the equipment of ancient and modern cavalry, thus exists one striking difference worth notice. The ancients were ignorant of the stirrup. There is no name for it in classic Greek or Latin, in Sanskrit or in native Persian. There is, however, in Arabic, and this may lead to the belief that the Arabs were its inventors. In European record there is, indeed, no authentic account of the use of the stirrup before the seventh century, corresponding with the first of the Mahomedan era. At present there exists no people from "China to Peru" without it, and we find it difficult to understand how a trooper would maintain a firm seat and make an effective use of sword or lance in its absence. The bridle, of course, was always used, and the celebrated Cuvier insists that our dominion over the horse depends on the toothless space for the insertion of the bit between the molar and canine teeth.

But you may desire to know the extent of the evils which a barbarous

cavalry inflicts in its ferocious invasions, such evils, on an enormous scale, as were inflicted by such heroes as Attila, Jengis, and Timur. You have it from a great orator when Burke describes the invasion of the plain of the Carnatic from the plateau of Mysore, about ninety years ago. "When at length," said the orator, "Hyder Ali found he had to do with men who would either sign no convention, or whom no treaty and no signature could bind, and who were the determined enemies of human intercourse itself, he decreed to make the country possessed by these incorrigible and predestined criminals a memorable example to mankind. He resolved, in the gloomy recesses of a mind capacious of such things, to leave the whole Carnatic an everlasting monument of vengeance and to put perpetual desolation as a barrier between him and those against whom the faith which holds the moral elements of the world together was no protection. He became, at length, so confident of his force, so collected in his might, that he made no secret whatever of his dreadful resolution. Having terminated his disputes with every enemy and every rival who buried their mutual animosities in their common detestation against the creditors of the Nabob of Arcut, he drew from every quarter whatever a savage ferocity could add to his new rudiments in the arts of destruction; and compounding all the materials of fury, havoc, and desolation into one black cloud, he hung for a while on the declivities of the mountains. Whilst the authors of all these evils were idly and stupidly gazing on this menacing meteor, which blackened all their horizon, it suddenly burst, and poured down the whole of its contents upon the plains of the Carnatic. Then ensued a scene of woe, the like of which no age had seen, no heart conceived, and which no tongue can adequately tell. All the horrors of war before known or heard of were mercy to that new havoc. A storm of universal fire blasted every field, consumed every house, destroyed every temple. The miserable inhabitants, flying from their flaming villages, in part were slaughtered; others, without regard to sex, to age, to the respect of rank, or sacredness of function, fathers torn from children, husbands torn from wives, enveloped in a whirlwind of cavalry and amidst the goading spears of drivers and the trampling of pursuing horses, were swept into captivity in an unknown and hostile land. Those who were enabled to evade the tempest fled to the walled cities. But escaping from fire, sword, and exile, they fell into the jaws of famine."

That is a sample of the oration which Pitt and Dundas, issuing from Downing street with more London particular Madeira than they could

conveniently carry, hesitated whether it was worth their while to go and listen to.

I have now but a few words to add on the supply of the English breed of horses for cavalry purposes. The English horse, like the Englishman himself, is a thorough mongrel, and as the horse has, beyond all question, improved by crossing, we may safely conclude that the being has suffered no detriment by it that has produced a Shakespear and a Milton, a Chatham and a Burke, a Watt and a Stephenson, a Marlborough and a Wellington, a Blake and a Nelson, and which will assuredly produce their equals whenever their country shall have need of their service.

We, who formerly imported all our best horses, are now the only people who export good ones, and we supply all nations that have sense and ability to buy. I have looked at our export of horses for the last year, for which the public accounts are made up, and find the number exported to have been 1,574, and their custom-house value to have been 117,422*l*. France had out of these 755, and Belgium and Germany 611. I suspect that the officers of Her Majesty's Customs are not good judges of horse-flesh, for the valuation of those furnished to France was short of 50,000*l*., or at the average of 66*l*. a head, which is much too low a valuation, for I have every reason to believe that one of the horses exported was "The Flying Dutchman" (of whom it never could be said that, like his namesake, "he was nowhere"), which was sold to the French for the sum of 5,000*l*. It is certain that we have turned the tables on the French since the time of Charles II, when a Frenchman was the master of His Majesty's riding-school, and pronounced by old Evelyn to be the first judge of a horse in Europe.

Wherever the Anglo-Saxon race has settled, the improved English horse has been introduced, and, wherever climate and pasture have been favourable, with success. India, which has most need of the cavalry horse, is not one in which the introduction of the English horse has been most successful. A great and expensive stud has existed in Bengal for sixty years, without ever having been equal to furnish even a sufficient supply for the European cavalry of that government. The stud of Madras, situated on the table-land of Mysore, is upon a far more rational and economical scale than that of Bengal, consisting only of Arab sires. The grasses of India are neither abundant nor nutritious; the plain proof of which is that the flesh of no mere grass-fed animal is fit for the table, that of the stall-fed animals alone being so. But even were the conditions more favourable for breeding than they are in India, studs

are not among the establishments which it is within the legitimate province of any government to maintain.

After the United States of America, which in breeding the English horse stands next to England itself, the most eminent success has attended its rearing in the Cape of Good Hope and Australia. The Cape farmer, who used to drive his produce to market at a snail's pace, with a team of sixteen oxen, now does it, at a smart trot, with eight English-bred horses—a royal team; in all likelihood, better cattle than those which conveyed Charles II in state (some lovely Thais by his side) from Whitehall to the City. The success has been still greater in Australia, where the pastures are more spacious, and the grasses more nutritious. In the course of the year 1858, the Australian colonies furnished for the Indian Cavalry 2,563 horses, at the average price, on the spot, of 30*l.* a head, and, when landed in India, at from 80*l.* to 90*l.*; being a smaller price for a better horse than that supplied by the Government stud.

Here, then, we find a country which, seventy years ago, had not only no horse, but no native animal more respectable than a kangaroo, the brain of which the great naturalist, Mr Owen, tells us, is of no higher order than that of a reptile, exporting more horses than England itself, and adding their value to five millions' worth of sheep's wool, and ten millions' worth of gold. Two generations ago its population consisted of a few savages, the very lowest in the scale of humanity, and now its inhabitants are Anglo-Saxons, amounting to near a million. A century hence, this continent of the Antipodes will contain more people than does now the United Kingdom; and unless they differ greatly from their progenitors, they will be meditating the conquest of the whole Indian and Philippine Archipelagos, giving law to China and Japan and quarrelling with New Zealand—by this time as crowded with free and ambitious Anglo-Saxons as itself.

John Campbell Esq.

Maddie Lodge,

The store

Newport.









