

took to that trade as naturally as a duck takes to water. There were thousands of her people who engaged in the "sum of all villainies," as John Wesley denominated the slave trade, but not the ownership of slaves. Massachusetts money and Massachusetts ships invaded the barracoons and the coasts of the African mainland, and thousands of "boys and girls from twelve to fourteen years of age," were brought to New England for use there, or for sale to the fathers of the present rebels in the South.

New England people were the "man-stealers" for the colonies of Britain, and for the states which now comprise rebellious Dixie.

There was money in the business—there was gain, there was pelf; and, up to the year 1808, when the vile trade was abolished, no one ever heard of a Massachusetts man denouncing this trade in human beings. When her old slave ships were worn out, and she could turn an honest penny at some other traffic, she became suddenly conscientious, and has continued to kick up a fuss generally with those who own the negroes which she sold to them.

Her conscience (which seems to be an India rubber one) has been drawn into many shapes on this vastly mischievous subject.

Captain Ellery seems to have a sharp eye to business, and he gives the gratifying announcement that "all the slaves have had the smallpox." To show the vast philanthropy of Massachusetts—she, always full of religious sentiment—he proposed to take New England rum as pay. This rum he would sell or trade on his next voyage, to pay for a new batch of darkies, adding to his profits on both species of property. It was a sharp dicker, to be sure, and eminently worthy of some people who don't live quite a thousand miles from Boston. Massachusetts fetters were placed upon the limbs of the slave, and "New England rum" debased the soul of the captive.

Lord save the world from hypocrisy and ransom those who deserve the contempt of man and the dire judgments of Heaven!

A SUGGESTION OFFERED.

"At dusk, much to our surprise, struck the eastern fork of the Kansas, or la Fourche de la cote Boucaniere," says Lieutenant Z. M. Pike in his journal, under the date of October 12, 1806. This is the rendering of the Denver edition of 1889, supervised by Mr. W. M. Maguire. The notes to this edition are few and ancient, being simply those of Pike himself, with here and there one added by his London editor of 1811; no explanation is offered of the "Fourche de la cote Boucaniere."

Dr. Cones, in his magnificent 1895

edition of Pike, renders this passage: "Struck the east (Smoky Hill) fork of the Kans, or La Touche de la Cote Bucanieus." The explanation that the stream meant was the Smoky Hill, is Dr. Cones' own; the variation in the spelling of the French-like title comes from his original. He followed the American edition of 1810, the first issued and the only one that passed under the author's own hand, while the Denver edition followed the second, which appeared across the Atlantic. This English edition, however, had the benefit of careful and competent editing at the hands of Dr. Thomas Rees; an advantage which that of the author himself did not enjoy; for Captain or Lieutenant or General Pike was a soldier, and no scholar. His French, of which he was quite lavish throughout his travels, was not of the best, though he had with him a grammar of the language, in the study of which he passed the time while he waited for the Spanish to come and catch him on their territory in 1807; so that it is quite possible either that he mis-spelled the expression that he had in mind, or that he overlooked the printer's misinterpretation of his MS, supposing that he went over the proof sheets of the 1810 edition. Dr. Rees' emendation, which was probably purely conjectural, since the Atlantic lay between him and his author, has the merit of being good French, but seems not to have made the puzzle any clearer to Dr. Cones, nor to have obtained his approval. He offers an explanation of his own: "the name in the text, 'La Touche de la Cote Bucanieus,' possibly stands," he says "for La Fourche de la Cote du Kansas, i. e., that fork of the Kansas which runs along the dividing ridge or coteau, which is perfectly true of the Smoky Hill fork."

This is a most reasonable guess; but one which would account for the modern name of the stream, while at the same time adhering as closely to the text as either of these, would be a still better one; and I have one to offer, which, if it be not passable as a final explanation, seems to me at any rate too singular a coincidence to be overlooked.

In Keating's account of Major Long's expedition up the Mississippi in 1823, the following passage occurs, on page 194 of the first volume: "Our guide informed us that the hill marked on the maps as the Smoky-hill (Montagne qui boucane of the French), lay at a long day's march (about 30 miles), in a north-easterly course from our noon encampment. This hill has received from the Indians the appellation of Mucho-wa-ku-min (Smoky Mountain), from the circumstance of its summit being generally enveloped with a cloud or fog, and, as we are told, not from

any tradition of smoke having ever issued from it."

If a misty hill in Iowa county, Wisconsin, was called the Montagne qui boucane, it is reasonable to imagine that a similar hill or range of hills in Kansas may have received the same name from the same Canadian voyageurs, and that a river may have taken its name from such a hill; and thus we would have both our Smoky Hill Fork and (making allowances for Lieutenant Pike's French) our Fourche de la Cote Bucanieus or Boucaniere.

It is hard to understand why just this word should have been used in this connection, for according to the dictionaries *boucane* means "to smoke" merely in the sense of smoking hams or fish, and it is not the modern word for even this; but that is a matter that concerns only Mr. Keating and his Canadian informants.

A. T. RICHARDSON.

FLOYD'S MONUMENT.

A few weeks ago THE CONSERVATIVE told how Charles W. Pierce, the veteran surveyor, came, in 1858, to the grave of Sergeant Floyd: how he found there a wooden cross instead of the cedar post which Captains Lewis and Clark said they erected in August, 1804; and how he repaired it and left it again in solitude.

Mr. Pierce was not the first to pay this attention to the soldier. J. F. Nicollet, who passed the spot in 1839, says this of it in his journal:

"We stopped at the foot of the bluff on which is Floyd's grave: my men replaced the signal, blown down by the winds, which marks the spot and hallows the memory of the brave sergeant."

It will be noticed that the professor's word "signal" throws no light on the curious point raised by Mr. Pierce's narrative as to the form of the memorial which marked the place for so long.

The loquacious Catlin, in his dateless travels, passed this way, probably in 1833; he climbed the hill and wept freely over the grave, "where," he says, "now stands a cedar post, bearing the initials of his name." Catlin's plate 118 represents the hill, and shows, on its summit, a slender object which may be a cedar post, leaning dangerously out of the perpendicular. We may believe this to be an accurate picture of the spot, which the artist says he visited several times: moreover, he takes it very seriously. "Stranger! adieu," says he, addressing the sergeant. "With streaming eyes I leave thee again, and thy fairyland, to peaceful solitude. My pencil has faithfully traced thy beautiful habitation: and long shall live in the world, and familiar, the name of 'Floyd's Grave.'"

A. T. R.