

A STUDY OF KIPLING'S USE OF HISTORICAL
MATERIAL IN "BROTHER SQUARE-
TOES" AND "A PRIEST IN
SPITE OF HIMSELF" *

ANN M. WEYGANDT †

THERE IS MORE than one reason why an author's use of historical material may be interesting to a researcher; some of these reasons are valid for him alone; some, he hopes, for others as well. Because I have been a Kipling enthusiast since the age of four, when *Just So Stories* was read to me, anything that concerns him interests me, and I may be said, in a sense, to have been occupied with Kipling's use of historical material all my life—or at least since I read *Puck of Pook's Hill* at eight, and asked my mother if 1066 was more than three hundred years ago. The world at large, incurious about the details of Kiplingiana, cannot be supposed to share a desire to explore Kipling's knowledge of history merely because it is his. But even those who have not an early-established devotion to Kipling may feel the detective's interest in tracing down material in widely separated sources—in discovering, for instance, that "A Doctor of Medicine" draws upon Culpeper's *Herbal*; the Sussex Archaeological Association's publications; Antony à Wood's seventeenth century compilation, *Athenæ Oxoniensis*; and modern findings on the way in which the bubonic plague is spread. Yet, though the detective interest is, I think, of general appeal, it seems to me that the most important reason for investigating a writer's use of historical material, and the one that has the strongest claim on the interest of the public, is the light such an investigation casts on the creative process—the way in which it shows the author at work, taking this bit of material and rejecting that, forming his conception of historical characters and blending fact and his knowledge of human nature to make Washington, or Talleyrand, or Henry VII come alive—catching from documents the spirit of an age or a

* A paper delivered at the University of Delaware on January 11, 1954, as one in the 1953-1954 series of Graduate Lectures.

† Department of English.

place, and contriving to reproduce it. A study of an author's methods is always of interest, but the outsider, the literary critic, usually has, if the author deals with the present time, no means of identifying exactly any portion of the author's material—unless the author obligingly says "Matilda is a portrait of my Aunt Jenny, and the town pictured is Newark, Delaware." (I leave aside, for the moment, the question as to whether the best authors of fiction ever give detailed pictures of actual people.) Even though the critic appears to have an advantage when concerned with contemporary material, since he knows contemporary life, and may even know the region or the milieu the author is describing, he is, in a way, dealing with intangibles when he tries to assess his author's character-drawing. He knows whether he can believe in the people or not, but he does not know much that is definite or specific about the author's raw material. The critic of a historical novelist or short-story writer can hope to see precisely what his author has done with at least part of his material, and can guess, pretty accurately, why. He cannot of course, solve the mystery involved in the creation of plot and incident; guess, with any certainty of correctness, how it occurred to Kipling, for instance, to associate a Sussex smuggler's adventures with Washington's reasons for insisting on peace with England in 1793 and 1794; but he can see how the background was built up, and imagine, if he feels brave, what some of the author's mental processes in working up to his "inspiration" were.

The points I have just made can be illustrated by a study of two short stories by Kipling—"Brother Square-Toes" and "A Priest in Spite of Himself." But these tales cannot be considered in isolation. They must, in order for us to understand them fully, be allotted their place in the scheme followed in two related collections of short stories, *Puck of Pook's Hill* and *Rewards and Fairies*. These books deal with episodes in English history seen in their relation to Kipling's own villages of Burwash and Rottingdean, Sussex. In the opening tale of *Puck of Pook's Hill*, Kipling's two children act the fairy parts of *Midsummer Night's Dream* three times over on midsummer eve in a fairy ring under Puck's Hill. If the fairies had still been there in numbers, Kipling tells us, they would have come swarming out, for the children have stumbled on the process for "breaking the hills"; however, only Puck is left to come, and he promises that in lieu of seeing the People of the Hills, the children

shall "see what they shall see and hear what they shall hear though it shall have happened three thousand year." First Puck himself tells them the story of Weland's Sword, made by a forgotten god for a young Saxon; then a Norman knight who came over with William the Conqueror and was given the manor on which the children live, recounts his adventures. A Roman centurion who paused at Burwash on his way north to Hadrian's Wall explains how it feels to defend a frontier post without relief. And so on. Finally, a Jewish money-lender sees to it that King John lacks the cash he needs to defy the barons, and that Magna Charta demands that justice be denied to "none," rather than to "no free man." In the second volume, *Rewards and Fairies*, the theme is the service rendered to an unthinking and often ungrateful public by a series of men—among them Laënnec, the inventor of the stethoscope; Nicholas Culpeper, the astrological herbalist; Sir Francis Drake; and Queen Elizabeth I. In the two stories with which I am now dealing, Washington is the man who is reviled for doing what he knows to be right and best for his country.

I should not like to give the impression that this series of tales is distressingly didactic. It does not read like a collection of tracts, but principles of behavior can be deduced from it. Kipling tells us in Chapter VII of *Something of Myself* that it was intended to be "a sort of balance to, as well as seal upon, some aspects of my 'Imperialistic' output in the past," and points out that his "underwood [underpinning?]" is "What else could I have done?" A character in each story says or implies this somewhere; the idea is that what he has done is his duty, and hence inescapable.

The two stories "Brother Square-Toes" and "A Priest in Spite of Himself" center around the same Sussex man, Pharaoh Lee, an Aurette from France on his mother's side, a gipsy on his father's, and a smuggler on both. His French cousins run contraband across the channel for Pharaoh and his father to pick up and take inland. In January, 1793, Pharaoh's smack is swamped by a French frigate taking the new ambassador of the French Republic, Genet, to America.¹ Pharaoh, since no other means of escape offers itself,

¹ "Brother Square-Toes," *Rewards and Fairies*, American Trade Edition, New York, 1910, 157. Louis XVI was guillotined on January 21, 1793. Genet, although he left Paris for Rochefort on January 23, did not sail until February 21, but this information was not readily available when Kipling wrote the story. See Louis Franklin Facio Genet, "Edmond Charles Genet," *Journal of American History* VI, Part II, 1912, 493.

slides into a porthole on the *Embuscade* (Captain Bompard) and pretends to be a newly pressed member of her crew. (Pretence is necessary, because King Louis has just been guillotined and France is on the point of declaring war on England.) On board he hears Genet explaining to anyone who will listen that he will force the United States to join with France in the war. Pharaoh contracts a fever shortly before the frigate docks at Charleston, and, during his convalescence, acts as the surgeon's assistant. But his illness recurs, he loses consciousness, and comes to himself looking out at "a town o' fine gardens and red-brick houses"—Philadelphia. The smell of lilacs entices him ashore, where he runs after an Indian in a red blanket, and is taken by him to Toby Hirte, a fiddle-playing apothecary who specializes in Seneca Oil and Von Swieten's pills. Toby buys Pharaoh from the ship's doctor, partly because Pharaoh fiddles and partly because he knows about pills. He has secured at once an employee, a partner in duet-playing, and a new member for the Moravian Church, to which he takes Pharaoh on the Sunday following his "purchase." Early on the Monday morning they start off together for Toby's summer place in Lebanon. Later Toby returns to Philadelphia to help in the yellow fever epidemic,² and Pharaoh goes off to the reservation with Toby's Indian friends, Red Jacket and Cornplanter, chiefs who know Washington and are very anxious that there be no war between the United States and England. In their eagerness to find out what will happen, they ride from Canasedago in New York to Mount Vernon, Pharaoh going along, and are hiding in the woods when Washington listens to Genet demanding that he join France against England. Washington is non-committal to Genet, but when Genet is gone and only his cabinet remain, they take up Genet's plea. Washington says that the United States has neither the ships nor other resources for such a war,³ and that there will be peace with England on England's terms even if he is burned in effigy in every city in the country.⁴ The

² Kipling carefully represents Hirte as reading of the fever in the *Aurora*, in actual fact Hirte's favorite newspaper. "Brother Square-Toes," 170; Abraham Ritter, *History of the Moravian Church in Philadelphia*, Philadelphia, 1857, 248.

³ In a letter written on June 14, 1793, to Washington about Genet, Henry Lee says he has told Genet that the United States has "no fleet, no army, no money to authorize us to take a part in the war with effect." See Jared Sparks, *Writings of Washington*, Boston, 1836, X, 541.

⁴ For the burning in effigy of unpopular figures on July 4, 1795, see William Cobbett, *Porcupine's Works*, II, London, 1801, footnote on 272-273.

Indians come up when the cabinet has gone, explain their errand, and announce that they will repeat to their tribe what Washington says. He tells them only to say that there will be no war; the rest of the talk was not meant for them.

This episode concludes the first story. In "A Priest in Spite of Himself," Pharaoh meets Talleyrand selling buttons in the Philadelphia streets, and brings him home to Toby to be fed. From the French émigrés at whose parties he fiddles, Pharaoh learns of Talleyrand's earlier political career, and his reputation for always wanting to be on the winning side. Red Jacket, seeing Talleyrand (in historical fact a famous gambler),⁵ throwing right hand against left, decides that Talleyrand is a foeman worthy of his steel, gambles with him, is beaten, and says he is a bad man but a great chief. Talleyrand, who somehow learns of the chiefs' visit to Washington, tries to find out from Pharaoh, Washington's reasons for refusing to fight, but neither Pharaoh nor Red Jacket will tell him. Presumably Talleyrand wants to buy his welcome back to France by bringing with him dependable information. He attempts to bribe Pharaoh, and when he finds the boy unbribable, sends him five hundred dollars with no strings attached. The money arrives after Talleyrand's own departure from Philadelphia. With this windfall, Pharaoh sets up in the tobacco business and, some years later, takes a cargo to England, intending to smuggle it in. He gets into a fight with a French lugger, loses his tobacco and his ship by confiscation, and follows the confiscated tobacco to Paris, hoping for help from the American ambassador. In Paris he sees Talleyrand with Napoleon, appeals to him, is given back his ship and twice the cost of his cargo, and *still* refuses to betray to Talleyrand Washington's reasons for desiring peace. Incidentally, he finds that Talleyrand can boss Napoleon, then only—and newly—first consul. The interview occurs a few days after Napoleon's *coup d'état* on November 9, 1799.

The problem of locating the sources of two such wide-ranging stories as these is formidable. Indeed, to hunt out the sources of any piece of historical fiction may seem at the outset a discouraging, perhaps an overwhelming, task. A researcher who does not regard

⁵ Whitelaw Reid, "Introduction," *Memoirs of the Prince de Talleyrand*, edited by the Duc de Broglie, The Grolier Society, London [1891], I, x; G. Lacour-Gayet, *Talleyrand*, Paris, 1947, 109-110.

his historical investigation as an end in itself can, however, cheer his labors with the memory of two things: because his aim is to study the creative process, he need not trail *every* historical fact to its lair in the archives, much as he might like to do so; and, for the same reason, he need not read everything that has been written on the subject he is pursuing. He is, in fact, obligated to judge his author by the material available to him at the date of composition. It may be of some interest to know whether a story is or is not accurate by present-day standards, but if the main concern is with an author's purpose and method, it is only relevant to know whether he has taken the pains to look up the best source at his disposal. Bibliographies and footnotes in recent publications may lead back to the volumes the author referred to, but it is only through such hints that the latest authorities are useful. Sometimes internal evidence will prove to the seeker that he has hit upon the source his author employed, but if evidence for the exact source is lacking, investigation can at least determine whether the writer carefully consulted the best level of information he could, the accepted authorities of his day. The researcher need not be afraid to look first in obvious places, however. A quotation from Lafayette in the article on Washington in the ninth edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1900) appears the likeliest source for the nick-name Kipling makes the Indians bestow on Washington: "Big Hand." Lafayette said that Washington had the largest hands he ever saw. (Washington did have an Indian name, *Conotocarious*, but it meant "Devourer of Villages," not "Big Hand.")⁶

Though Kipling may sometimes have begun with the *Britannica*, there can be no question that he usually went much farther. Those following his footsteps must refer to biographies, county histories, archaeologies, guide books, and ordnance maps, as well as national histories, Traill's *Social England*, and works concentrating on certain periods.

It is necessary to consult authorities on Sussex at the very beginning of "Brother Square-Toes." The children are at the seaside—at their father's old haunt of Rottingdean, the map-reader can tell by the description of the "little wrinkled waves grieving along the

⁶ *Journal of Colonel George Washington*, ed. J. M. Toner, M. D., Albany, 1893, 51; *The Diaries of George Washington*, ed. John C. Fitzpatrick, Boston and New York, 1925, I, 79; Samuel G. Drake, *The Book of the Indians of North America*, Boston, 1837, Book V, 113.

sands up the coast to Newhaven and down the coast to long, grey Brighton. . . ." The two youngsters have walked down to the Gap and observed the revenue officer start off on his patrol of the shore. This presumably is happening in about 1910, the date of the story's copyright. Immediately they hear a man singing about smuggling and Telscombe Tye. Sussex newspapers and guide-books tell us that the Gap east of Rottingdean was a famous place for smuggling in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Telscombe, a few miles away, was equally well-known.⁷ So far, so good. But the singer who appears is oddly dressed for a Sussex smuggler, even of the late eighteenth century: "straight, plain, snuffly-brown coat, brown knee-breeches,"—broad-brimmed hat and broad-toed shoes—all very neat.⁸ Pharaoh Lee, the French-English gipsy, is wearing the costume of the Moravian Brethren as described by Abraham Ritter in his *History of the Moravian Church in Philadelphia*.⁹ (I cannot help thinking that Kipling much enjoyed the incongruities in this tale.)

It is not long, then, before we leave our Sussex shoreline traditions to run after other sources. After locating the mine from which Pharaoh's costume was digged, we find that our next need is a little information about the French navy in the eighteenth century, in its relation with Genet. Where did Kipling turn for this? The ship-board atmosphere is only very briefly sketched; it may well owe more to Marryat, roughly a contemporary of Genet, and a great favorite of Kipling's, than to any records of the French admiralty. Kipling does, however, supply correctly the name of the ship that conveyed Genet and that of her first officer—*L'Embuscade* and Bompard. There are various places where he might have located these; I shall go into them in more detail when I discuss his sources

⁷ R. Thurston Hopkins, *The Kipling Country*, New York, 1925, 146-149. For a general discussion of smuggling in Sussex, see E. V. Lucas, *Highways and Byways in Sussex*, London, 1904, 273-279.

⁸ Ritter, 145.

⁹ Anice Page Cooper, "Rudyard Kipling, a Biographical Sketch," *Around the World With Kipling*, New York, 1926, 32; Irving E. Mansback, "Some Kipling Backgrounds," *Kipling Journal* LXXI, LXXII, LXXIII, October and December, 1944; April, 1945. Miss Cooper refers to this source; Mr. Mansback names it. The bibliography occurs in *Kipling Journal* LXXIII, 14. Mr. Mansback gives information about historical characters, some of whom are mentioned in "Brother Square-Toes" and "A Priest in Spite of Himself," but does not attempt to show how Kipling put this material to use.

on Genet. Here it will suffice to say that he must have gone further than the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* to unearth his facts.

The Sussex atmosphere, as we have seen, was set partly by tradition and more by Kipling's own knowledge of the coast from Rottingdean to Newhaven. The shipboard days may owe something to Kipling's first-hand acquaintance with the British navy of his day, as well as to Marryat, and to any further researches Kipling made. Just so, the atmosphere Kipling gives to the Philadelphia of 1793 and the country back of it is partly distilled from Ritter's book and partly from Kipling's memories of Pennsylvania—apparently the first country-side in America in which he stayed with friends, so that he thoroughly absorbed the feel of the neighborhood. We know that he visited Philadelphia on his first trip to America, in 1889, and he was probably there again during his four-year stay in the United States, 1892-96.¹⁰ Most of his associations with Pennsylvania seem to have been of quiet and countrified atmosphere, and he selected from Ritter's book bits of description that re-inforced his impressions. Ritter's book is a quaint one—an amateur's job, not that of a professional historian. Ritter has drawn on the church records for the history of the church before his time, but he uses the book largely as a repository for his memories of his childhood haunts and doings—in which, of course, the church, near which all its members seem to have lived, played a large part. He describes the "plain" costume of the Moravians, the appearance of the church at various stages in its career, and Pastor Meder's garden. This garden boasted a peach tree from which he, as a child pumping the organ, and sitting by the window in the intervals of the chore, used to filch fruit. He explains that the sermons are delivered alternately in English and German. He tells who lived in every house on the streets near the church, and provides character sketches of many of the people. He mentions the French on Race Street between Second and Fourth near Drinker's and Elfrith's Alleys. He refers to Talleyrand's selling buttons at Second and

¹⁰ "How I Found Peace at Musquash on the Monongahela," *From Sea to Sea II*, Chapter XXXVI. Lowell Thomas, in "The Boy Who Wrote Like a Man," the life of Kipling which forms a preface to *Great Kipling Stories*, Philadelphia, 1936, says (p. 41) that Kipling took several trips from Vermont to Philadelphia to look up material for this tale. I have nowhere else seen it suggested that the story was being worked on so early. It is copyrighted 1910. For the identification of "Musquash" with Beaver, see Mrs. W. M. Carpenter, "Kipling Origins," *Kipling Journal* LV, October, 1940, 16.

Drinker's Alley. He tells of Red Jacket's hymn-singing with Toby Hirte, and describes the musico-medical confusion in Toby's room.¹¹ In all, Ritter's book is a lovingly meticulous attempt to re-capture the past. It is written in a rather high-flown, semi-eighteenth century style, despite its date of 1857—and with a sense of humor. Kipling might well have liked it for its own sake. He has drawn on it very heavily in the Pennsylvania portions of Pharaoh Lee's two tales. He himself says, "A little history of the Moravian Church in Philadelphia at the beginning of the last century supplied most of the characters that were needed in the tales and when one got Red Jacket, Toby Hirte, the Moravian connection and the legend that Talleyrand once sold buttons for a living in Philadelphia all mixed up together, you can see that the rest of the tale marched by itself."¹² Citation from the texts will show how much Kipling owes to Ritter's description of Toby Hirte. I have italicized the relevant phrases and sentences. The passages from Ritter come first.

But here, too, we have a relish for social epicureanism in the person and character of a certain Tobias Hirte.

This specimen of the olden time was resident in the second story of the back building of No. 118, just named.

He was a bachelor, an itinerant apothecary, a hermit, or a cit, as fancy or convenience might suggest.

His itineracy was not limited to the mere disposing of curatives, nor to the single eye to gain. He was fond of travel. "*Liberty and independence was his motto*"; and when mounted on *his sorrel mare, with saddle-bags at each side, and a large umbrella, with a handle of unusual length*, on the pommel of his saddle, he bestrode the pinnacle of his glory; and the summer season, from early spring, opened the highway to this enjoyment.

Although vending his compounds as he passed the route of his search, his principal object, for many years, was a visit to the Indians—Seneca, and several other tribes—with whom he was on the most sociable terms and whose chiefs always called on him, at his hermitage in Philadelphia, when they came.

Amongst these were Cornplanter, the Seneca Chief, and his

¹¹ Ritter, 49-66; 60, 68; 169; 245, 259, 265, 276, 280; 278; 247; 248-249.

¹² Cooper, 32. Substantially the same passage is quoted by Thomas, 41, and Mansback, *Kipling Journal* LXXI, 4, and footnote, (for which see p. 6). Mansback says the quotation is from a newspaper clipping of about 1917 and adds that the letter cannot be proved authentic. The style sounds like Kipling's, and Cooper's article appears in a handbook, *Around the World With Kipling*, issued by Kipling's American publishers, Doubleday, Page and Company.

associate, *Red Jacket*, both of whom I have seen in his room in *Second Street*. . . .

Cornplanter was a noble specimen of our race, in person and purpose, and known to history as a very efficient aid to General *Washington*. . . .¹³

Thus associated, my subject was facilitated in his gatherings of social, as well as pecuniary wealth, and *his sale of Seneca oil made him as popular as his details of Indian customs, manners, and peculiarities; the special purpose of his annual visit being to gather or purchase this oil from the Senecas.*

Although an itinerant, he was not without homes, seeing that the interim of his travel found him at—what he called—*his country seat, in Lebanon, Pa., where he cultivated and enjoyed fruits of all kinds, and the most choice* . . . (Ritter, 247-248).

Ritter winds up his account of Hirte's country activities with a picture of Toby at the back door of his cabin reading the Democratic daily *Aurora*, and goes on to give a description of his winter quarters in Philadelphia.

Here, in a room of about ten by fifteen feet, sat this veteran in nostrums, picturesque in the adornment of his walls with the remains of a music store, fiddles, flutes, French horns, and the like; whilst below, in one corner, stood an old-timed spinnet, steadied to the floor by a fifty-six pound weight on its lid or top, in range of which sat the "lord of his survey," at a table either redolent of roast goose, apple-sauce, &c.; or a mass of pill-stuff, or other medicament, in preparation of a summer's trip; whilst behind him sat a boy, bottling or boxing curatives for all the ills of human inheritance, spurred to speed by the promise of a feast of coffee and sugar-cake at the end of the week. [It was this boy's job that Kipling gave to Pharaoh.] In front stood a large and very grand—as we thought in those days—mantle clock; but, a little beyond, another, of more importance and more interest. *This was a musical clock—a great curiosity; whose Swiss peasantry, in a recess over the dial, took an hourly turn in a cosy dance, to the jingle of a most fascinating set of well-tuned bells, gazed and wondered at by the Schuankfelders, who supplied him regularly on the evenings of*

¹³ Ritter appears to have been on the wrong track here, at least as far as Cornplanter's earlier years are concerned. Both Cornplanter and Red Jacket fought against the United States in the Revolution. See Drake, Book V, 104, 114; Thomas L. McKenney and James Hall, *The Indian Tribes of North America*, ed. Frederick Webb Hodge, Edinburgh, 1933 (originally published 1836; see preface, iv) I, 11, 181. Later Cornplanter acted as a kind of mediator between the United States Government and the western Indians. *American State Papers, Indian Affairs*, Washington, 1832, 145-147.

Tuesday and Friday, with cream, butter, and *Dutch cheese*; the latter always most popular for its offensive odor.

He was a bachelor to all intents and purposes, and his apartment a stranger to *whisk or water*. His habits were unique. He prepared and ate his breakfast of toast and coffee, at about 10 A. M.; lunched on tea and toast, or plain bread and butter and Dutch cheese, at 2 P. M.; but dined sumptuously on roast pig (which he called "spanferkle") or roast goose, with no small amount of potatoes, apples, cold-slaw, bread and butter, &c., settled with several glasses of good Madeira, at about 11 o'clock at night, and then a pipe; and then, despite homoeopathy, if all within was of doubtful temperament, a goodly number of Von Swieten's pills—a composition principally of aloes—were sent to check rebellion. Yet he killed the time of near one hundred years (Ritter, 248-250).

Of the material contained in these passages, Kipling made sporadic use—on one page drawing on one paragraph; on another, calling on the next. We first see him leaning heavily on Ritter when Red Jacket, trailed to Conrad Gerhart's bakery by Pharaoh, discovers that the boy is hungry.

He opens a door on to a staircase and leads the way up. We walked into a *dirty little room of flutes and fiddles* and a fat man fiddling by the window, in a smell of cheese and medicines fit to knock you down. I was knocked down too, for the fat man jumped up and hit me a smack in the face. I fell against an old spinnet covered with pill-boxes, and the pills rolled about the floor. The Indian never moved an eye-lid.

"Pick up the pills! Pick up the pills!" the fat man screeches.

I started picking 'em up—hundreds of 'em—meaning to run out under the Indian's arm, but I came on giddy all over and I sat down. The fat man went back to his fiddling.

"Toby!" says the Indian after a while. "I brought the boy to be fed, not hit."

"What? says Toby, "I thought it was Gert Schwankfelder." He put down his fiddle and took a good look at me. "Himmel!" he says. "I have hit the wrong boy. It is not the new boy. Why are you not the new boy? Why are you not Gert Schwankfelder?"

"I don't know," I said. "The gentleman in the pink blanket brought me."

Says the Indian, "He is hungry, Toby. Christians always feed the hungry. So I bring him."

"You should have said that first," said Toby. He pushed plates at me and the Indian put *bread and pork* on them, and a glass of Madeira wine ("Brother Square-Toes," 163-164).

After Pharaoh has eaten, Toby, himself, according to Ritter, an enthusiastic but by no means excellent fiddler,¹⁴ learns that Pharaoh fiddles too, and decides that Providence has sent Pharaoh to take the place of the truant Gert Schwankfelder. He says to Red Jacket:

“Now look at this boy and say what you think.”

The Indian looked me over whole minutes—*there was a musical clock on the wall, and dolls came out and hopped while the hour struck.* He looked me over all the while they did it.

“Good,” he says at last. “This boy is good” (“Brother Square-Toes,” 164-165).

There follows some description of the Moravian community in Philadelphia and Pharaoh’s reaction to it and its church. But soon Kipling gets Pharaoh on the move again. The following passages are taken from the account of the trip to Lebanon.

As soon as the *dancing clock* struck midnight that Sunday—I was lying under *the spinnet*—I heard Toby’s fiddle. He’d just done *his supper which he always took late and heavy.* “Gert,” says he, “get the horses. *Liberty and Independence* forever! The flowers appear upon the earth and the time of the singing of birds is come. We are going to *my country seat at Lebanon*” (“Brother Square-Toes,” 167).

. . . But let me tell my tale my own way, same as *his brown mare* used to go to Lebanon. (“Brother Square-Toes,” 165.)

. . . *Toby sold medicines out of his saddle-bags,* and gave the French war-news to folk along the roads. Him and his *long-hilted umberell* was as well known as the stage coaches (“Brother Square-Toes,” 167).

. . . and so we jogged into dozy little Lebanon by the Blue Mountains *where Toby had a cottage and a garden of all fruits.* *He come north every year for this wonderful Seneca Oil the Seneca Indians made for him* (“Brother Square-Toes,” 168).

As can be seen from the passages I have quoted, Kipling depends upon Ritter for the touches that give an impression of reality. There are more examples of this: “Pastor Meder’s garden where the big peach tree is”—“The service was in English that week”—and so on. He has invented for Toby a pun on the name of one of his neighbors, David Jones the hatter, next door to the Buck Tavern. In “Brother Square-Toes,” Toby says, “The horses are in Davy Jones’s locker,” and Kipling lets Pharaoh explain, “That

¹⁴ Ritter, 64, 152, 250.

was his joke. He kept his mare under David Jones's hat shop in the 'Buck' tavern yard, and his Indian friends kept their ponies there when they visited him."¹⁵ Similarly when Kipling needs a name for one of his minor characters, he picks the most picturesque from Ritter's lists of neighbors and church officers. Adam Goose and Sister Haga are selected rather than George Schlosser and Elizabeth Mentz.¹⁶

In a few instances Kipling allows Ritter to mislead him. Plenty of authorities available in 1910 assert that while Cornplanter was for the most part friendly to Christianity, Red Jacket was inimical to it. Ritter suggests that both the chiefs superintended his learning of an Indian version of "Jesus, hear our prayer,"¹⁷ and, either on the strength of this passage, or deliberately attributing Cornplanter's qualities to Red Jacket, Kipling represents Red Jacket as at least partly Christianized. He does more. Apparently for no other reason than that Ritter calls them associates, he describes these two leaders of the Senecas as great friends. All writers on Indian affairs who go into any detail whatsoever tell us that Cornplanter and Red Jacket were rivals who alternately ousted one another from power, and that Cornplanter on one occasion publicly called Red Jacket a coward.¹⁸ It seems probable that Kipling knew of this rivalry and ignored it; a remark of Pharaoh's that Red Jacket was the better talker of the two must be based on a knowledge of Red Jacket's oratorical powers that could not have been gleaned from Ritter. Here Kipling has evidently made further researches but decided to sacrifice accuracy to expediency, preserve Ritter's apocryphal account, and employ the names, if not the actual characteristics, of two well-known Senecas of the day.

I may have given the impression that Kipling never departs from Ritter. He does do so. For convenience sake, he gives Red Jacket more English than he evidently had at spoken command; Ritter's account of the hymn-singing session does not imply that any other language than Iroquois was used, and early authorities agree that while Red Jacket understood English, he refused to speak it.¹⁹

¹⁵ Ritter, 246; "Brother Square-Toes," 165-167.

¹⁶ Ritter, 161, 236; "A Priest in Spite of Himself," 191, 203.

¹⁷ Ritter, 247-248; McKenney and Hall, I, 14, 16-18 and 187; Appleton's *Cyclopaedia of American Biography*, 1886, I, 743; V, 205.

¹⁸ Ritter, 247; McKenney and Hall, I, 18-19, 180.

¹⁹ Ritter, 247; Drake, Book V, 98 ff.; McKenney and Hall, I, 15-16; "Brother Square-Toes," 169.

Occasionally, then, Kipling modifies Ritter, sometimes in order to make a point. Ritter gives an account of the purchase of a stove for the church in 1794—apparently a great event, but one that caused no controversy. The upper rooms were so cold despite the stove that foot-warmers were needed for the old sisters, he adds. But Kipling, after altering the date to 1793, changes this heartily agreed-upon innovation into an occasion for disharmony among the members, some of whom feel that artificial heat is worldly, and he mentions the foot-warmer group as neutral, not caring either way. He perverts Ritter in this fashion because he wants to give Talleyrand a chance to display his diplomacy. The abbé Talleyrand-Périgord talks to two Moravians on opposing sides of the great stove question, in each other's presence, and makes each man feel that he agrees with him. Kipling makes this plausible adaptation for the sake of character-drawing, just as he represents Talleyrand as calling Toby "Dr. Pangloss," in not entirely complimentary reference to the confirmed optimist in Voltaire's *Candide*, and allows him to make a sort of buried reference to Molière in the self-description "a priest in spite of myself."²⁰

Kipling, then, twists Ritter and falls back on his own knowledge of French literature in order to make his characters more vivid and real; in the same way he uses his knowledge of Pennsylvania landscape to make his background convincing. His thumbnail sketch of the Pennsylvania Dutch country has not, I think, been bettered—"Little houses and bursting big barns, fat cattle, fat women, and all as peaceful as Heaven might be if they farmed there." When he goes into more detail he is equally good. "In the cool o' the morning the cat-bird sings. He's something to listen to. And there's a smell of wild grape-vine growing in damp hollows which you drop into, after long rides in the heat, which is beyond compare for sweetness. So's the puffs out of the pine woods of afternoons. Come sundown, the frogs strike up, and later on the fireflies dance in the corn. Oh me, the fireflies in the corn!" Bits like this make Pharaoh's journey with Toby seem like a trip that was actually taken.

Just as he depended on his knowledge of present-day Sussex and

²⁰ Ritter, 56-57, 65; "A Priest in Spite of Himself," 190-191. Talleyrand was personally acquainted with Voltaire. See Lady Blennerhasset, *Talleyrand*, tr. Frederick Clarke, London, 1894, I, 39.

Pennsylvania to supplement traditions about smuggling and Ritter's reminiscences, Kipling, who took the hint about Red Jacket's supposed Christianity from *The History of the Moravian Church in Philadelphia*, drew, I think, part of his idea of what an American Indian was like from a very different source. He had Ritter's—and others'—authority for these men's occasional interviews with George Washington,²¹ but I feel sure that this picture of the relationship between Washington, Red Jacket, and Cornplanter is based in part on what he knew of relations between officials in British India, and, say, Pathan chiefs against whom they had fought in their youth. He has acknowledged more than once that his sketch of the Roman officers, Parnesius and Pertinax, on Hadrian's Wall, was a sketch of North-West Frontier subalterns;²² his descriptions of the friendship between the Pict leader and the young Romans are presumably also transferred from an Afghan border scene; this friendship between Washington and the American Indians appears likely to be a repeat borrowing. Both Kipling's Picts and his Red Indians have no desire to be caught between the greater powers.²³ Other possible points of comparison suggest themselves. An oblique reference to Braddock's defeat is made. Washington says to Cornplanter, who fought on the French side on that inglorious occasion. "You taught me to look behind trees when we were both young."²⁴ It is easy to imagine a colonel saying something like this to a native officer who began his career on the far side of the border.

It is difficult to tell whether Kipling did much special research on Washington himself for this story. The 1900 *Encyclopaedia Britannica* articles on Washington and on United States history emphasize Washington's thwarting of Genet's desire to use the United States against England. At first glance, it seems that these articles might have been almost enough for the purpose of the tale. But Kipling may have checked on Washington's movements a little; though there is no evidence that Genet ever went to Mount

²¹ Ritter, 248, 260; Drake, Book V, 113; McKenney and Hall, I, 29.

²² André Maurois, in a discussion following a lecture on "Kipling and his Works from a French Point of View" delivered before the Kipling Society on April 18, 1934, said that Kipling had told him this. *Kipling Journal* XXX, June, 1934, 46-47. Major C. S. Jarvis bore similar testimony. See an extract from *Desert and Delta*, 1938, 45-47, quoted in *Kipling Journal* LXVIII, December, 1943, 16.

²³ "On the Great Wall," *Puck of Pook's Hill*, 167; "Brother Square-Toes," 169.

²⁴ "Brother Square-Toes," 169, 179; Drake, Book V, 111-113; Appleton's *Cyclopaedia*, I, 743.

Vernon, it is true that Washington was there late in the fall of 1793, at the suggested time of Genet's visit.²⁵ It is also true that in April, 1793, Genet projected a visit to Mount Vernon *en route* from Charleston to Philadelphia; by September he was scarcely on such terms with Washington as to think of being a house-guest, unless he was willing to vilify a man and then accept his hospitality.²⁶ Perhaps Kipling thought him capable of such behavior. It looks, at any rate, as if Kipling may have considered probabilities of time and place, and he would have had to go beyond the *Britannica* for these. There are, moreover, some indications that Kipling referred to William Cobbett's *Porcupine's Works* for material on both Washington and Genet. After all, as a purveyor of one contemporary British point of view, Cobbett is *a priori* a likely source. He lays a great deal of stress, as does Kipling, on the fact that Washington stood alone in opposition to war, while as a matter of actual fact the cabinet appears to have agreed with him²⁷—even Jefferson, for all his French sympathies.²⁸ Kipling's estimate of Genet's character and up-bringing could also have been based, at least in part, on Cobbett's. Cobbett calls Genet "abundantly assuming and insolent—uniting the levity of a Frenchman to the boorishness of a

²⁵ Washington's letters from September 16 to October 27, 1793, are dated from Mount Vernon or that vicinity. See *Writings of Washington*, ed. John C. Fitzpatrick, Washington, 1940, XXXIII, 89-141. Sparks's *Writings of Washington*, X, 369-386, does not permit such exact dating, but shows that Washington was at Mount Vernon from September 23 to October 24. Pharaoh describes the trip to Mount Vernon as taking place after the first frosts, when the fall color is at its height. "Brother Square-Toes," 172.

²⁶ F. J. Turner, "Correspondence of the French Ministers to the United States," *Annual Report of the American Historical Association*, 1903, II, 213. Washington's letter to Secretary of War Knox on September 3, 1792, shows that visits to Mount Vernon by foreign ministers were not out of the question: "Both the French and British ministers talked of coming this way." Sparks, *Writings of Washington*, X, 290. For relations between Genet and the government after July, 1793, see John Bach McMaster, *A History of the People of the United States*, New York, 1893, II, 139-141. In a letter of September 15, Jefferson told Genet that his recall had been asked for. Washington Irving, *Life of George Washington*, New York, 1867, V, Chapter XXII, 721.

²⁷ *Porcupine's Works*, II, 276. Cobbett is here speaking of Washington's advocacy of the Jay treaty with Britain in 1795, rather than of his neutral attitude toward France in 1793, but the issue is fundamentally the same—whether or no to remain at peace with England.

²⁸ John Spencer Bassett, *The Federalist System*, New York and London, copyright 1906, 86, 92; Nathaniel W. Stephenson and Waldo H. Dunn, *George Washington*, New York, 1940, II, 361.

Calmuc." Like many other authorities on the period, Cobbett gives the name of the *Embuscade*, the frigate which conveyed Genet to America, but he does not spell it as Kipling does, and does not mention the name of her commanding officer, Captain Bompard.²⁹ Bompard is mentioned in most of the lives of Washington and in the multi-volume histories of the United States, like McMaster's *History of the American People* (copyright 1885). A source like McMaster would seem probable, but F. J. Turner in the *Annual Report of the American Historical Association* for 1903 combines allusions to Bompard with additional material that might have provided grist for Kipling's mill. Turner spells the *Embuscade* French-fashion, like Kipling, and repeats Jefferson's verdict on Genet: "Hot-headed, all imagination, no judgment, passionate and even indecent towards the P[resident] in his writing as well as verbal communications."³⁰ If Kipling did consult Cobbett, and did find Jefferson's characterization of Genet in Turner or elsewhere, it is not surprising that he should have allowed Pharaoh to describe the ambassador, an aristocrat by birth, and a diplomat by training,³¹ as a "rude, common man" who "never had more manners than a Bosham tinker." And if Kipling somewhere ran across John Adams's letter to Jefferson (June 30, 1813), with its reference to "the terrorism excited by Genet, in 1793," when Philadelphia crowds threatened to drag the president out of his house, it would have corroborated his belief in Genet's kinship with the mob.³²

Historically speaking there is no doubt that Genet displayed both ill-manners and rabble-rousing tendencies, but it is perhaps a moot question whether he planned to enlist actual military aid from the United States, as Kipling consistently assumes that he did. His instructions were, so far as we can find out, not to try to make the United States declare war on England, but to obtain as much help from us as possible. Genet's early speeches in America were relatively moderate, but since he was arming French vessels in our ports, bringing British prizes into them to sell, and endeavoring to launch an American-manned expedition against the Spanish-American colonies, he soon irritated the United States government,

²⁹ *Porcupine's Works*, II, 360; I, 103.

³⁰ McMaster, II, 98 ff.; Turner, II, 230, 237. Like Turner, Bassett, 98, quotes this passage from Jefferson's letter to Madison.

³¹ Appleton's *Cyclopaedia*, II, 624.

³² Stephenson and Dunn, II, 368.

which had issued a declaration of neutrality on April 22. When forbidden to carry on these militant activities, Genet became extremely intemperate in his language, and attempted to appeal to the people over the president's head. Kipling may have felt that Genet's actions were deliberately intended to draw us into open warfare. Washington himself suspected that they were, as he reveals in a message to congress in the fall of 1793.³³ Perhaps Kipling read this message; in any case, whatever sources he consulted on Washington and Genet, it seems certain that he did not find any encyclopaedia, or any single history of the United States, a sufficient authority. He appears to have used the obvious sources as springboards. This supposition is most strikingly reinforced by the fact that none of the writers I have mentioned, however accessible or inaccessible, supplies Bompard's first name; Kipling gives it, and correctly. It could not have been easy to find; even the contemporary newspapers seem content to dub Bompard "Citizen" or "Captain."³⁴ Possibly it was from the archives of the French navy that Kipling derived this piece of information; only from a very recently published article, depending on the *Archives de la Marine* as one of its sources, have I been able to verify the "Jean Baptiste" that Pharaoh so easily drops into his account of the *Embucade*.³⁵ It is interesting that Kipling should have taken such pains over this name, when he was willing to neglect or ignore Red Jacket's paganism and his dislike for Cornplanter. He could have mentioned "Captain Bompard" without risk of anyone's asking for more; he chose to search out the man's Christian name. Yet he has allowed a seemingly far more important element in his story, the picture of the relationship between the two chiefs, to be glaringly inaccurate. This fussiness over detail in the first instance is not easily reconcilable with his inaccuracy in the second, especially since he could have invented names for the Indians needed in his tale, while building their characters up on such hints from truly historical figures as he chose to use.

³³ *Message of the President of the United States to Congress Relative to France and Great Britain*, delivered December 5, 1793. With the papers therein referred to. To which are added the French originals. Published by order of the House of Representatives, Philadelphia, 1793. Quoted in part by Irving, V, 723.

³⁴ *The Pennsylvania Gazette* and *The Pennsylvania Journal and Weekly Advertiser* for the spring and summer of 1793 abound in references to Bompard and the *Embucade*, but never give the captain's first name.

³⁵ E. Francheschini, "Jean-Baptiste-Francois Bompard," *Dictionnaire de Biographie Francoise*, Paris, 1953, Fascicule XXXIV, 893.

If it is difficult to identify the exact source of Kipling's material on Washington, Genet, and Bompard, it is equally hard to come to a satisfactory conclusion in investigating his sources on Talleyrand. He almost certainly knew something of him before he began to work on "A Priest in Spite of Himself." Talleyrand is not an obscure eccentric like Toby Hirte. Kipling might, moreover, have been especially interested in Talleyrand on two counts independent of his connection with this story. Talleyrand, like Washington, was a Mason,³⁶ and Kipling was an extremely devoted follower of Masonry.³⁷ Talleyrand always stood for an alliance with England, under all six governments he worked for;³⁸ Kipling was also firmly convinced that Europe's stability and England's welfare demanded that England and France be friends.³⁹ In preparing to write "A Priest in Spite of Himself," Kipling probably read a popular biography of Talleyrand, like Lady Blennerhasset's, and possibly a portion of Talleyrand's own memoirs as well. At least, it seems possible that Talleyrand's mention of the Moravian community at Bethlehem caught Kipling's eye, and that references to his "indifferent lodgings" and "narrow quarters" supplied the hints for the room "as bare as the palm of your hand" which Pharaoh describes. The remark that Sieyès "sulks in his corner" may account for Kipling's giving Bonaparte a speech about "that sulky ass Sieyès."⁴⁰ As for Kipling's conception of the relations between Napoleon and Talleyrand at the beginning of the first consulate, he may represent Talleyrand as a little more openly contemptuous of Bonaparte than he actually was at this date,⁴¹ but, in doing so, Kipling makes good use of Napoleon's lame attempt to win the two chambers of the French assembly by eloquence rather than force.

³⁶ Lacour-Gayet, I, 83; Emile Dard, *Napoleon and Talleyrand*, tr. Christopher R. Turner, New York, 1937, 76, footnote.

³⁷ Kipling, *Something of Myself*, New York, 1937, Chapter III, 58.

³⁸ Lacour-Gayet, I, 125. This fact has long been recognized by commentators on Talleyrand.

³⁹ "A Thesis" (Sorbonne Banquet; November 1921), *A Book of Words*, London, 1928, 205-206; "The Trees and the Wall" (University Banquet, Strasbourg; November 1921), *ibid.*, 214-215; "Waking from Dreams" (Strasbourg; November 1921), *ibid.*, 219; "Our Indian Troops in France," (La Bassee; October 1927), *ibid.*, 297-298.

⁴⁰ *Memoirs*, I, 177, 183, 160; "A Priest in Spite of Himself," 201.

⁴¹ Lacour-Gayet, I, 357-61; Blennerhasset, I, 327; II, 118, 137, 154. Later Talleyrand gained a reputation for treating Napoleon with "disdainful deference," and for sustaining his rages with indifference. Dard, 42, 199-201; "A Priest in Spite of Himself," 213-214.

He shows Napoleon boasting about it as if it had been a success, and Talleyrand taunting him with the results—a torn coat when he was ejected.

In the two stories we have been discussing, Kipling has kept fairly close to dates and facts in some places, and to possibilities, such as the Indians' visit to Mount Vernon, in others. I think we can say that though he has made some errors, and some deliberate departures from fact, on the whole he has tried to be accurate. Indeed, it was his usual practice to take considerable pains with these historical tales. For instance, the first English and American editions of *Rewards and Fairies* show him hesitating between "Senlac," "Santlache," and "Hastings" as names for the famous battle. The alterations may have been made for the sake of consistency, but Kipling may also have reflected the controversies among historians on this point. Freeman, depending on one chronicler, Ordericus Vitalis, asserted that "Santlache" was the Norman name for the battle.⁴² Horace Round denied the force of Freeman's arguments. Kipling appears to have plumped for "Santlache"; for, in the definitive Sussex edition, projected before his death, "Santlache" stands.⁴³ Perhaps it keeps its place because Kipling had come across Stevenson's refutation of Round's refutation of Freeman in the *English Historical Review* for 1913.⁴⁴ If so, Kipling displayed here the same attention to detail that he revealed when he tracked down Captain Bompard's first name. On the other hand, though he speaks in Chapter VII of *Something of Myself* of the "honest research" that was joined to "legitimate inference" in his tales on Roman Britain, he inadvertently stationed in England a legion that never was there,⁴⁵ and purposely called his young officer, whom he

⁴² W. H. Stevenson, "Senlac and the Malfossé," *English Historical Review* XXVIII, 1913, 292-303.

⁴³ John H. Round, *Quarterly Review* CLXXV, 1892, 9; Flora V. Livingston, *Bibliography of the Works of Rudyard Kipling*, New York, 1927, 315.

⁴⁴ Stevenson, 292-303.

⁴⁵ Sir John Medley, *Melbourne Age*, November 22, 1952, as quoted by Ernest Short, "Notes," *Kipling Journal* CV, April, 1953, 1-2. Medley explains that attempts to correct Kipling on this point—putting Legion XXX in England—were unsuccessful, but that later a stone with an inscription of the Seventh Cohort of the Thirtieth Legion was found on the Wall. This was Parnesuis's cohort. A letter to Kipling procured an invitation, but when Medley visited at Burwash and saw the notes from which the story had been written, he concluded that Kipling had just used the first figures that occurred to him. Archaeologists still believe that only odd men from the Thirtieth ever reached England. See also B. S. Browne, "Flense, Flench, or Flinch," *Letter Bag, Kipling Journal* LVII, April, 1941, 25-26; E. Daw-

treats like a lieutenant, a centurion, though a centurion was comparable to a sergeant. He did this, a letter quoted in Ballard's catalogue tells us, because he thought children would have heard of centurions on account of the one mentioned in the Bible.⁴⁶

One question that an investigator of historical sources may be asked is, "How do you know that your author did not absorb some of his material from local talk, an archaeological village rector, folklore he learned of his own employees?" I don't know it; in fact, I assume that a part of Kipling's knowledge came through just such channels. In *Something of Myself*, Chapter III, he says that, as a young man in India, he drew on the members of his club for "technical knowledge"—absorbing it, apparently, whether he wanted to or not—and, as an older man, he turned to people like George Saintsbury, another fellow club-member, this time at the Savile.⁴⁷ He probably consulted experts wherever he could find them, and may well have spent little time reading the guidebooks I have laboriously consulted. (Guidebooks, however, are at least mentioned in *Something of Myself*.)⁴⁸ Kipling's names for Sussex characters may come from gravestones rather than from Sussex Archaeological Society publications; he may have heard a fragment of "Old Mother Laidinwool" sung, rather than found it in Coker Egerton's *Sussex Folk and Sussex Ways*.⁴⁹ He may not have looked in a book when he needed the name of a Sussex parson loyal to the Stuart cause for "A Doctor of Medicine," the story about Nicholas Culpeper. Perhaps he saw Zack Tutsham's name in a list of rectors hanging up in Dallington Church, and knew that he was forced to yield his pulpit to a Puritan divine by the date of his withdrawal. But the Sussex Archaeological Collections at any rate prove that the Zachary Tutsham mentioned in "A Doctor of Medicine" was a real man, and *A History of the English Church during the Civil Wars and under the Commonwealth* confirms the fact.⁵⁰ I have found

son, "A Centurion of the Thirtieth," Letter Bag, *Kipling Journal* XL, December, 1936, 135; *Something of Myself*, Chapter VII, 204; Bertram C. A. Windle, *The Romans in Britain*, London, 1923, 67.

⁴⁶ Ellis Ames Ballard, *Catalogue Intimate and Descriptive of my Kipling Collection*, Philadelphia, 1935, 250.

⁴⁷ *Something of Myself*, Chapter III, 49; Chapter IV, 93.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, Chapter VII, 195.

⁴⁹ J. Coker Egerton, *Sussex Folk and Sussex Ways*, London, 1881, 297.

⁵⁰ William Henry Blaauw, "Civil War in Sussex," *Sussex Archaeological Collections* V, 70; William A. Shaw, *A History of the English Church during the Civil Wars and under the Commonwealth*, II, London, 1900, 315.

that Kipling did not even invent the name "Attersole," though I think he probably was the first to fit it to a clergyman and then cap it with the nickname "Wail." It is on record that Culpeper lived with a relative, William Attersole, for some time.⁵¹ Kipling is always ready to use the most picturesque name that is also accurate or appropriate to the neighborhood about which he is writing, and to give it the added twist that a contemporary would have been likely to contribute.

Earlier I mentioned the need for consulting ordnance maps when dealing with the background of Kipling's stories. His own delighted dependence on maps is illustrated in "Brother Square-Toes." The trip from the Seneca reservation to Mount Vernon was traced, he tells us, on an old map which, I agree with Mr. Mansback,⁵² may well have been the Evans map of 1755. At least all the places Pharaoh lists from Canasedago to Ashby's Gap are to be found on the copy of Gibson's London edition, printed 1758, as reproduced in Plate 26 of Paullin and Wright's *Atlas of the Historical Geography of the United States*.⁵³ It is noteworthy, however, that the names are not all spelled as Kipling spells them, and that in his own account of the "old map of the American Colonies . . . which gave me all the old trails and ferries that were required," he dates it "1774 or thereabouts."⁵⁴ We cannot be sure that Kipling's map and Evans's are the same. Kipling was very likely not looking for his Colonial map when he found it; he says Providence sent it to him. He may even have bought it before he knew he was going to make any practical literary use of it. He loved maps for their own sake. There were two globes in his study at Burwash, the final sentence in *Something of Myself* tells us, and his sister describes him chuckling over odd names, like "Loby-Toby" for a volcano, on an admiralty chart of the East Indies he was studying for "The Disturber of Traffic" (*Many Inventions*, 1891).⁵⁵

Having reviewed Kipling's dependence on his sources, historical

⁵¹ "Introduction," *Culpeper's English Physician and Complete Herbal*, ed. William J. Ferrier, London, 1938, ix. The name "Attersoule" is dotted through the pages of the Sussex Archaeological Society's collections. See "A Doctor of Medicine," *Rewards and Fairies*, New York, 1910, 278.

⁵² "Some Kipling Backgrounds," *Kipling Journal* LXXII, April, 1945, 13.

⁵³ Charles O. Paullin and John K. Wright, *Atlas of the Historical Geography of the United States*, Baltimore, 1932, Plate 26.

⁵⁴ Cooper, "Rudyard Kipling, a Biographical Sketch," 32.

⁵⁵ Alice M. Fleming, as quoted in C. H. Milburn, "The Homes of Rudyard Kipling," *Kipling Journal* LXIV, December, 1942, 13.

and cartographical, we are now in a position to enter on the most conjectural phase of this discussion and try to guess at Kipling's mental process as he evolved Pharaoh Lee's story. He already had his theme for *Rewards and Fairies*—the giving of unacknowledged service. I will advance the hypothesis that he had at an earlier time stumbled on Ritter's book about the Moravians, with its mention of Talleyrand and his button selling. Kipling may have asked himself what Talleyrand was doing in Philadelphia. With his conception of Talleyrand, he would be sure to think there was a good political reason why the man went into exile there rather than elsewhere. Washington was the most important person in Philadelphia at the time, and Talleyrand presumably was interested only in major figures. As a matter of fact, it is known to be true that Talleyrand had letters to Washington, as Kipling makes him say; but he never was actually granted an interview, though Kipling allows him to imply that he was. Kipling is not misrepresenting Talleyrand here; telling a lie by implication would not be out of character for him!⁵⁶ It is also true that Washington made himself unpopular by his refusal to support republican France against England, as monarchical France had supported him. The French minister, Genet, did try in vain to persuade him to do this. Washington, then, because of his undeserved unpopularity, would fit well into the scheme of the book, but how is Washington to be brought into a book laid in Sussex? There is a way to introduce him. A Sussex man may be represented as having gone to America, so that someone connected with Sussex can tell Washington's story to the children. (He is artificially linked to America by being made to live, when in England, on the old Penn estate, in the town of Washington.) But he must be provided with a reason for crossing the Atlantic. Perhaps Kipling does not want to suggest that anyone would willingly leave Sussex for the United States; certainly for the purpose of the story he needs to give his narrator a plausible pretext for knowing the French ambassador. It occurs to Kipling that he may be able to place his hero accidentally on board a French ship carrying Genet. Having read Ritter (according to my hypothesis), he knows he is going to use Toby Hirte, who can be linked to George Washington by their acquaintance with the same Indians. And Hirte played the fiddle (badly, Ritter says), but he

⁵⁶ Lacour-Gayet, 183-185; Reid, "Introduction," *Memoirs*, I, xx.

played it. If Kipling makes his hero fiddle, that will be a way to get the two together. Gipsies often fiddle, and a gipsy might get along well with Indians. And if this gipsy fiddler can also be a smuggler and half-French, it will be easy to boost him accidentally onto a French ship and have him taken for a French citizen while aboard. The French streak will also make it simple for him to scrape acquaintance with Talleyrand. And what more probable than that, once established in America, he should try to smuggle goods into England? Then he can be caught by the French, and have a reason for going to Paris, where he will find Talleyrand again, and form an estimate of Bonaparte as well.

This theoretical reconstruction is open to criticism. But whether or not I have traced correctly the steps by which Kipling arrived at his plot, I can say with confidence that his usual scheme for writing an historical short story is this: Against a physical background well known to him, he places events he has imagined on the basis of some historical facts—often facts that it required some effort to unearth. And he assumes that people doing similar jobs, at intervals of anywhere from one hundred to fifteen hundred years, will be something alike.

This formula differs from that of other writers chiefly in that Kipling took more pains with his history than many of them did, and was, on the whole, more careful to write about parts of the world with which he was familiar. It is recognized that Scott allowed himself liberties that might well be called license, except in his novels about seventeenth and eighteenth century Scotland. And while Thackeray was careful, it is fair to say that Kipling was more scholarly, more concerned with verifying details, than many of his predecessors. On the other hand, he discarded one story about Defoe, he records in Chapter VII of *Something of Myself*, because it was over-loaded with accurate references.⁵⁷ He saved only those tales, historical and other, that, once started, wrote themselves.

The research Kipling did we can, at least in part, follow; the reason for his choice of this or that bit of material we can ferret out; but it is more difficult to pursue the footsteps of the creative impulse that he calls his daemon. There is no explaining genius, but it is comforting to see genius hard at work. Kipling combined energy with genius; I know of no better way to make the past live.

⁵⁷ P. 202.