

NEW LIGHT ON HUC AND GABET

Their Expulsion from Lhasa in 1846

SCHUYLER CAMMANN

ABBÉ HUC'S *Travels in Tartary, Tibet and China, during the years 1844-5-6*, has long since become one of the world's great travel classics.¹ For some decades after its publication, however, it was read with the utmost scepticism. Foremost among the sceptics, and the book's chief detractor, was the Russian explorer, Prjevalsky, whose vindictive attempts to disprove Huc's statements caused many people to doubt that he and Father Gabet had ever entered Tibet.² It was some forty years after the book first appeared before Huc found a champion in the American traveller, W. W. Rockhill, who in writing of his own expeditions, quoted the Abbé frequently, and stated his faith in the earlier traveller's observations.³ Shortly after this, Henri, Duc d'Orleans, wrote a book protesting the widespread lack of belief in Huc's narrative.⁴ Refuting Prjevalsky's major charges point by point, he made it clear that the Russian's motive for casting slurs on the Frenchmen was largely due to his jealousy at their having gone so far into the interior, where he himself had been unable to go.⁵ Finally, in 1900, Henri Cordier published some diplomatic correspondence between Ch'i-ying,⁶ the governor-general at Canton, and the French consul, M. de Bécour, which discussed the expulsion of the two Lazarist fathers from Lhasa, leaving no doubt that they had been there.⁷ The last comprehensive treatment of the subject appears to have been an article in *T'oung pao* (1926) by Paul Pelliot,

¹ First published at Paris in 1850, the *Travels* were translated by William Hazlitt and published in London in 1852 (Office of the National Illustrated Library). This was reprinted in Chicago by the Open Court Publishing Co. in 1898 and 1900. Still another edition of the same translation, edited with an introduction by Paul Pelliot was brought out in London in 1928 (G. Routledge & Sons).

² See Henri Duc d'Orleans, *Le Père Huc et ses critiques* (Paris, 1893), chapters I, II, and III, pp. 7-32, for some of Prjevalsky's accusations and their refutations.

³ W. W. Rockhill, *Land of the lamas* (New York, 1891) pp. 125-26, for one example.

⁴ See note 2.

⁵ Orleans, *op. cit.*, pp. 4, 26.

⁶ Ch'i-ying, a capable Manchu official is perhaps best known for having been the Imperial Commissioner appointed to sign the Treaty of Nanking with Sir Henry Pottinger. Biographies of him appear in the *Ch'ing shih kao*, ch. 376, p. 4b, and *Ch'ing shih lieh-chuan*, ch. 40, 35a. Also see an article by J. K. Fairbank, "Chinese diplomacy and the treaty of Nanking, 1842," *Journal of modern history*, 12 (Mar., 1940), pp. 1-30.

⁷ H. Cordier, l'Expulsion de MM. Huc et Gabet du Thibet, documents inédits, *Bulletin de geog. historique et descriptive*, 2 (Paris, 1909), pp. 223-33.

who collated all previous references, adding more information from old letters, most of which had long been hidden in French religious journals.⁸ This article later came out in English, without its detailed footnotes, as the preface for a new English edition of the *Travels*.⁹

Since the publication of Pelliot's study, the Palace Museum in Peip'ing brought out a collection of Chinese documents relating to foreign affairs in the nineteenth century. This was entitled *Ch'ou-pan i-wu shih-mo*, or Documents Concerning the Management of Barbarian (foreign) Affairs. Among its papers are several relating to the arrest and subsequent examination of Frs. Huc and Gabet.¹⁰ I have recently translated them in the hope of presenting further information on these famous travellers. It will be evident that the facts displayed in the reports of the Chinese officials do not all agree with M. Huc's often-embroidered narratives, but in most cases the former may be considered more reliable,¹¹ and thus can serve to check statements in the

⁸ P. Pelliot, *Le voyage de MM. Gabet et Huc à Lhasa, T'oung pao*, 24 (1926), pp. 133-78.

⁹ See note 1.

¹⁰ *Ch'ou-pan i-wu shih-mo* [Tao-kuang section]. (Peip'ing: Palace Museum, 1930). Hereafter cited as *IWSM-TK*.

I am very much indebted to Dr. John K. Fairbank for locating these documents, the source for each of which is cited below, and for constructive criticism in the preparation of this paper.

Some of these documents appear elsewhere. No. III appears in the Tao-kuang section of the *Shih Lu* (*Ta Ch'ing Hsüan-tung Ch'eng Huang-ti shih-lu*), ch. 428, p. 4a. This is identical in form, except that the expression *yang-jen* 洋人, foreigner, is used in place of the less complimentary *i-jen* 夷人, barbarian, throughout. No. V appears in the same collection, ch. 430, p. 4a. I have been unable to find no. VII in this source, and have failed to find any reference to the case in the volumes of the *Tung-hua lu* which cover this period (Tao-kuang section, chs. 53 and 54). Pelliot notes that a translation of no. IV, by Gabet, appeared in the Lazarist journal, *Annales de la congrégation de la mission*, vol. 13, for 1848, pp. 209-17, but I have not succeeded in finding a copy of this work. A partial translation of it appears, however in Huc's *Chinese Empire* (Harper's ed. of 1855) vol. 1, 80-81; 96-99, but in the latter case it was only introduced to furnish some local color and is very unsatisfactory as a translation.

¹¹ Pelliot in his introduction to the *Travels* says that Huc had the eyes to see and the power to recall what he had seen in life, but that these very gifts had their counterpart in a somewhat ardent imagination, which led him on occasion to invent what he supposed himself to be merely reporting; that he could not be trusted in details, even in those which concerned him personally; and that even his chronology of the journey brings up difficulties.

One example of Huc's muddled chronology has some bearing on the events of this paper. Huc claimed that they had entered Lhasa on the 29th of January (O.C. *Travels*, vol. 2, p. 143) and that they left on March 15th (*ibid.*, p. 251). On p. 229, however, he said further, "In accordance with the orders of Ki-chan (Ch'i-shan) we were to set out after the festivals of the Thibetian New Year. We had only been in Lhasa two months, and we had already passed the New Year twice, first the European New Year, and then the Chinese; it was now the turn of the Thibetian." The Tibetan New Year in 1846 fell on the 26th of February. (Waddell, *Lamaism*, p. 454, says that the Tibetan New Year begins in February with the rise of the new moon. The *American almanac* for 1846 (p. 12) says the new moon in that year was on the 25th of February. Add one day for International date-line.) This means that they must have reached Lhasa by the end of December, and have left in the last week of February. As support for this hypothesis, Gabet stated that they arrived at Lhasa at the end of December and left on the 26th of February (Pelliot, *TP*, vol. 24, p. 165). Al-

Travels. The documents are also of interest as showing the contemporary attitude of Chinese officials toward the "foreign barbarians."

The first document on their case¹² is the report of Ch'i-shan, the Chinese Resident in Tibet,¹³ describing the arrest and first questioning of the two travellers. The actual reasons for their seizure were never specifically admitted, beyond the mention that the prisoners were rumored to be suspicious persons.¹⁴ Huc casually reveals what was the probable reason when he describes their first days in Lhasa.

Some ill-disposed persons went on to consider that we must be Russians or English, and ultimately almost everyone honored us with the latter qualification. It was set forth without further hesitation that we were Pelings¹⁵ from Calcutta, that we had come to make maps, and to devise means to get possession of the country. All national prejudice apart, it was very annoying to us to be taken for the subjects of her Britannic Majesty. Such a quid-pro-quo could not but render us very unpopular, and perhaps end in our being cut to pieces; for the Thibetians, why we know not, have taken it into their heads that the English are an encroaching people, who are not to be trusted.¹⁶

After a few interviews Ch'i-shan seems to have been reassured that the suspects were merely French priests with no evil designs, and they had "tolerably intimate communication" with him. Then one day he rather suddenly informed them that he wished them to leave Lhasa. The reason for this change of attitude has never been adequately explained. Huc evidently blamed it on the ill-will of Ch'i-shan, and appears to have acted unnecessarily disagreeable in their last interviews, in an effort to get back at the Chinese

though it seems unlikely that they would be forced to set out on New Year's Day, Huc spoke of the difficulty of procuring animals on their second stage because of the New Year's season (*O.C. Travels* vol. 2, p. 257). No doubt Huc deliberately gave the later starting date because he wanted to be able to describe the colorful Tibetan New Year Celebrations as though he had personally seen some of them.

¹² *IWSM-TK*, ch. 75, p. 21b, line 5, to 23, line 2.

¹³ Huc (*O.C. Travels* vol. 2, pp. 172-73) gives a brief account of Ch'i-shan's life. He was a Manchu who suffered disgrace after concluding an abortive agreement (the Chuen-pi convention) with the British during the Opium War. He was sent to Tibet in virtual banishment, but was later restored to favor as governor-general of Szechuan. For biographies, see the *Ch'ing shih liih-kuan*, ch. 376, 1a, and the *Ch'ing shih liih-chuan*, ch. 40, 18a.

¹⁴ See document I below, first paragraph.

¹⁵ The Nepalese and Tibetans used the word *p'i-leng* to refer to Indians under British rule, and, by extension for the English, themselves. In Tibetan the word means 'stranger.' See Imbault-Huard, Un episode des relations diplomatique de la Chine avec le Napal en 1842, *Rev. de l'Extrême Orient*, 3 (1887), p. 8, note 3.

¹⁶ *O.C. Travels*, vol. 2, p. 163. Later (p. 165) Huc says that it is probable that the English would not have been excluded from Tibet more than any other nation, had not their invading march into Hindustan inspired the Dalai Lama with natural terror. Apparently the regent in Lhasa shared the same dread, but he seems to have had faith in the bulwark of the Himalayas. (See *ibid.*, p. 186.)

official.¹⁷ A clue to the reason for their expulsion is offered, however, in these Chinese documents. For Ch'i-shan's report to Peking was accompanied by a second memorial enclosing a letter from the King of Nepal.¹⁸ This said that the British were concluding a war with the Sikhs, and that if they took over the Sikh territories they would then become his neighbors. From there it would be easy to invade his country as a step to Tibet. Ch'i-shan and his colleagues probably took this warning quite seriously, in spite of their low opinion of the sender, since it seemed to substantiate their own fears. Even though they seem to have remained convinced that the prisoners were Frenchmen, the fact that they had arrived in disguise,¹⁹ knew several languages, and had been so anxious to leave by way of India, might well have caused the Chinese officials to suspect a possible connection between them and the English. At any rate, shortly after the receipt of the letter, they were sent, under guard, back to China.²⁰

Some suspicion that there was more than a coincidence between the arrest of the two strangers and the Gurkha king's warning seems to have impressed the Court, for in the Emperor's memorandum to the Grand Council, after summing up the resident's report, he expressed the fear that the prisoners might not really be Frenchmen. Accordingly he cautioned the viceroy of Szechuan, who was to preside over their next trial, to make very sure of their nationality.²¹

The examination at Chengtu made it seem apparent that they actually were merely French preachers, as they stated, but a final examination at Canton was necessary before they could be released. At this last trial, a new element appeared,—the question of the rights of missionaries. The recent edicts of toleration²² had expressly forbidden missionaries to go outside the five treaty ports set aside for foreign residence in the settlements following

¹⁷ See. O.C. *Travels* vol. 2, p. 227–29 for an example of their attempts to bait Ch'i-shan.

¹⁸ See Document II below. The King of Nepal at this time was Rajendra Vikram Sahi.

¹⁹ Huc (O.C. *Travels*, vol. 1, p. 12) describes their preparations for the journey by shaving their heads and donning lama costume. Ironically enough he does not seem to have understood the bewilderment of their converts who witnessed the transformation. This incident may well have given rise to the later legends of European priests turning lamas, which are cherished by Old China Hands.

²⁰ The letter was dated the 26th of January 1846, and as it commonly took at least twenty five days from Khatmandu to Lhasa, it must have arrived about the middle of February at the very time when Ch'i-shan seems to have adopted his stronger line.

²¹ See Document III below.

²² M. de Lagrené had failed in his hope of getting a clause of toleration included in the French treaty of 1844, but Ch'i-ying, the Chinese Commissioner did obtain for him two edicts of toleration which gave the Roman Catholic Church a slightly more favorable position. See K. S. Latourette, *A history of Christian missions in China*. (New York: 1929), pp. 229–30. For the actual texts of the edicts see H. B. Morse, *International relations of the Chinese Empire*, vol. 1, appendices IX and X, pp. 691–92.

the Opium War.²³ This case was only one of several violations,²⁴ and the Chinese authorities tended to take a severe view of their offense. As they proved that they had gone inland before the edicts were made, however, they were not punished on this account, but were handed over to the French consul at Macao.

DOCUMENT I

The first official mention of these famous travellers is found in a memorial to the throne from the Chinese resident in Lhasa, received in Peking on the 29th of April, 1846.²⁵

The Imperial resident in Tibet, Ch'i-shan, 琦善 and the Assistant Resident, Jui-yüan 瑞元,²⁶ memorialize: we humbly observe that when the annual Tibetan Mission,²⁷ with the Abbots and others returned from the capital [Peking] to Central Tibet [lit. 'the province of Tsang'], we, your slaves, heard rumors that they had, travelling with them, suspicious men. Thereupon we ordered the Kalon,²⁸ Chu-ch'ü-chieh-pu 注曲結布, to make an investigation and seize the three men. He has sent them here, and your slaves have jointly examined into (the case).

All were dressed in the clothes of Mongol lamas. When questioned, all were capable of speaking Chinese; and they were able to explain and recite books in both Manchu and Mongol characters, but they were not yet conversant with Tibetan speech and script.²⁹ One was named Joseph Gabet (Yo-tse Ko-pi 約則噶畢), and one was named Evariste (E-wa-li-ssu-t'a 額窪哩斯塔 = Regis-Evariste Huc).³⁰ They

²³ Canton, Amoy, Foochow, Ningpo and Shanghai were the five ports opened by the Treaty of Nanking, signed August 29th, 1842.

²⁴ The Lazarist, Laurent Carayon, was arrested in Chihli in December of the previous year (1845) as he was passing through Kalgan on his way to Mongolia. He was first conducted to Pao-t'ing-fu for examination then when it developed that he was French and a Catholic priest, he was sent down to the French consul in Macao. See letter from the French consul to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, quoted in Cordier, *op. cit.* p. 225. Also, the Spanish Franciscan, Navarro, was seized in Hupeh in the Spring of 1846. The first of many Chinese documents on his case appears in *IWSM-TK*, ch. 76, p. 1, and successive ones are found in this and the following chuan (ch. 77).

²⁵ *IWSM-TK*, ch. 75 p. 21b, line 5 to p. 23, line 2.

²⁶ Jui Yuan was a Manchu Duke who had held high office in Peking. He is briefly mentioned in the *Hsiü-pei chuan-chi*, ch. 57, p. 19a.

²⁷ The yearly tributary mission required of Mongol and Tibetan rulers by the Ch'ing Dynasty. See J. K. Fairbank and S. Y. Teng, "On the Ch'ing tributary system," *HJAS*, 6 (June, 1941).

²⁸ The central government of Tibet consists of four ministers called Kalons, one monk and three laymen, who form a council over which the Dalai Lama, or the regent acting for him, presides (Waddell, *op. cit.*, p. 396).

²⁹ Pelliot's introduction to the *Travels* says that Gabet must have spoken Chinese and Mongol rather fluently. He wrote a small collection of prayers and an elementary catechism of Catholic doctrines in Mongolian, and a Manchu grammar, together with a tract on the connection between Manchu and Mongolian. He taught these languages to Huc, when the latter arrived some years later. Both learned a little Tibetan in the neighborhood of T'aerh Ssü 塔爾寺 (Kumbum Monastery) in the Kokonor region, but Pelliot ridicules Huc's quotations of complete conversations which he claims to have overheard. (See also Pelliot, *TP*, 24, p. 175).

³⁰ It seems strange that they did not give their Chinese names. Gabet's name was Ch'in 秦 (Pelliot, *TP*, 24, p. 136), while Huc's was Ku Po-ch'a 古伯察 (*ibid.*, p. 139).

are brothers of the same ancestry, men of France. At the place (called) Pondicherry, belonging to France they commonly practise the Roman Catholic religion.³¹

Joseph Gabet, in the 16th year of Tao-kuang (1836), started on his journey from Fukien, passing through Kiangsu, Hupeh, and other provinces, and arrived at the capital (Peking). His younger brother, Evariste, in the 21st year of Tao-kuang (1841) started on his journey from Kwangtung [the port of Macao], and passing through Hupeh, reached the capital. In the Shengking region [Fengtien Province of Manchuria], they met each other and then they travelled and lived together in Jehol, Chahar, Kueihuach'eng [capital of modern Suiyuan], and places in Mongolia. In all these (regions) they have gone back and forth.

In the 22nd year of Tao-kuang (1842) in Chahar, they engaged the now-arrested (Mongolian) tribesman, Sa-mu-tan-chin-pa 薩木丹盡巴,³² from Nienpaihsien in Kansu,³³ to render service for them. Last year they went to Sining and heard of Tibetan and tribal merchants returning to Tibet from the capital. Then they came here together (with them) and were apprehended.

We found on investigation, that between the said country (France) and China, the route is long and dangerous; and the people and land barbarous and coarse (respectively). Not to stay in their native place, burning incense and regulating their conduct, but on the contrary to come here,—what sort of conduct is this? Moreover the Buddhist (lit. 'Preserved') Scriptures were transmitted from the Western Regions which are not far away from the said barbarians' homes. Why must they, forsaking what is near, desire what is far?³⁴ Both gave evidence that in all the regions of China there are men who study their religion, hoping and planning to increase and extend its propagation; yet when one enquires as to the names of their co-religionists, they say further that they are unable to remember (them).

We have examined their baggage. Roman Catholic scriptures in Manchu writing, Mongol writing, and printed barbarian language, were very numerous, (Yet) they were not very important so they were at once returned. But among them were two sheets of barbarian script. On investigation, they were the said accused persons' letters from home, together with the certificates for preaching brought from the country in question,—five sheets in barbarian script; and twenty one books in barbarian letters. What languages were in them, there was no one who knew.

We called as witness their servant, the tribesman Sa-mu-tan-chin-pa, and ac-

³¹ This remark seems quite irrelevant. Possibly the Frenchmen mentioned Pondicherry as a possession of their country, in a wild effort to explain their nationality. There does not seem to be any evidence that either of them had ever been there.

³² Pelliot (*TP* 24, p. 136, note 2) says that his name might well have been Bsam-gtan 'Jin-pa; Huc always spoke of him as Samdadchiemba; Sandburg (*Exploration of Tibet*, p. 126) calls him Bram-dad Chhe-ba. In the absence of definite knowledge of its spelling, I am retaining the Chinese transliteration.

³³ In modern Sining district of Ch'inghai province (Kokonor). This Mongolian was apparently still living in this neighborhood in 1889 (Rockhill, *Land of the lamas*, p. 45). Rockhill says, "I spoke to the old man's nephew about him, and Abbé de Meester knew him well. He is still hale and hearty, a lover of good cheer and fond of gambling, and a lukewarm Christian."

³⁴ These questions typify the attitude of the sensible Chinese scholar of the old type toward the Westerner whether traveller or missionary, then as now.

ording to his testimony it is true that he was hired as a servant, but we cannot get to know the details.

Your slaves find that the said accused persons recently arrived in Tibet and at once were seized and interrogated.³⁵ Since there are not any (other) men who can be called as witnesses, what they testify as to the places they have been through is indeed evidence from one side (only); and when they produced the foreign books and barbarian writings, again we repeat, there were no men to explain them. If we investigated by guesswork it would be insufficient to constitute judicial evidence. Further, as beyond the passes the roads and trails are distant, and there are mountains at every step [lit. 'all the steps are mountains'], if we waited until the memorial was received, the sending of the prisoners would be delayed.

Since in Tibet there were no points for cross-examination, we were careful and did not guess rashly. After the oral testimony we straightway appointed a special deputy³⁶ to escort them and turn them over to the governor-general of Szechuan. He (the viceroy) will temporarily take control of them, waiting for the day when the Imperial command is sent down. To send the persons through him would be comparatively convenient. Joining together, we have made a clear statement (of the case).

DOCUMENT II

The accompanying report, enclosing the letter from the King of Nepal,³⁷ says:

Ch'i-shan and others again memorialize; we, your slaves, have recently received a petition from the Gurkha king. Translated into Chinese, it says that the Pilings (P'i-leng 披楞) are now fighting with the Sen-pa 森巴 (the Sikhs),³⁸ and have already defeated the Sen-pa once; that the said nation (Nepal) is connected with the Sen-pa as a neighbor, and if the Pilings have seized the territory of Sen-pa he fears their victory will cause (them) to covet Tibetan territory; that the said country's (Nepal's) strength is slight, and it lacks the ability to hold its southern approaches. His request for direction has come to hand. At the same time he sent a copy of the statement concerning the circumstances of the Pilings fighting with the

³⁵ Huc gives the impression that they were permitted to walk about freely for some time, before they registered with the authorities and were treated as prisoners. Perhaps Huc felt that his readers would have greater confidence in his descriptions if they felt that he had been able to wander at liberty; or perhaps Ch'i-shan, already in disgrace, wanted the Court to think that he had been very quick in apprehending the criminals. Considering the characters of both, either explanation might be possible.

³⁶ This deputy who escorted them was Li Kuo-an, 李國安 a Chinese from Chengtu, who had served as a military official in Tibet and Nepal. (See O.C. *Travels*, vol. 2, p. 243). Already a very sick man, he died on the journey, between Batang and Litang in modern Sikang province (*ibid.*, p. 326.)

³⁷ *IWSM-TK*, ch. 75, p. 23, line 10 to 24, line 9.

³⁸ *Sen-pa* evidently is a term used by the Nepalese and Tibetans to refer to the Sikhs. Besides the fact that the British were fighting the Sikhs at that time (1845-46), the King of Nepal in his tribute letter to the emperor of China in 1842 referred to the Land of La-ta-ko (Ladakh) of which the men of Sungpa had taken possession. Ladakh was seized by the Sikhs under Gulab Singh of Jammu in the period 1834-41 (see Imbault-Huard, *op. cit.*).

Sen-pa, and he also transcribed the draft of a letter sent him by the Piling trade chiefs in Kwangtung.

We, your slaves, find that in recent years the said country [Nepal] has several times sent up petitions, either asking to be given money or requesting the exchange of territory,—even to the extent of arbitrarily writing begging matters in a memorial.³⁹ Not only this, but on several occasions, [though Imperial disapproval of his previous begging memorials had been expressed] he begged a remembrance of (the Imperial) grace. He is completely impossible! Now again he takes advantage of the P'i-leng joining in battle with the Sen-pa to petition for directions. At the same time he transcribes the draft of a letter from the Piling chiefs in Kwangtung to send in for inspection. He speaks ambiguously; his purpose is extremely crafty. The general situation is that the said country (Nepal) has hitherto had P'ileng men residing and trading there. They echo what they have heard from each other, and thus it gives rise to their extravagant desires.

We, your slaves, have again and again considered and deliberated, but we did not find it convenient to put in writing a reply to (this) petition. (Now) at this juncture, in an official proclamation, we repeatedly gave instructions, causing him to realize that in guarding the southern passes he would thereby be protecting the frontiers of the said country (Nepal), and that he should not send and display these words of false suspicion and dissatisfied moaning, falsely hoping to get his will. Besides (we) sternly ordered the (Chinese) civil and military (officials) as well as native military officers conscientiously to train, and cautiously to guard the borders. Respectfully sending the original petition of the king of the said country, your slaves at the same time are giving out the official proclamation, copying it and presenting it, also, for your Majesty's inspection.

Again examining the recently captured French barbarians, Joseph Gabet (and Huc), both gave evidence that the English barbarians are called *Anglais* (ang-ke-lei 昂格勒). This P'i-leng is the Tibetan collective name for the barbarian tongues of foreign nations, and is certainly not the name of the country. That the P'i-leng which were mentioned by the Nepalese of course were the English is evident. Moreover we learned from the Mohammedan traders in Tibet that Sen-pa is a territory belonging

³⁹ In his 1842 tribute letter (see previous note), the King of Nepal declared that, finding that the land of Ta-pa-ka-erh, a dependency of Tibet was bordering on his frontier, he would like to exchange it for his own territory of Mo-ssu-tang. At the same time he suggested that if the land of Ladakh, which had been seized by the men of Sen-pa, was placed under his jurisdiction, he would pay tribute for it; and he also asked for the gift of ten *li* of territory in the neighborhood of Bhutan to place troops there as a protection for Southern Tibet against the British in Sikkim. As if this were not enough, he also asked for money in order to be able to expel the Pilings and be in a position to protect his lands, reminding the Tao-kuang emperor that his grandfather in the Ch'ien-lung period (Sept., 1793) (in writing to accept the submission of the Gurkhas) had said: "If there are people from without who trouble you or invade your territory, you can send a petition to bring these facts to our attention. We will then send you men and horses, or make you a present of a certain sum of money to come to your aid." Having been refused his requests in 1842, the king of Nepal seems to have written this second letter in another attempt to cash in on the promise of the Ch'ien-lung emperor. This explains why the Chinese officials write of him as though discussing a spoiled child.

to Hindustan⁴⁰ on the West Road,⁴¹ and also is not the name of a nation. Joining together, we have made a clear statement.

DOCUMENT III

In his edict to the Grand Council, commenting on Ch'i-shan's first memorial,⁴² the Emperor might well have had in mind the second, with its threat of foreign invasion. For after a short summary of the report on the arrest of Huc and Gabet, he remarks, "As the said barbarians can make themselves known in Chinese speech, Manchu writing, and Mongol script, we fear they might not really be Frenchmen." The edict goes on to recommend:

Let Pao-hsing 寶興 (the Szechuan governor-general),⁴³ when they are handed over to (authorities in) the province of Szechuan, question them closely as to their antecedents and the places which they passed through. He must absolutely get definite facts, and immediately write a memorial. The original memorial (of Ch'i-shan) together with the papers of evidence should all be copied and handed over (to Pao-hsing) for examination. As for the barbarians' letters and books which are stored in a wooden box, let them all be sent out together (to Szechuan).

DOCUMENT IV

After the two Frenchmen had been delivered to the provincial authorities of Szechuan at Chengtu, they were again examined as reported in the following memorial from Pao-hsing, received in Peking on the 14th of July, 1846.⁴⁴ (I omit the first three lines, which merely acknowledge and summarize the aforementioned edict as incorporated in a communication sent him by the Grand Council.)

The Grand Secretary and Governor-general of Szechuan, Pao-hsing, memorializes: . . . The barbarians in question were sent from Tibet and arrived here on the 21st day of the 5th moon (June 6th).⁴⁵ I accompanied and superintended the four

⁴⁰ The usual Chinese transcription of Hindustan is Wen-tu-ssu-t'an, 溫都斯坦 but the scribe has miswritten the first character, making it *nich* 涅. The name appears correctly further on.

⁴¹ The 'West Road' was the trade route from Lhasa into Central India by way of Ladakh and Kashmir, thence leading down through the Punjab to Delhi. Since the Sikhs then owned Ladakh, Kashmir, and so much of the Punjab, it was perfectly correct to speak of the territories of Sen-pa as lying on the West Road.

⁴² *IWSM-TK*, ch. 75, p. 23, lines 3 to 9.

⁴³ Pao-hsing, a Manchu, also occupied the position of Grand Secretary from 1841 to 1848 when he died. For his biography see *Ch'ing shih kao*, ch. 371, 1a.

⁴⁴ *IWSM-TK*, ch. 75, p. 47b, line 8, to 49b, line 7.

⁴⁵ If this is, as is probable, not the date of their actual arrival, but the date on which they were formally delivered to Pao-hsing for trial, we have additional corroboration for the fact that the prisoners must have left Lhasa about the 26th of February (see note 11). Because from February 26th to June 6th is exactly a hundred days, and Huc's itinerary from Lhasa to Chengtu accounts for at least ninety-five days, while it was four days more before they were brought to trial. (Lhasa to Chamdo, 36 days (*O.C. Travels*, vol. 2, p. 292); at Chamdo 3 days (p. 296); Chamdo to Angti,

chief officials of the province⁴⁶ in their judicial examination. According to their testimony, one was named Joseph Gabet,⁴⁷ and one was named Evariste. Both are Frenchmen, and together they practise the Roman Catholic religion, being known as brothers. Both preached the religion beyond the borders. In the 21st year of Tao-kuang (1841), they met in the region of Hsiaopeik'ou 小北口 in Kuantung (Southern Manchuria). As to the additional testimony, nothing was different from that which was announced by the resident in Tibet.

Joseph Gabet, in the 16th year of Tao-kuang (1836), arrived in Kwangtung, and afterwards, by way of Fukien, Kiangsi, Hupeh, Honan, Shantung and Chihli, reached the capital. Moreover, from Peking he went to places in Jehol, Kuantung, Mongolia, Chahar, Kueihuach'eng, the Ordos, Lanchow and Tangar (in the Kokonor region). Then he went to Central Tibet with some Tibetan and tribal merchants. As to the places he reached, he either stayed several days or several months, up to a year or more, unequally. As to (his) Chinese writing and Chinese speech, they were acquired at the capital. As for the Manchu and Mongol script and speech, both were learned in Kuantung; (he) positively did not have a definite teacher.

As to Evariste (Huc), in the 21st year of Tao-kuang (1841) he shipped on a warship of the said country (France) to reach Canton. He also reached Peking by way of Kwangtung, Kiangsi and other provinces. Then, going out in the neighborhood of Kueihuach'eng to preach, he afterwards met with Joseph Gabet, and they lived and travelled together. His Chinese speech was learned beyond the Great Wall.

In regard to the tribesman Sa-mu-tan-chin-pa, he is a man of Nienpaihsien in Kansu. Because at an early age he had accompanied some lamas and emigrated to Mongolian places, he was engaged by the said barbarians to render service.

I, your subject, considering that the said barbarians had gone out far to preach religion, wondered what was their (real) intention after all; and furthermore, being so many years abroad, where their daily expenditures came from; why they had not returned to their country for a long time; and did they, after all, have or not a fixed term of years; as for the disciples which they had taught, how many there already were; and as Tibet is where the lamas live, and the said barbarians went there together, what had they wished to do?⁴⁸

Again, therefore, I specially investigated, and according to what they state, the men of that country who practise religion, spread their religion in order to cultivate good works. As their preaching spreads, so their merit deepens. They certainly do not forcibly extort money from believers. If they are desirous of going abroad to

apparently 6 days (pp. 297-311); at Angti 5 days (p. 312); Angti to Batang about 10 days (pp. 314-21); at Batang 3 days (p. 322); Batang to Litang 7 days (pp. 323-27); at Litang 2 days (p. 328); Litang to Tatsienlu 8 days (p. 330); at Tatsienlu 3 days (p. 332); Tatsienlu to Chengtu 12 days [Harper's ed., *Chinese Empire*, p. 59]; waiting for trial 4 days (*ibid.* p. 69). Huc merely confuses his already muddled chronology by saying (O.C. *Travels*, vol. 2, p. 332) that they arrived in Tatsienlu in the early part of June, three months after their departure from Lhasa.

⁴⁶ Collectively called the ssü-tao, 司道 these were the provincial judge, provincial treasurer, salt commissioner, and grain commissioner.

⁴⁷ From here on, Gabet's name appears in all the documents in inverted form as Ka-pi Yo-tse.

⁴⁸ These systematic questions, item by item, seem to have provided the basis for the examination at Canton. See Document VI.

preach, they state it clearly to the king of their country, who issues a prepared document (authorizing) travel to Kwangtung. They deliver this to the general agent stationed at Canton, and then come forward to all regions to preach. (Moreover) they positively do not have a definite term of years. If on a journey there is lack of wherewithal, they send a letter to the general agent in Canton, and straightway he sends silver to supply them. As for the men from their country who have gone abroad to preach, every province has them. There is none who does not encourage men to do good. They have no other intention. All men can be taught. After having taught them, however, they do not meet again to read the scriptures, so they were entirely unable to remember the names and surnames of those whom they had taught.

As to the Tibetan regions; formerly there were men of their country living there, and they were going to them. Originally they wished, after they had preached, to return to their country by way of Gurkha (i.e., Nepal),⁴⁹ (but) because they could not yet make themselves understood in Tibetan writing and speech, and besides had not yet taught men, they were seized and examined by the resident in Tibet and brought to Szechuan. (End of testimony).

We split open and examined the wooden box. As for the barbarian books and letters which were stored in it, no one could recognize them. On investigating the said barbarians, both testified that they were their letters from home and preaching certificates. It is my humble opinion that we have nothing that can give evidence whether all the facts in the said barbarians' testimony are true or not. To propagate the Roman Catholic religion is now, however, not restricted by law. Moreover, looking into the color of the barbarians' beards and eyebrows and eyes, they were not the same as (those of) the Chinese. Indeed, they are foreign barbarians and are certainly not native scoundrels or pretenders. There is no doubt of it. It need not be investigated again. But, as to the barbarian script in the books, what language is it after all? They should naturally be sent with the barbarians to Kwangtung province, and be examined and interpreted by men who know barbarian script. On translating (these), if there are really positively no different facts, then hand them over to the Frenchmen that they may establish their identity and return home; thereby displaying that the truth has been thoroughly looked into.

As to the case of Sa-mu-tan-chin-pa, it was announced that he had stopped acting as servant, as, according to the substance of the barbarians' (testimony), he could not understand, and wished therefore to be sent home to his native place, Nienpaihien, in Kansu. So he was handed over to a bailman (in Lhasa) to vouch for him [lit. 'to restrain and correct him'].

DOCUMENT V

Another edict to the Grand Council briefly summarized the case to date, and stated certain suspicious elements still not satisfactorily explained as a

⁴⁹ This probably alludes to their hope of passing through Tibet and Nepal in order to reach Pondicherry, which was nipped in the bud by Ch'i-shan's insistence that they must return through China in order to be investigated further. No doubt their desire to go down to India was a strong reason for suspicion that they were in league with the English, if not Englishmen in disguise.

basis for the final examination in Canton. Omitting the summary, it said:⁵⁰

As the barbarians in question had travelled far on the ocean and had passed through several provinces, learning the script and speech of every district, what after all was their intention? According to what they testified, it was only to teach men and do good; and they had no other aim. As to their being unable to remember the number and names of those whom they had taught, we fear this is difficult to believe. As the king of the said country issued a prepared document for specially going to Kwangtung so that they might communicate with the general manager and come forward to preach in all places, it is not positive that this is their vocation.

Make known to Ch'i-ying 耆英 and Huang En-t'ung 黃恩彤⁵¹ (the chief officials in Canton), when they (Huc and Gabet) arrive under escort, they should make a strict investigation in detail; at the same time in addition make a personal inquiry whether or not the barbarians in question were sent by the said country (France), and whether they have or have not been sent money for the purpose of helping them; also have the barbarian books and barbarian letters which are stored in the chest, handed over to a man who recognizes barbarian writing, to run over the various things and translate them clearly, entirely obtaining the gist of them.

In the event that they actually are French barbarians, and only preachers,⁵² and there are absolutely no other angles, then (they should) write down and consider the circumstances, firmly undertaking this. As to the original draft, and the paper of evidence, in both cases write copies and present them for examination.

DOCUMENT VI

The investigation by the Canton officials was by far the most thorough and introduced a new element,—the objection of the Chinese officials to foreign missionaries going into the interior. This attitude led to a number of arrests immediately before and after the last trial of Huc and Gabet.⁵³ The memorial reporting the trial was received in Peking on December 4th, 1846.⁵⁴

The Assistant Grand Secretary and Governor-general of the Liang-Kwang, Ch'i-ying, and the Governor of Kwangtung, Huang En-t'ung, memorialize. We acknowledge the receipt of the two French barbarians, named Gabet Joseph and Evariste, who arrived in Tibet to preach, and who were passed on by Kiangsi province after being forwarded by other provinces, (finally) arriving in Kwangtung under escort, accompanied by a despatch. Conforming to orders, the Provincial Judge, Yen Liang-hsün 嚴良訓, together with the deputy, the Expectant Tao-t'ai Chao Chang-ling, 趙長齡 directed the prefecture of Canton in closely question-

⁵⁰ *IWSM-TK* ch. 75, p. 49b line 8, to p. 50, line 10.

⁵¹ Huang En-t'ung as Ch'i-ying's assistant helped in carrying out the first trade treaties. His biography occurs in *Ch'ing shih kao*, ch. 377, p. 4a.

⁵² Still the note of suspicion that they might be English.

⁵³ See note 22.

⁵⁴ *IWSM-TK*, ch. 77, p. 1, line 2 to 3b, line 2.

ing the said barbarians. (Here follows a short summary of their itinerary as before, concluding with the statement that on examining thoroughly, the evidence was for the most part the same as that which was announced by the governor-general of Szechuan and the resident in Tibet.)

We examined,—considering that the barbarians in question had travelled far on the ocean and had passed through several provinces, learning the dialects and writing of every region,—what was their intention after all? According to the evidence, their country considers preaching (an act of) merit; the more a man preaches, the greater his merit. Therefore they have no care for the distant road, coming to China and advancing into every province to preach. Moreover, because the speech and writing of their country is not understood by the men of China, therefore they learned Chinese writing as well as the dialects of all provinces. Without doubt the motive was for convenience in preaching religion, and there was no other intention. The Roman Catholic religion which they practise actually is to exhort people to do good.

As to all the provinces which they passed through, both now coming, now going; there certainly was not much time to leave behind a (large) number of converts, and moreover as there were no documents or records, they were actually unable to look back and recall their names and surnames.

We examined into the matter of whom they called the 'general agent,'—considering that in Kwangtung up to this time French merchants were not very numerous, and considering that their consul (only) established himself recently, (while) formerly there was certainly no barbarian chief kept there.—What men was he associated with, and by what means had the king of the said country issued the prepared document to come to Canton as a permit to vouch for them? And, as for their travelling so far into the interior—over a period lasting several years, and a road covering ten thousand li, with their travelling expenses therefore not being slight—how were they able to bring all (the travel money) from their native land? Examining into what men had supplied them, we commanded that they give a definite accounting item by item. According to the evidence, the prepared document which they took with them was like the diploma of a Chinese monk. In Macao, barbarians of the same religion from all nations are numerous. On (their) seeing this diploma they (Huc and Gabet) were then able to be received in residence. In actual fact, in the 16th and 21st years (1836, 1841), at the times they came to Kwangtung, their country had appointed no general agent. Formerly, in Szechuan, there was muddled evidence (on this point).

As to the travelling expenses which they needed; as they shaved their heads and disguised themselves, and roughly understood Chinese and Manchu and Mongolian speech and script, they were no different from the monks of the interior. At all times they collected subscriptions like Buddhist priests. Also there were men to grant alms as well. As they were bachelors they did not have many expenditures, and thus (their financial resources) did not reach exhaustion. There is still the question of surplus, and whether or not there were men to supply them.

They both spoke, asking for the consul of their native land, now in Macao. Along the road they were taken with a chill and must be cured of the disease in the prov-

ince. They implored meanwhile to be handed into the custody of the Dutch consul. (End of testimony.)

When the judges' detailed notes came to hand, your servants personally caused them to be investigated thoroughly and judged impartially. We obeyed (the Imperial command) and again secretly made an additional examination. The barbarians in question actually are Frenchmen, and certainly are not scoundrels or pretenders.

To go on to the barbarian letters and barbarian books that were locked in the wooden box; we turned them over to the Deputy, P'ing-ch'ing 平慶, and the Ching 涇 (-ch'ou?) Tao-t'ai, P'an Shih-ch'eng, 潘仕成 secretly ordering them to act on the matter and translate them. (But) because they were not the same as Dutch writing,⁵⁵ they were unable to make them out. Further the Tao-t'ai in question passed them on to an American chief to identify them. According to what he said, the barbarian letters were letters from home which the said barbarians had formerly received in Canton, and the official credentials to preach which were issued by the king of the said country. This then is what the said barbarians had called the 'prepared document.' Moreover the barbarian books were ordinary Roman Catholic books which the Westerners call 'Gospel books'. As the words and phrases were comparatively many, one occasion was not sufficient to translate them. Now he has their old preserved block print books translated into Chinese characters to hand in for inspection. (End of report.)

At the same time, according to the deputy in question, in the presence of the said barbarian chief, he took away a barbarian book in Chinese characters. On examination, the composition was in vulgar speech (probably meaning, in the vernacular). Still it had no improper words or phrases.

Accordingly, the said barbarians, Joseph Gabet and Evariste (Huc) were transferred to the custody of the Dutch barbarian chieftain [M. J. Senn Van Basel, Dutch consul in Canton],⁵⁶ and turned over to the French barbarian chief for restraint and correction. After their delivery, the French chieftain, Bécour (Pei-ku 吡咕) reported (to Ch'i-ying) saying that the barbarians in question had actually come forward from his country to preach, and now would be sent back to Mongolia, and that he could not be influenced or intimidated.⁵⁷ We have humbly investigated the Roman Catholic Church. Since formerly in the Ming (Dynasty) when Matteo Ricci (Li Ma-tou 利瑪竇) entered China to preach, it has already lasted for several hundred years, while Macao's great and small Catholic monasteries have all been built for many years, with the view to making a place for the foreign (lit. 'barbarous') monks to band together. Chinese and barbarians are mixed up together, and true and false are difficult to separate.

⁵⁵ Literally 'writing of the red-haired (people),' a term which was still used for the Dutch, but which later came to be used for most Europeans.

⁵⁶ The correspondence between the Dutch and French consuls is reported in Cordier, *op. cit.*, pp. 227-28.

⁵⁷ The correspondence between Bécour and Ch'i-ying is reproduced in Cordier, *op. cit.*, pp. 229-33. Notice the threatening attitude of the French consul. This was balanced by the contemptuous tone of the Chinese; particularly in the references to the 'barbarous' Catholic monks, 'banding together,' the latter expression is one usually used referring to bandits or brigands.

Last year the French chief (Lagrené)⁵⁸ requested that those (converts) practising the religion to do good be spared from punishment for crimes. Your servants immediately calculated that the barbarians of all countries must have preachers who had secretly gone into the interior. Therefore at the time of deliberation we especially made clear in the agreement that we did not consent that the barbarians should go far into the interior to preach,⁵⁹ and (we) firmly set up restricting laws in order to be prepared if they were caught in the future, to avoid causing a pretext (for foreign agitation). On this occasion Joseph Gabet (and Huc), and on a previous occasion the Spanish barbarian Navarro 納巴羅 (Na-pa-lo⁶⁰), the former and the latter passing through Tibet and Hupeh respectively, were seized and examined and brought as prisoners to Canton. Both parties then declared that it was several years previous when they had gone into the interior to preach, and it was before the treaty had yet been made. Thereupon we transferred them to the custody of their respective barbarian chiefs. At the same time we ordered that they be examined according to the treaty and restrained and corrected. The chiefs of the said barbarians all had no objections to the agreement before (but now), afterwards are utilizing these (cases) for lawsuits. Managing (the situation) we still may be able to prevent this from becoming a thorny affair.

DOCUMENT VII

The Imperial edict to the Grand Council concerning this memorial⁶¹ restricted its comments to the religious question. Apparently the original suspicions that Huc and Gabet might have been connected with the British in India had by this time been allayed. Skipping the repetition in the summary, it said:

Ch'i-ying and others memorialized that they have investigated the French barbarians who arrived in Tibet to preach . . . and now have already had the said barbarians handed over to a barbarian chief for restraint and correction.

Naturally one ought to manage like this in treating the barbarians of every country, and not allow them to go secretly into the interior to preach. As recorded in the treaty, the restricting laws are very severe. Although on this occasion both Joseph Gabet (and Huc) who went to Tibet, and on the former occasion, the Spaniard Navarro, who was caught in Hupeh, calculated that the time (of their entry) was

⁵⁸ M. Theodose de Lagrené who had come to Canton and negotiated a treaty for France similar to the one that Pottinger had gotten for England in 1842.

⁵⁹ The exact words of the edict were: "As to those of the French and other foreign nations who practice the religion, let them only be permitted to build churches at the five ports opened for commercial intercourse. They must not presume to enter the country and propagate religion. Should any act in opposition, turning their backs upon the treaties, and rashly overstep the boundaries, the local officers will at once seize and deliver them to their respective consuls for restraint and correction" Morse, *op. cit.*, p. 691.

⁶⁰ Cordier, *op. cit.*, p. 226, note 1, says that Michael Navarro belonged to a branch of the Franciscan Order. He had arrived in Hongkong in 1841, and returning to the interior after this incident, he was made Vicar Apostolic of Hunan in 1856. He died in that province in 1877.

⁶¹ *IWSM-TK*, ch. 77, p. 3b, line 3, to p. 4, line 3.

before the treaty was settled. Hereafter, considering this edict, make known to all the said barbarians that outside of the five ports in which they are permitted to build chapels and worship, they are certainly not permitted to come into all provinces on their own authority, or arbitrarily roam around. By all means command the said barbarian chiefs personally to act to restrain them and to render respectful obedience to the finished agreement, in order to put a proper stop to this business, avoiding pretexts, and thus making the most desirable (situation).

CONCLUSION

With this document, the case of Huc and Gabet appears to have been officially closed,⁶² though the religious question was by no means settled. It reappears in several memorials.⁶³ All this testimony in the newly-found and recently published documents leads us to the conclusion that Huc and Gabet were expelled from Lhasa largely because of the fear that they might be secret agents, somehow connected with the threat of British invasion of Tibet. By the end of the trial in Szechuan, however, the authorities there were convinced that they were French priests, and apparently were impressed by their sincerity. Finally in Canton, when it was proved that they were nothing more, due either to an attempt to lessen the anticlimax, or to Ch'i-ying's disappointment at the apparent failure of the edicts he had requested, to curb the Christian advance,—which he saw only as one phase of the general European encroachment,—the religious question was emphasized, and it was made to appear that this had been the chief reason for their detention. This explanation was apparently accepted by the French consul, and ultimately by the expelled priests themselves.⁶⁴ Only the material in the first three documents, however, can furnish the true answer.

⁶² In November 1846, a month after they reached Macao, Gabet sailed for Europe, instead of returning to the Mongolian Mission. It is thought that he wished to persuade the ecclesiastical authorities in France and Rome to award the Tibetan Mission to his order. When this failed, he begged to be sent back to Mongolia, but the doctors in Europe forbade a cold climate, and (in 1848) he was sent instead to Brazil, where he died unhappily in 1853, at the age of forty-five.

Huc remained in Macao until 1848, when he returned to North China. In 1852 his bad health obliged him to go back to France, and in the following year (1853), he resigned from his order after long-standing differences. He lived by his pen, writing *The Chinese Empire*, and *Christianity in China, Tartary and Tibet*; as sequels to the *Travels*. The last two were mere potboilers, full of plagiarisms from his own previous work as well as from the works of others. He died in 1860, at the age of forty-seven. The lives of both were no doubt shortened by the exposure and uncertain diet on their Tibetan adventure. (Pellicot, *T'oung pao*, 24, pp. 136-40).

⁶³ Throughout chuan 77 of *IWSM-TK*; see p. 22, line 5, for a typical example.

⁶⁴ See Bécour's letters in Cordier, *op. cit.*