MALAGASY REFUGEES TO BRITAIN, 1838-1841

by

J.T. HARDYMAN

Modern methods of travel enable many people to see countries other than their own. In most cases their journeys are of little interest to anyone else. In contrast, there is a growing interest in the much smaller number of « travellers » of different kinds in the last few centuries about whom any clear record remains. At one end of the scale is the individual or the very small group who, in addition to any particularly significant purpose in their journey, may derive some extra importance from their very rarity as transcultural visitors. At the other end of the scale is the migration, whether voluntary or under duress, of a comparatively large group, in between are small alien communities living for a brief period in a host country. Such travel and such residence may have wide-reaching effects, as, for example, in connection with the « image » which the people of one country may have of another, an image which may be expressed in personal attitudes, in literature and in art, as well as in more formal social, economic and political relationships (1).

This is true of Malagasy « travellers » as of others. Without going further back into the history of movements accross the Indian Ocean and the Mozambique Channel, it can be said that in the four hundred years between 1500 when the island was first seen by Europeans and 1896 when it was declared a French « colony », the total number of Malagasy who went overseas (most of them being taken as slaves) is not clearly known but any estimate must appear comparatively small when placed alongside figures relating to West Africa ; many thousands did, however, go to the Americas and to the Mascarene Islands. In the 19th century several groups of Malagasy, as well as a number of individuals, visited Europe, mostly for cultural, religious or political purposes. Among early examples were the youths trained in Britain in the 1820's and the Embassy of 1836 (2).

The present paper deals with the group generally known as «the Malagasy Refugees» who arrived in Britain in 1839. Their residence there and the links involved with Mauritius and elsewhere during their exile are interesting from various points of view. For example, as a part of the history of the Christian Church in Madagascar ; for the interest in Madagascar which they aroused ; for an unexpected link with colour printing ; and even for the discussion in the terms of that day of a topic still of current interest in various parts of the world, namely, the rights and wrongs of the flight of nationals of one country to another. The theme has been treated before, but usually as little more than a chronological re-telling, sometimes with fictionalised additions of the main features of the story as derived from one or two major sources. Here, against the general background of the circumstances in Madagascar, the story must be recounted again, but with the addition of new information and with a rather more refined analysis ; followed by a more systematic assessment of some of the effects of their travels and contacts. Their journey was an «event», even though not a major one, in the history of the Christian community in Madagascar and elsewhere. It could therefore be presented primarily in terms of, for example, the nature, aims, methods and son on of that community, in both its local and its worldwide dimensions. For present purposes, however, it will be seen rather as an event in a different series – that of the travel of Malagasy overseas, and of the varied effects (including those within the Christian community) of such travels. The story of all the refugees is brought to mind by the use of the name of one of them for a road in Antananarivo : Lalana James Andrianisa (3).

I

THE FLIGHT OVERSEAS

BACKGROUND CIRCUMSTANCES

The refugees left Madagascar in 1838. With some others who did not travel so far, they felt compelled to go into «voluntary» exile partly because of the general situation and partly because of their individual circumstances. Some of main features of this background may be briefly indicated. First, there was the new direction taken by internal politics. Andrianampoinimerina, the most powerful chief in Imerina, had taken the first steps in applying a deliberate policy for the unification of Madagascar. This policy was greatly extended by his son Radama by means of wide ranging military expeditions, using force against those who did not willingly surrender. This implied a new idea of central authority and of its range. Radama's successor, Queen Ranavalona, adopted the same general policy, even though in practice full control over the whole island was not achieved. Second, diplomatically Madagascar was really

in touch only with Britain and France. Relationships with the former perhaps tended to be marginally better than those with the latter, chiefly because of longstanding French «claims» to some areas of the island, and especially after the naval expedition against Tamatave in 1829.

Third, since the arrival of its first missionaries in 1818, the London Missionary Society had had considerable success in, for example, literary education and had gained a considerable following. In the 1830's the Malagasy authorities were especially interested in certain technical skills taught by the missionaries. Fourth, the missionaries had raised an important issue. Their view of their missionary task included, in the circumstances, «technical aid» which was by no means to be thought of as if it were nothing but a bait – but that task went far beyong the transmission of various skills, however beneficial. Their religious beliefs and teaching, based on the Bible and the long, varied history of the Christian community, raised the question of the relation between a truth which claimed to be «universal», with a claim on the people of all nations, and the ancestral customs and beliefs of any one people – in this case, Malagasy culture. This question was complicated by the misunderstanding likely to be cause by the inevitable embodiment of beliefs in particular individuals and institutions, with various cultural and political implications. The new religion, thus incarnated, appeared to involve a threat to the social and political structures inherited from the past. Fifth, as a result of the interplay of the factors mentioned, a new «national» policy had been developed. Although the technical help was still sought, the practice of Christianity by any Malagasy was forbidden in 1835 ; the missionaries thought it best to leave ; and some Malagasy Christians were put to death in 1837 and 1838. Although still retaining links with the Mascarene Islands, Madagascar seemed to be less open to the wider world than it had been in recent years and an Ambassy was sent to explain the Malagasy point of view to Britain and France. Sixth, despite the prohibition of 1835 there were still some Malagasy who continued to practice their faith in secret. Seventh, not only the missionaries who had left the country, but also the parent Missionary Society and its supporters retained a strong interest in Madagascar and its people, showing, as was to be expected, a special concern for the Christian (4).

THE ESCAPE OF THE SIX

Among the Christians was a small group linked especially with the Vonizongo area, whose leader was Rafaravavy Mary. The story of their experiences as the authorities searched for them while they were still in Madagascar has been told in detail in English, Malagasy and French (5). For the present purpose it is enough to say that they spent many months in hiding, frequently changing their place of residence. Sometimes they avoided arrest only because of some fortuitous circumstances when detection seemed inevitable. This was the group which made a joint effort to flee overseas. They were driven to take this decision because they were convinced that the search for them was so per-

sistent that one day they would be caught and be put to a violent death. They did not hold that such a martyrdom would necessarily produce the greatest possible good for the community of Malagasy Christian. Rather did it seem reasonable to go overseas, at least for a time. Then word came from outside. In 1838, three of the missionaries whom they knew (D. Jones, E. Baker and D. Johns) were all in Mauritius. They were concerned with the welfare of the Malagasy resident in that island. But they were also able to keep in touch by correspondance (a result of the literacy campaign which they had themselves regarded as so important) with certain Malagasy Christians in Imerina and on the coast. It was decided that Johns should go to Tamatave to make what personal contacts he could. This he did in the middle of 1838. Unable to travel inland, he chose the device of writing as many letters as possible to the Queen and various prominent persons, being sure that in this way news of his presence on the coast would become widely known, even among those in hiding. His plan worked. Someone among the secret Christians wrote two letters : one to Rafaravavy to announce Johns arrival ; and one to Johns, asking him to remain at Tamatave for some weeks.

Rafaravavy and her companions decided to take this chance to escape. On the journey to Tamatave the greatest care had to be taken to avoid recognition. But they reached their destination. Johns had already left to arrange transport to Mauritius. They were attended to by a sympathic official named Ramiandrahasina. When the ship was in port, they were each provided with a «suit of sailor's clothes» as a disguise ; and while someone caused a diversion by talking to the guards they were taken «privately on board». Captain Eivent congratulated them by using the Malagasy expression «*Efa kabary*» (it is all over). The ship called at Sainte Marie where during ten or twelve days the party « received great kindness from many of the French residents « (6).

So it was that six Malagasy Christians succeeded in escaping from the threat of arrest and death. All but one of the seven were to reach Britain – and that one was replaced by another who joined the party in Mauritius so that the total number remained the same. But there was no clear plan decided on from the start that Britain was to be the final destination. At each stage of their journeys the situation had to be assessed and a decision taken about the next move. The first stage had been the journey to Tamatave. The second was the passage to Mauritius and residence there. The third was the decision to go to South Africa and the stay of several weeks there. The fourth was the decision to go to Britain and the more extended period of residence there. The fifth was the return to the south-west Indian Ocean, where the refugees eventually had contacts with Mauritius, Madagascar and the Comoro Islands. For two of the party there was even what could be called a sixth stage : the return to permanent residence in Madagascar.

Apart from the story of the time they spent in hiding before setting out for Tamatave, few biographical details are known about most of the refugees.

Mary Rafaravavy seems to have been regarded as one of the chief leaders of the Christians after the departure of the missionaries. Because of her standing in the Christian community, her personal character, the social position of her family and her seniority in years, it is not surprising that she was recognised as the leader of the refugees party. Her father was a wealthy judge ; her brother had been a general until he was demoted for being a Christian ; her husband was officer in charge of soldiers in the Imamo district, but apparently not a Christian. She may have been about 35 years old, but was fortunate to have survived to that age, as on two occasions sentence of death was about to be carried out when unexpected events (such as a serious fire) caused official decisions to be changed. Both *David Ratsarahomba,* who had a house in Antananarivo,and *Simeon Andrianomanana,* who came from the Vonizongo district, were subjected to the poison ordeal, but survived. *Joseph Rasoamaka,* also of Antananarivo, had been sold into slavery for his Christian beliefs, like his three companions already mentioned. It was said of him that although young, he was «looked up to... as a wise and prudent adviser». *Andrianilaina* and his wife *Sarah Razafy* both came from the Vonizongo district ; the husband had been a school-teacher. Both had a high social status ; the wife was twenty years old. These were the seven who fled to Mauritius. Andrianilaina remained there ; but his place was taken by *James Andrianisa,* who had arrived in Mauritius shortly afterwards. Although his family home was at Ilafy, not far from Antananarivo, he had spent several years at Tamatave after being adopted as a young boy by his uncle Ramiandrahasina, who had arranged the refugees' escape (7).

MAURITIUS AND SOUTH AFRICA

The refugees were at once given a good welcome in Mauritius. Official interest in them and in the background to their flight was implied in the fact that on 14 October 1838 they were «permitted to land at once, without any local or official impediments». Similar goodwill was shown by a doctor who charged no fees for treating one for malaria. There were at the time probably between 10,000 and 20,000 Malagasy living in Mauritius. It is not clear what proportion of that high figure was intended by the statement that «many of them» visited the refugees daily. But the contacts with fellow-Malagasy were important. Nor was interest shown by them alone. It was, of course, the community linked with the London Missionary Society which received the refugees. Practical help was given by British Army Officers and others who contributed generously to travelling expenses (8).

It would have been possible to remain in Mauritius ; and in some ways there would have been advantages in so doing ; for example, a prompt return to Madagascar at a suitable moment would be easy. But some had other ideas. It was indeed «suggested and recommanded by several pious and intelligent friends» that the refugees should go on to Britain. There, it was thought, they could both learn English and obtain «much general knowledge, all of which

would be useful to them as teachers if they were able to return to Madagascar. They should at least go to the Cape where J. Phillip, who represented the Directors of the London Missionary Society, would advise on what should be done. It is understandable that only such a simplified version should, in the circumstances, be given to the public when the missionaries Freeman and Johns published the story in 1840. But in fact this brief statement, while true in broad outline, fails to indicate a major disagreement over policy, not simply in connection with the party which had just arrived, but more generally in relation to all those Christians who still remained secretly active in Madagascar. The only hint given about such differences is the statement that there was «much deliberation». There were three main matters to be considered : Johns' return to Britain ; whether the refugees should travel beyond Mauritius ; and the general policy concerning Christians in Madagascar. On the first of these there was no disagreement. But on the other two matters there was a serious divergence of view between Johns on the one hand and his colleagues Jones and Baker on the other (9).

Johns was in bad health and his view that he should go was confirmed by his doctor. Jones willingly gave his «full consent». There were three further reasons besides the medical : that because of «the state of Madagascar» there was «not the slightest hope that we shall resume our labours soon». Johns could not, it was thought, be very effective in all he might do in Mauritius until he had a better knowledge of French. Lastly, «a visit to his native Country» (Wales) would increase his vigour for possible future work in Madagascar (10).

On the second question as to whether the refugees should remain in Mauritius or not Jones was very far from giving the same willing consent. In a private letter to William Ellis, the L.M.S. Secretary, he stated unequivocally : «Mr Baker and myself disapproved of his measures». Johns' case rested on two main arguments. First, that communications between Madagascar and Mauritius were still open enough for it to be «generally thought that (the refugees) are not safe here». Second, there would be great advantages for future work ; for the young men at least could be given special training overseas. He had heard that «provision has been made at the Cape for the support of three pious Malagasy youths» who wished to become Christian teachers. The young refugees, regarded as being of «sterling piety and good talents» should be placed «in some seminary in England». If this plan proposed at the Cape were approved by the Directors, there could be no doubt about the rightness of taking them to Britain. But Jones, whose views it is implied were shared by Baker, was disturbed by other aspects of the situation. The first was the great expense. Further, Jones was sceptical and stated that in his opinion the scheme was «to no good purpose whatsoever». Third, there was what Jones regarded as a case of moral misjudgment. A husband and wife would be separated if Razafy went on with the party while her band was left behind in Mauritius. To this last point Johns had a reply : that the couple themselves had taken this «painful» decision. The husband would remain «to accomplish important objects on

behalf of the persecuted Christians in Madagascar, by visiting some suitable area where his wife could not go with him. The wife, on the other hand, would learn English and later be able to teach her husband ; further, it seemed best that Rafaravavy should have «a female companion».

It was less easy than it might have been to take collective decisions because there seems to have been a change in the formal relationships of the three colleagues. In Madagascar there had been a missionary committee. But in Mauritius, where they were working under different conditions, the missionaries seem to have been individually responsible to the Directors, but not to have formed an official committee of three. Therefore Jones and Baker could only discuss matters with their colleagues and give advice. The disagreement must not be exaggerated and it seems not to have caused any break in personal relationships. In these circumstances Johns was at liberty to remain unconvinced by his colleagues' arguments and to make his own decision. With the evident backing of a number of prominent laymen, he decided to go at least as far as the Cape. Jones indeed seemed prepared to accept that proposal on the ground that living expenses for the Malagasy would be less there than in Mauritius. But Johns was not looking at it in that light ; he was expecting that the Cape would only be a half-way house to Europe. Jones made it very clear when writing to London that he was very glad to have no responsibility for action taken. Referring to Johns he said : «When he perceived myself and Mr Baker not approving *all* his plans & measures»... «he being determined on his own plans, arranged all himself and took the whole responsibility upon himself, so that no responsibility whatsoever rests on me». This last remark seems to imply a reference to the position he had held in Madagascar of «Senior Missionary». The difficulty he attributed to Johns' temperament : «His weakness is, that he thinks himself always right and we are always wrong when we do not perfectly agree with his views». But even so Jones was generous enough to say : «I must avow that I believe that he did act with the best intentions and from a pure motive though, in my opinion, very improperly and injudiciously».

There still remained the third difference about the policy to be adopted towards the Christians in Madagascar. In Johns' view efforts should be made to help as many as possible to escape from the persecution to which they were subject. Jones on the other hand would not accept flight as a normal policy, though he was prepared to allow it in certain circumstances. He said that he was «opposed to the Malagasy Christians fleeing out of the country» as that would be «like taking the light out of a dark country, or the precious gold out of it». However, he would accept the flight of «those whose lives are certainly in imminent danger». The refugees clearly fell into this last category. The missionaries were therefore able to agree about the particular case before them, even though the wider differences in policy remained in the backgroung (11).

Johns and his Malagasy companions left Mauritius on 2 December 1838 and arrived at Algoa Bay, South Africa, on 28 December. Later they moved

to Cape Town. There were three main parallels between the stay in Mauritius and that in South Africa. First, they met former missionaries from Madagascar : Johns, Jones and Baker in Mauritius, Chick, Cameron and Kitching in Africa. Second, although in Cape Town the Malagasy were not present in thousands as in Mauritius, there were a certain number, whom they visited. Third, members of the churches both entertained them and contributed to their expenses. But Africa provided one new experience when the refugees met Hottentot Christians at Port Elizabeth. Direct communication was impossible. But the Bible became a special type of phrase-book «conversation between the two groups, neither of which knew anything of the language of the other, (was) by the method of pointing out suitable phrases in the Bible, the reference then being looked up in the Bible written in the language of the other».

The decision as to whether the party should remain at the Cape or go to Britain had to wait on the riturn of Philip, the Directors' representative, to Cape Town. The delay meant that the party stayed for about six weeks there. But when Philip had considered the different possibilities he did not hesitate. Johns, he thought was «an excellent man, and a man of very tender feelings». And as to the propriety of his taking (the refugees) on from the Cape to England, I have not on my mind the shadow of a doubt», Philip made no direct reference on paper to the plan which according to Johns had been mooted in South Africa for the training if certain Malagasy. But as no other Malagasy were given such special training, it is evident that the refugees were seen as the means of fulfilling that plan. Philip saw further possible benefits in the visit of the refugees to Britain, in the effect they would have on the churches : «... the appearance of the dear people... in England will prove highly favourable to the interests of the missionary cause» (12).

WELCOMED IN BRITAIN

The refugees set out on the third stage of their travels, with Johns, of course still in charge of them. They reached London at the end of May 1839. The interest and importance attached to their arrival is shown by the way in which the Directors and the missionary constituency welcomed them at three meetings within a few days and by the very long and detailed report which was published. Within only «a few hours» of arriving Andrianomanana was speaking at a meeting at Henley-on-Thames. Next, all the refugees attended a meeting espacially called for two of the Committees dealing with certain parts of the world, one having responsibility for the work in Madagascar. The general background was familiar and sometimes was known of the refugees' personal circumstances. But instead of information being conveyed by correspondance, the six Malagasy Christians had come across the world and were in London. They could be seen, listened to and questioned. The purpose of the special meeting of the Committees was therefore «the examination of the religious history and character of the refugees from Madagascar, in order that as many Directors as possible might have the means of satisfying themselves on this

point. After what must have been a rather formidable «examination» had been carried on «for upwards of two hours... by a series of questions on various subjects», the Directors «as a result of the whole, felt upon to express their highest gratification» (13).

The third meeting was on a very much larger scale : a public meeting «open to all the friends of the Society». So many were expected to attend that it was held in Exeter Hall, where several thousands could be accommodated. A number of addresses were given, notably one by Freeman, himself one of the former missionaries in Madagascar, who outlined the story of the Society's work and the background to the arrival of the visitors. He also introduced them one by one and put a series of questions to each in turn concerning their personal beliefs, their feelings on leaving their country, the situation in Madagascar and their views about the future. Resolutions were carried expressing sympathy with the Christians in Madagascar and promising «protection» and support for the refugees. Andrianomanana appealed to the audience to remember his country, to which he and his companions hoped they would be able to return for the benefit of their countrymen. The writer of the lengthy printed report conclued with the comment that it had been «one of the most interesting services in which the friends of Missions have ever had the privilege to engage» (14).

That welcome was the prelude to what was to be for most of the Malagasy a stay of two and a half years in Britain. It was the Missionary Society which was responsible for their welfare, with special help being given by Freeman and Johns and their wives. There were three main concerns to which the Directors gave the most attention : health, the missionary interest of the churches and training for future service.

The primary duty was to protect the visitors' health. Two deaths among the group of Malagasy youths nearly twenty years before were a reminder of the risks run by those who came from the tropics. The solicitude of the Directors is seen most clearly in the way they dealt with the numerous requests, which began to come in at once, for the Malagasy to visit various churches. It would have been easy to take advantage of the enthusiasm engendered by the welcome meeting. But the immediate decision was that it was «not yet expedient to send the Malagasy into the Country to attend Public Meetings, lest their health should suffer in a climate to which they have not been accustomed». They had to be «guarded from the vicissitudes of the atmosphere» ; and although eventually they were encouraged to travel and attend meetings, the general policy was that this was only «under certain conditions and limitations, as may be compatible with their health». A director with medical qualifications was to report on their health from time to time (15).

Despite this care, there were three cases of bad health among the party of six. Rasoamaka recovered and remained. Andrianomanana suffered from «an indisposition» which was serious enough to lead to his premature departure

But the most serious case was that of Razafy, who was already too ill to go with him, along with Johns. She died on 26 December 1840 and was buried in the family grave of a church-member at Walthamstow. Her death led the Directors to decide within a few days that it was «not expedient that the Malagasy (sic) refugees should remain in England beyond the ensuing summer». Health therefore proved to be the deciding factor in determining the length of their stay (16).

The second concern of the Directors was to promote missionary interest. The thousands who attended the Exeter Hall meeting showed how effectively the refugees could stimulate interest in missionary work in general and especially in Madagascar. So far as the proviso that health had to be safeguarded allowed, the Directors were eager for the Malagasy to be seen and heard in different parts of the country. They met individual requests and also made arrangements «to enable them to visit the principal auxiliaries throughout the Kingdom» – the auxiliaries being the official groupings of local churches for missionary support. It is possible to compile a list of those places about which there is clear evidence that they were visited by one or more of the refugees ; and to add in brackets other areas which almost certainly were also visited :

LONDON area	: Exeter Hall ; King's Weigh ; Walthamstow ; Croydon ; Henley-on-Thames ; Ongar ; (Bishopsgate),
EAST	: Dunmow ; Norwich ; (Cambridge),
SOUTH	: (Brighton),
WEST	: Bristol ; Wales,
MIDLANDS	: Birmingham ; Coventry ; Nottingham ; Leicester ; Doncaster,
NORTH	: Hull ; Manchester, Newcastle ; Leeds.

This list is uncomplete ; but it illustrates the reference made by Rasoamaka to their travels : «We have gone to and from in this country» (17).

Third, the refugees were to be trained, to ensure that they would be competent to serve among their fellow-Malagasy, whether in their own land or elsewhere. There training consisted of three main types : educational, technical and religious. The level of «education» attained by each before leaving Madagascar cannot be precisely indicated for lack of direct evidence. But the type and range of knowledge and technical skills which would be normal in the communities in which they grew up can be taken for granted. It seems probable that most (and perhaps all) of them were at least partially literate, as a result of the direct or indirect influence of the schools set up by the missionaries. On the other hand, at the time of their arrival they were not able to understand remarks made about them in public in English. But residence near London offered new opportunities. Different arrangements were made for the women and for the men. The former were living in the Johns home in Walthamstow (where Freeman was minister of Marsh-Street Church). Mrs Johns was «instruc-

ting» them and undertook «to do all in her power to qualify them for future usefulness». No more specific details are available (18). The men on the other hand attended a British and Foreign School Society school, also in Walthamstow. Empasis was laid on «improvement in the English language and... acquiring general knowledge». There was even greater concentration on English (evidently seen as a very important tool for self-improvement and for future service) during their last six months in the country. During that period the men were separated for the reason that if they continued to «reside together, the habit of constant communication in their national language interrupts their progress in the acquisition of the English». Ratsarahomba, for example, was sent to the Academy organised by R. Cecil at Ongar – and missed by only a few months the chance to be a fellow-student of David Livingstone, who was to become that Academy's most famous alumnus (19).

Technical training was concentrated on printing. The effectiveness of printed material had been demonstrated by the missionaries in the 1820's and had been extended in the 1830's. It is therefore not surprising that it was thought that «knowledge of the art of printind might be of service in the future history of the Madagascar mission, and with that in view J.J. Hall, a member of the Walthamstow Church, provided «a press and a fount of type» for the use of the Malagasy «while residing at Walthamstow». Religious training seems to have been less specific than the linguistic and the technical. But «nurture» in the Christian faith which had caused them to be brought to Britain must have been regarded as central, both for their personal benefit and in view of the work which it was hoped they would later be able to undertake. The close contacts with the Johns and Freeman families, as well as the association with the local church, provided the conditions required for such «nurture». Andrianomanana was baptised at that church (20).

There was no pre-determined course of study or training to be followed and no diplomas to be gained. The Directors provided the best instruction and care they could in the circumstances and within the time-limit required by considerations of health. Preparations were made for the fourth stage in the travels of the refugees : their return to, in the first instance ; Mauritius. Meetings had been held to welcome them. Now meetings were arranged to bid them farewell. At a meeting with the Directors, Rasoamaka was the spokesman «to thank them for the kind attentions» shown, and to emphasise their desire to work among their fellow-Malagasy. It must have been with some pride that they presented items which they had printed themselves (21). The programme of the public meeting was very similar to the original welcome in that descriptions were given of conditions in Madagascar and questions were put to the Malagasy. The emphasis was on service. The atmosphere may be judged by two quotations. The question was put to one : «... are you willing to go back to your own country and suffer many hardships and many trials, if you can get permission to return, after all the comforts that you have now enjoyed for over two years in this ?» The reply was. «Yes» Freeman's final injunction

again turned their eyes to their fellow-countrymen : «Twenty thousand in Mauritius and thousands in Madagascar know that you have come to England, and that you have been taught, and that you have learned much. You go back to teach them all you know». Of the six refugees who had arrived in 1839, one had died in Britain and another had returned to Mauritius. Only four remained to hear that final injunction. Passages had been booked and with Mr Johns they were seen off by «a large party of friends». They sailed from London on 12 October 1841, were delayed at Plymouth and finally left on 7 November. They arrived in Mauritius at the end of January 1842 (22).

None of the refugees was ever to see Britain again. In one sense their visit was over. But the break was not so final as that might suggest. Before considering the effects of their visit to Britain and elsewhere, their later history as individuals may be briefly outlined. Each of the five survivors lived and worked in Mauritius in some capacity and some went further afield. Mary Rafaravavy worked at Moka, and for a short time on the west coast of Madagascar. She died of tuberculosis at Moka on 23 April 1848. David Ratsarahomba worked in the Port Louis area and at Moka and paid a brief visit to the Comoro Islands and Madagascar. He died at Port Louis on 2 August 1850. Joseph Rasoamaka worked for some time in Mauritius and also in Madagascar and the Comoro Islands. He returned to Antananarivo in 1861 and died there the following year. James Andrianisa worked in Mauritius for over 30 years. In that time he paid brief visits to Madagascar and eventually returned to live there. He died at Tamatave on 19 July 1882 while serving as Assistant Governor. Simeon Andrianomanana seems to have spent the rest of life in church-work in Mauritius and survived at least until 1872 (23).

II

SOME EFFECTS OF OVERSEAS TRAVEL AND RESIDENCE

The flight, travel and overseas residence and activities of the refugees had varied effects. Such effects could be assessed according to a wide variety of categories, at different levels of analysis. Attention will here be given, first, to the refugees themselves ; second to the peoples with whom they came into contact in a direct or indirect manner, examined on a geographical basis ; third, to some matters concerning religion and culture.

A – *THE REFUGEES*

Four main ways in which the refugees were affected may be selected : in their role as bearers of Malagasy culture ; as Christians in their attitudes towards their fellow Malagasy, and in their personal lives.

Culture

As Malagasy they obviously had a full practical knowledge of their national culture. But never having before left their own country their knowledge of other cultures hardly extended beyong what they saw of the lives and activities (including technical skills) of a handful of missionaries and some other Europeans. Their travel overseas was therefore a face-to-face introduction to other peoples with different ways of life, a different national history and a different status in the world. The cultural differences were most clearly focussed in language. In their own culture, despite some possible preliminary hesitation over regional differences in the meaning of certain words, mutual comprehension was easy. In Mauritius the presence of so many Malagasy meant that residence there was a bridge between a known and an unknown culture. The first stricking demonstration of the problem of language was met in South Africa. Communication between the Malagasy and the Hottentots was only possible (without the intervention of an interpreter) because of a shared religious tradition embodied in the Bible as translated into two languages : Malagasy and Dutch. The language-problem had to be faced again in Britain. In some (probably early) private contacts the same method as that followed with the Hottentots was adopted. In public meetings a missionary interpreted. But special emphasis was laid on the learning of English as a mean of personal contact, as a key to knowledge and as a tool for future work. There is no record of the exact degree of skill attained by each of the refugees before leaving Britain. But some at least became able to speak in public. The language barrier vis-a-vis the English speaking world had been surmounted (24).

There is not enough evidence to make possible and adequate estimate of the refugees' impressions of British culture in general as seen in their daily life and in their travels. It is to be noted, however, that they spoke several times of the kindness and compassion with which they were received ; and in writing to fellow-Christians in Madagascar they made a point of mentioning the religious liberty which they found in Britain (25).

Religion

The Malagasy did not travel simply «for the gratification of more curiosity» (26). It was specifically because of their role as Christian refugees that they had the chance to see other lands and peoples of the two groups of Malagasy which had preceded them to Britain, the one had been mainly *educational* in its aims, looking to future administrative responsibilities and industrial progress ; and the second had a *diplomatic* purpose. The Missionary Society had close connections with these two groups. But in the case of the third group, the refugees, it was directly responsible without reference to any Government department. Everything that was done for and with the refugees could therefore be more clearly related to the religious and «missionary» circumstances of their visit.

One important effect was the range and quality of the personal relationships into which, notwithstanding their different cultural background, they were able to enter with certain individuals and families. Despite the difficulties of communication, some of these contacts were maintained in later years by correspondence. In addition, they came into less direct contact with the many thousands who attended the numerous meetings at which they spoke. A second effect of their experiences in Britain on their role as Christians was the reinforcement of that role. This was shown not only by what they learned through the spoken or written word, but also in other ways. For example, in the context of a reference to their having had to leave their families and friends, they stated that they had «found friends a hundredfold». Again, if the statements made at the end of their stay are compared with those they made at the beginning, it is found that the same major themses and the same tone are maintained ; there is no regression, but rather a deepening of their convictions (27).

General attitude towards fellow-Malagasy

The term «fellow-Malagasy» here refers to two distinguishable groups. The first was large and comprehensive, consisting of all fellow-countrymen without distinctions, as forming one people or nation, with Queen Ranavalona as symbolic and active Head. The second group, abstracted from within the «nation», consisted of the comparatively few scattered Malagasy Christians. The Malagasy Christians showed two important features. One was limiting : in whatever country they were residing (wheter Madagascar, Mauritius, the Comoro Islands or elsewhere) they formed a «Christian Society» or a perhaps unstructured «Church» distinguishable both within the local Malagasy community and within the total Malagasy people. On the other hand, there was an expansive aspect to their life : in their role as Christians they were linked by common beliefs and loyalties to Christians in other nations.

The attitude of the refugees to both of these groups of Malagasy during their stay in Britain was largely determined by what might now be called a Christian philosophy of history, as seen in the particular understanding of such a philosophy current in the evangelical missionary constituency at that time. Among the central themes emphasised were Divine power, authority and purpose ; a religious anthropology laying stress on human weakness and hopelessness ; the possibility of «salvation» through Jesus Christ ; and the importance of love and forgiveness. So far as the whole Malagasy people were concerned, the understanding of «the state of the nation» can be indicated by one of the various answers given to questions put to the refugees at both the welcome and the farewell meetings : «They are all (spitirually) dead». In view of the persecution of the Christians, the deaths of some (well-known to them) and their own varied sufferings, they displayed an unexpectedly charitable attitude towards «the Queen and those in power under her». They said that they did not feel «resentment», but rather hoped that God woud «enlighten their understanding». Indeed, their eschatological beliefs led them to be much

concerned about those in authority : «We shoud feel more sorry for those who are guilty of the blood of our beloved friends than for our friends who were martyred by them». Their attitude towards the Christians who remained in Madagascar and still ran the risk of being killed, was one of sympathy and encouragement. In a special letter to those Christians they wrote : «We all sympathize with you and feel for you». And on the basis that Christian history showed that persecution was often to be expected, they urged them to be «courageous» (28).

Service

There was one other theme which recurred in connection with both the nation as a whole and the Christians in particular that of «service». This aim was evidently impressed on them not only by the circumstances of their daily life, but also by their contacts with the Directors and the missionaries and their training. One statement by Rasoamaka may be taken as typical : When about to leave Britain he told the Directors that he and his companions had a «desire to employ their future days in the service of Christ among their countrymen either in Mauritius or Madagascar» Such a purpose was already clearly intended by Johns when he took them to South Africa and in the education provided in Britain. The Directors decided that Rasoamaka and Ratsarahomba «be appointed as Native teachers to their countrymen in the Mauritius» and it was recognised that Rafaravavy also would be rendering «services» (29).

Personal affairs

References to a concern for fellow-countrymen must not be allowed to obscure the fact that the flight from Madagascar and the visit to Britain had very personal effects. With the exception of Razafy, whose husband went as far as Mauritius, the refugees had to travel without their marriage partners. Two certainly never saw them again ; the same must probably be said of three others. The wife of Ratsarahomba (Raminahy) was put to death with other Christians when trying to flee at a later date (30).

B – *SIX COUNTRIES*

The flight of the refugees had effects of differing importance in no less than six countries : Britain, Madagascar, Mauritius, Comoro Islands, South Africa and Siberia.

BRITAIN

Interest in Madagascar

It might be hoped that some account could be given of the reaction of the community in general, as distinct from the special «missionary constituency».

But despite the interest which might have been aroused by the recent publication of Ellis' substantial *History of Madagascar*, the arrival of a party of exiles in special circumstances and their welcome at a very large gathering in London did not qualify to be mentioned in the *Times*. At the local level, Walthamstow, with which they were most closely associated, was then only a village and had no local paper (31). Matters were different within the missionary constituency. This did not comprise all in the country who might have concern for overseas missions. It consisted of the immediate supporters of the London Missionary Society, together with those of certain other main Nonconformist societies ; also of the British and Foreign Bible Society and of various other bodies with a strong social conscience. The constituency, in this connection, can be broadly equated with the readership of two monthly journals, the *Evangelical Magazine* (which incorporated the L.M.S. *Missionary Chronicle*) and the *Missionary Register*.

Within this constituency, already familiar with new from Madagascar, the visit of the refugees stimulate a widespread and deepening interest in Madagascar and its people, as seen largely in terms of the circumstances surrounding the persecution of the Christians. The recent visit by the Malagasy Embassy had been official, distant and known only to a few. The visit of the refugees was a complete contrast, in that they had no official status, could be easily approached at meetings and elsewhere and came with a «story» of their own which aroused strong emotions and sympathy. The welcome meeting was described as «a very interesting occasion» and everywhere «a lively interest» was shown (32).

That interest was shown in various ways. There were numerous requests for them to travel and attend public meetings (One of the first two requests received was made by Clunie of Manchester, who had taught some of the Malagasy youths in the 1820's) (33). What was reported of their attendance at a meeting in Hull was probably generally true : «The appearance of these Christian refugees... as they stood arrayed in their native costume – especially the white flowing lamba, gracefully covering the whole person – produced a startling impression on the audience» (34). Those who saw and heard the refugees in persons or who read about them responded in several ways. There were substantial financial contributions from different parts of the country for closely-linked purposes : «for the Malagasy» ; for the «rescue» of Malagasy Christians who wished to escape as the refugees had done ; for the support of the refugees in their future work ; and for the general funds of the Missionary Society (35). Some made gifts in kind (36). Again, there was a desire for mementoes (37).

The refugees made a sufficient impression on several persons for them to recall the meeting several decades later. One of these was himself to work as a missionary in Madagascar from 1867 to 1876 : Joseph Sewell recalled how years before the appearance of the refugees at a meeting in Leeds «affected

me much». Reference has already been made to the «startling impression» made by some of the refugees in Hull, as recalled forty-five years later by James Sibree Snr, who was himself to have a close connection with the island through his son. Others who spoke of their recollections had no such direct connection. At a reception for the Malagasy ambassadors at Birmingham in 1883, R.W. Dale spoke of the «vivid impression» made on his mind forty-three years before by the «tragic narrative» of the life of Christians in Madagascar and by the «romantic story» of the escape of the refugees, some of whom he had seen. As a result he had since taken «an exceptional interest in the (Malagasy) nation and in Madagascar. C.L. Brightwell, a writer of missionary biography, recalled a visit to her home in Norwhich about thirty-four years before by J.J. Freeman and «his interesting charges». Similarly Mrs J. Luke recalled that sixty years before the story of the refugees «exerted special sympathy» and that they with Mrs Johns as interpreter had visited her home in London (38). Finally, it is surprising to find that although the refugees left Britain as long ago as 1841, as recently as 1926 Mrs Harriet Johnson, of London, was able to write of her memories of the refugees whom she knew over eighty-five years before (39).

Evidence of Missionary Activity

Just as the refugees realised that they travelled in their role as Christians, so the Missionary Society saw in them evidence of its own missionary activity. It was not simply that they were individual converts in whom a personal interest might be shown. On both sides a wider and deeper understanding of what was involved was sought. The refugees expressed, for example, their view of the situation of their fellow-countrymen. The Society for its part related the refugees' experience of suffering and the circumstances which gave rise to it to an understanding of the history of the Christian Church. Four main points were made.

First, the refugees were seen as evidence of what may be described in institutional terms as the Society's missionary policy and activities, against a background of many hundreds of years of the Church's life. This was expressed by a number of significant words, notably results, demonstration, illustration, proofs, fruits, triumphs and power. Second, it was reiterated on the basis of statistical evidence about the growing number of Christians in Madagascar despite the persecution (though in fact the numbers involved were small) that, as was said by Tertullian, «the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church». In the sense of martyrs who had been put to death there had been two by 1839. But the refugees, because of their experiences, were assimilated to them and it was evidently that they too would have some effect on the attitudes of some of their fellow-countrymen. Third, it was thought that the same facts of suffering and death should affect Christians in Britain and make them reject «sectarian differences» so as to have greater unity in missionary action,

persecution in many countries and in many periods, the persecution in Madagascar was seen as only a temporary obstacle which, paradoxically, might itself eventually forward the achievement of the missionary aim (40).

Association with Walthamstow

An especially close association was formed with Walthamstow, which at that time was not yet a part of London. The link was provided by J.J. Freeman, minister of Marsh-Street Congregational Church. Apart from the personal connection with the Freeman and Johns families, there were close contacts with two institutions. One was the British and Foreign School Society school, attended by the men. The other was the church. Contemporary church records which might have referred to them have not been preserved. But there is other evidence to show how they were accepted. For example, contributions towards their support made by individuals or single churches approached half the total given throughout Britain (41). When Sarah Razafy died a church-member allowed her to be buried in his family grave. The funeral itself had been an important occasion, attended by the leaders of the Society and by Robert Moffat, the missionary from South Africa who was at that time very much in the public eye (42). It can be said that the residence of the refugees in Walthamstow created in Marsh-Street Church an immediate and longstanding interest in their story and in Madagascar which was lasted until recent years. Certain members continued to correspond with the Malagasy for years after they had left (43). Twenty years after their departure, this continuing interest provided a contribution to the fund for the erection of the Martyr Memorial Churches in Tananarive (44). In the 20th century the church was presented with a document in the handwriting of Rafaravavy (45). The history of the church gives three pages to the refugees. At the time of the centenary of their visit it was possible to interest the local press in the link with Madagascar (46). Their story may also have influenced discussion about the «Madagascar Stone» (47).

The Arts

The visit to Britain was reflected in various artistic forms. Some major public addresses, of which verbatim accounts exist, can be placed on account of their style and emotional overtones in the category of oratory (48). Second, there has been a considerable amount of prose literature, even though no claim was made for special literary excellence. The most important example was the book published a year after the arrival of the refugees, namely, Freeman and Johns' Narrative. The first main source for that work lay in the writers' own direct knowledge. But nearly half is clearly based on information derived from the refugees' own account of their experiences. Further, their presence was a main reason for the publication of such a book at that time (49). In addition,

there were a number of articles ; and perhaps even a special pamphlet (50). Third, it was not unusual within the missionary constituency to supplement prose statements with poetry. Several poems were written about the refugees. Though of no particular poetical merit, they expressed emotions and elicited sympathy (51). Fourth, there has been one minor example of a dramatic presentation of the story (52). Fifth, a striking example of pictorial art is provided by the coloured representation of the refugees, forming the frontispeace to the book by Freeman and Johns. It is notable not only for being a set of true likenesses presented within an imagined setting ; but also as being an early example of the method of colour printing in oils devised by G. Baxter (53). Sixth, a memorial tablet provides an example of the art of the monumental mason. It is very probable that it was visits to Bristol by the refugees which helped to stimulate the interest which later led to the erection of a tablet (in Highbury Congregational Church) to the memory of Rasalama, the Malagasy convert speared to death in 1837 (54).

MADAGASCAR

Official reaction to the Flight

The original party of six fled because their religious beliefs put their lives at risk. The authorities soon associated with them Ramiandrahasina, the official who helped them at Tamatave and who himself fled a few months later. He was afraid of being punished for having given that help and also because there was a risk that advantage could be taken of the case because of an ulterior motiv : he could be forced to undergo the *tangena* poison ordeal. Its administration could be manipulated so as to «convict» him and so acquire his considerable property (55). Two main themes are evident in the official attitude to those who had fled : guilt and punishment. They were guilty on two counts : first, as secret Christians they were wanted persons ; their success in excaping the net exacerbated their crime ; second, they had committed an illegal act in leaving the country without explicit authorisation. They all therefore deserved punishment. The Queen's Secretary judged that this was to be nothing less than death (56).

Official reaction to other Christians

Condemnation of the refugees extended to those who were associated with them. So far as the Christians who remained in Madagascar were concerned, there seems to be no clear evidence that the escape led to any immediate intensification of the search for those living in secret. But the escape provided a precedent for the attempted escape of sixteen other Christians in 1840 ; and must have been well to the fore when it was decided that several should be put to death. But there was immediate condemnation of missionaries and other Europeans who were thought to have had a share in the escape. «Since the flight of the native Christians is known» wrote David Jones», the Malagasy

Government is becoming more hostile than ever against us especially those who were more directly concerned in facilitating their escape». Again, it was judged that the Queen would not agree to Johns returning «because of the Christians he helped to escape». And Griffiths, though allowed into Madagascar on a commercial, not a missionary basis, was eventually told that he could not set foot in Madagascar again because he had «stolen» Malagasy nationals, that is, helped Christians to try to escape (57).

Diplomatic Issues

As indicated by the use of the word «stole» with reference to Griffiths, the flight raised the question of the status of persons who fled from their own country to another State without official permission. Correspondence between the Malagasy authorities and the Governor of Mauritius made evident two different views. The view of the Malagasy Government can be expressed in two sentences : a) a citizen has no right to leave his country for any reason without a permit ; b) if he succeeds in doing so, the authorithies in the country in which he comes to reside are obliged to send him back at the request of the authorities of his own country. These points were made in what David Jones referred to as a «bold and very impolite letter» (58). Against these assertions, the Governor Mauritius made two points : a/ it is not the custom of «wise» nations having friendly relations with other nations to make such requests ; except in serious cases, such as assassination ; b/ departure without a permit is not in itself a criminal act ; and if foreign nationals in such circumstances are of good behaviour in their host country, a call for extradition is to be refused.

In the correspondence there is a clear difference of opinion as to what constitutes a crime serious enough to require extradition. But behind the formal language used by the Governor, there probably lay his conviction, as surmised by Raombana, that to send the refugees (or others similarly placed), back to Madagascar would be to «feed them to hungry lions and tigers». The successful escape of Malagasy nationals and their legal protection overseas evidently became for a time, according to Raombana's account, an obsession with Ranavalona. Not only was the affair regarded as shaming the authorities, whose will had been successfully resisted. It also implied that if those who fled could not be «publicly executed, all the malcontents of the reals would seek to flee to Ste Marie, Bourbon and Mauritius». This could result in a «general desertion», mockery of the Throne and the publication overseas of statements that her subjects preferred to live elsewhere. The consequences of this obsession could have been serious and far-reaching. A blockade might be imposed which would have prevent Mauritius from importing what it needed from Madagascar. If that had happened, Britain might have eventually agreed to send the refugees back in order to safeguard the required imports ; Mauritius would have benefitted – but at the cost of the refugees' lives. On the other hand Britain might have declared war in order to force the lifting of the blockade.

Whether or not Raombana was right in judging that these serious risks existed, a new consideration was skilfully introduced (according to Raombana) by Rainiharo, a leading member of the Government. The ban on the export of oxen to Mauritius would have cut across his own commercial plans. He therefore provided a plausible diversion, concerned with the importance of giving further training to the soldiers. This was accepted ; and in time this particular issue came to be «forgotten» (59).

Contacts and Attempts at New Work

When the refugees left Britain they were able to settle in Mauritius. There they could remain without fear of being abducted in some way (as had been feared by some of their friends in 1838) ; or, so far as they knew, of being extradited by the Governor. But that did not mean that they were entirely cut off from the possibility of some direct contact with Madagascar. It was obviously out of the question for them to try to return and work openly in the centre of the island, the area from which they had originated. But it was still possible to work among other Malagasy by taking advantage of the political circumstances on the north-west coast, especially, where Ranavalona's authority was not fully recognised by all the inhabitants and their leaders. The protagonist of work on that coast was Johns, until his death two years after his return from Britain. But some of the refugees were eager to share in the work and after Johns' death they found in J. Le Brun an interested friend and helper, even though he did not himself visit Madagascar (60). In 1841 Johns and Andrianomanana visited the west coast to find a suitable place where work could be started. Christians in Antananarivo who heard of their presence set out to visit them on the coast, but were caught before they had gone many miles and were put to death. In 1842 Rafaravavy and Rasoamaka settled at Nosimitsio where, as it was put, a «door had opened» insofar as the local chief had asked for teachers. They were well received by Ratsimiharo the chief, his own wife and sisters being among the first to attend classes. It was reported that «a good many» became literate ; and as «many applied... for spelling books... and improved fast», prospects appeared good. But all hopes were dashed when, after Rafaravavy and Rasoamaka had rejected an invitation by a Roman Catholic missionary to work for him, the French authorities in Nosibe made it impossible for them to continue their work. Johns himself died at Nosibe in the presence of Rasoamaka in 1843. Rafaravavy returned to Mauritius, whereas Rasoamaka went to the Comoro Islands. Le Brun had high hopes in 1845 that work could be started again. But this seems not to have proved possible. Two years later he suggested to Ratsarahomba that he should take advantage of a ship going to the Comoro Islands and to the west coast in order to see what was happening. Ratsarahomba's eagerness to accept the offer was shown in the rather melodramatic manner in which he apostrophised his native land in a letter to a friend : «O Madagascar with all thy faults I love thee still». At Ibaly he was well received by Raboky, the chief, and his people. But it could be no more than a brief visit and he returned to his work in Mauritius.

The next year it was their knowledge of English which afforded Andrianisa and his uncle Ramiandrahasina an opportunity to go on a British ship to Tamatave. A few years later, in 1852, Rasoamaka and Andrianilaina at Nosibe had some direct new about conditions in the centre of the island when they were visited by envoys sent by Radama, the Queen's son who was favourable to the Christians, to investigate rumours about the presence of Europeans at Ibaly. Rasoamaka seems to have been able to stay for some time at Nosibe.

These references, though so brief, show that the refugees, accompagnied on some occasions by other Malagasy Christians from Mauritius made some attempts to work among their fellow-countrymen in areas where some contact was possible. They concentrated on literary and religious instruction. But the evidence is not sufficiently detailed to make possible a clear assessment of the immediate impact of their short-lived efforts or of their further effects (61).

Responsibility within the Mission-Church Organization

Some of the refugees were appointed by the Directors to certain posts in Mauritius. Some also undertook particular assignments in Madagascar and the Comoro Islands. Within the Mission-Church organization this marks a stage in the development of the distribution of «authority», or responsibility and of the process of decision-making. They did responsible work in Mauritius. But the opportunity and the power to show initiative and to take decisions of their own was much greater when they found themselves, in some cases, it seems, for several years, on the coast of Madagascar or in the Comoro Islands, far from colleagues who could have given advice, if required. The former missionaries in Madagascar up to 1846 when the last left Mauritius, obviously helped with many of the arrangements. But it is equally evident that they had confidence in the ability of the refugees to work on their own. A significant proof of such confidence and trust is provided by the way in which Le Brun negotiated with two who were working in the Comoro Islands. He wrote to them with a view to their returning to Mauritius. They did not agree, as they had plans to go to Ambongo. Later, Ratsarahomba if he met them in the Comoro Islands was commissioned to re-open the question. There is no more indication than on the previous occasion that Le Brun was trying to give them orders (62). This slight development of the missionary organization was taking place for the most part outside Madagascar ; and certainly outside the main Christian community which still remained in the island. It should therefore be seen as taking place paralled to the contemporary development among the secret Christian groups in central Madagascar, where certain persons were recognized as having the qualifications to be the natural leaders of such groups (63).

Official Service

It has already been mentioned that Andrianisa visited Tamatave as an interpreter because of his knowledge of English. In fact, his knowledge of that

language provided the foundation for a career which took him far beyond his earliest work as a teacher, and from which considerable commercial and administrative benefits accrued to Madagascar. Some time after his return to Mauritius he was reported to have «gone round Madagascar» as interpreter on a British ship, the Isis. He facilitated commerce between Madagascar and Mauritius (except presumably during the period 1845-1853 when there was an embargo) by acting as interpreter for ships' captains. In the 1860's he interpreted for the Malagasy consul in Mauritius, who was not himself a Malagasy ; and also helped in legal cases concerning Malagasy. He seems to have been the obvious choice as interpreter for the official British Missions to Madagascar in 1861 and 1862. He ended his career in an administrative post in the Malagasy government : as assistant to the Governor of Tamatave, ironically holding an official position in the port from which he made a surreptitious escape years before (64).

MAURITIUS

The refugees were compelled by force of circumstances to settle in Mauritius. Two of them chose to reside there for many years even after a return to Madagascar became possible. Certainly two, and probably three of them died there (65). So far as the interests of Mauritius are concerned, two main effects may be noted. The first has already been indicated in the reference to Andrianisa's activity as an interpreter in connection with commercial, legal and consular business, except that now his work is to be seen from the point of view of Mauritius rather than of Madagascar. But the main activity of the refugees lay elsewhere : in «missionary» work of different types.

The decision by the Directors to make Mauritius the base had evidently been taken as a result of discussions between themselves, the former missionaries in Madagascar and the refugees, before Freeman at the farewell meeting said it was hoped that they would «meet with an extensive sphere of usefulness in the Mauritius». There were three main objects. First, to provide a home for the refugees themselves (even though it was envisaged as only provisional, the exact period depending on the course of events in Madagascar, about which no confident short-term prophecy could be made). Second, to work within the Malagasy community of perhaps 20,000 or more. It was towards these fellow-Malagasy that the main obligation was left. But it was realized that while cultural ties might attract some, it would not necessarily be an easy task. That had already been made evident when, for example, the sudden interest shown in the refugees during their visit in 1838 had soon evaporated (66). Third, to seek opportunities to work in selected areas in Madagascar where visits or eventually even residence might be possible.

As already noted, some of the refugees had been appointed even before they left Britain to certain spheres of work and arrangements had been made for their support (with the exception, it seems, of Andrianisa, who may have been thought to be still too young, but who was later to join the others as a teacher).

With them were associated certain other prominent Malagasy Christians who had also fled to Mauritius, but who had not travelled further afield, notably Andrianado, Rafaralahy, Ramiadana and Paoly. The refugees thus became part of a larger group. Although the two main activities in which they were engaged were closely linked, a distinction may be drawn between their educational and their religious work. Special attention was given to certain areas of the island. The most important site was at Moka. Some property had been bought there by Johns to carry out the first object by providing «an asylum for the Madagascar refugees». It was in fact not simply a refuge but rather a centre for active work among the Malagasy of the area. In 1844, for example, it was reported that «the Malagasy station at Moka goes on exceedingly well», with 40 children and a Sunday congregation of 100. Rafaravavy worked there ; and later, after some time spent with Baker as a printer, Andrianomanana. Ratsarahomba was at Grand Bassin and later moved to the estate of C. Telfair. Andrianomanana was still working as an «evangelist» in 1864 ; in 1872 he was with the Anglican Church as a catechist (67).

COMORO ISLANDS

The inhabitants of the Comoro Islands in the Mozambique Channel were not Malagasy. But the attention of the refugees and of others associated with them, notably Andrianilaina and Ramiandrahasina, was directed to the islands because of special circumstances. Until the practice had been forbidden by Radama, certain Malagasy had frequently sailed in large canoes to attack and plunder the Comoro Islands. But a new situation had developed as a result of political events in Madagascar. Andriantsoly, a Sakalava leader on the west coast fled there with his followers ; similarly, Ramanetaka, a prominent relative of Radama, fled to save his life after the accession of Ranavalona, also with his followers ; and had even become Sultan of one of the islands. There seem to have been certain other Malagasy already resident. So it could be said that there was – even though it was not a very homogenous group – a «Malagasy community» in exile in the 1840's. By 1845 at least Rasoamaka and Andrianilaina were in Mohilla (Moheli). A reference to their building a dhow suggests that they were supporting themselves by such work. Later Ramiandrahasina went to Johanna (Anjouan). Their main purpose seems to have been to engage in «missionary work», not among the Comorians, but among their fellow-Malagasy, even though in the circumstances, when living in an Islamic civilization, some of the Malagasy had become Muslims. They were able to give a certain amount of instruction in reading and writing (in Roman characters) to some Comorians. It is possible therefore to indicate that some influence was exerted on two groups : the Malagasy in exile, and some of the Comorians. But in this case it is even more difficult than with the work in western Madagascar to evaluate the extent and effectiveness of such influence (68).

SOUTH AFRICA

The refugees spent only a few weeks in South Africa and their contacts there were therefore likely to have an effect than in Britain and Mauritius.

Even so, two points already made in describing their stay there may be recalled. First, they aroused interest in their own story and in the Christians in Madagascar, leading some to respond with financial contributions ; the donors included both some of White extraction and some Hottentots. Second, some contact was made with Malagasy who (unlike those in the Comoro Islands) were not voluntary exiles, but who, perhaps almost without exception, had been brought to South Africa against their will, or whose ancestors had been so brought (69).

SIBERIA

The last geographical area to be mentioned is unexpectedly distant from Madagascar. In the other countries already referred to, there was a clear and immediate contact with the refugees in person. In contrast, the contact with Siberia was indirect, but still produced an identifiable result. This was possible because of the printed material describing its own work which circulated within the organization of the Missionary Society. A copy of Freeman and Johns' *Narrative* was received by Swann and Stallybrass, missionaries among the Buriats. The interest aroused no only by the text but also by the portraits of the refugees (the «artistic» Baxter print already mentioned in connection with Britain) was expressed in two ways. First, a leading «Mongol Buriat Convert» named Shagdur wrote a letter to the refugees in Britain in January 1841. In such circumstances it is interesting to note what he had to say to such people whom he had never seen. Five main themes can be distinguished : a/ sympathy with the refugees at having been compelled to leave their country because the authorities had «put grievous hindrances in the way of Christian belief and practice ; b/ understanding of what was implied by the departure of the missionaries from Madagascar, as their own missionaries in Siberia were also about to leave, as they were not allowed to remain ; c/ encouragement to deepen their Christian faith ; d/ a comparison between the state of non-Christian religion in Madagascar and in the Buriat community ; e/ greetings not only from the writer himself but also from two others named Sobnok and Sanjial, also evidently Christian converts. Second it was the interest shown by the missionaries themselves which led them to pass on the information to the Buriat Christians. Evidence of continuing interest is shown by two letters which Swann wrote about the refugees on his return to Britain. The second was written after they had already left the country and it is not possible to be sure that he ever met them in person. But he translated the long letter which they wrote as an appreciative reply to Shagdur before they sailed. The themes which they discussed were very similar to these in the letter and they in their turn, for example, outlined some Malagasy beliefs and sympathized with their correspondent and his companions in the difficulties which they had to face in their country (70).

C – *RELIGION AND CULTURE*

The effects of travel and residence abroad have so far been considered in relation to the refugees themselves and to individual geographical areas. But

the effects may also be examined in relation to certain broader questions. Out of many possible themes, three may be selected for brief treatment : the international Christian community ; the image of Madagascar and the Malagasy : the image of other lands and peoples.

The International Christian Community

The remark made at the welcome meeting in London that the refugees did not travel «for the gratification of mere curiosity» strikingly emphasizes the fact that the justification for their travel overseas laid in their specific role as Christians. By the actions of certain non-Malagasy members of the international Christian community (as it happened, though not of necessity, by a particular group which stood within European culture) a Malagasy Christian community had been formed. At one level it is possible to see that there was a basic agreement on certain important religious themes between the traditional Malagasy culture and the newly formed Christian community. But the ultimate reasons for the flight of the refugees lay, first, in the conflict between the two in respect of certain major beliefs and in the probably social implications of such beliefs ; and second, in the links established between the Malagasy and the international Christian community, which carried certain other implications, especially when opponents had misinterpreted some beliefs.

Within the international Christian Community, within which the refugees were seen no as, so to speak, idealized Christian but specifically as *Malagasy* Christians, they played three main parts. First, as *recipients*. In Mauritius, South Africa and Britain, they were received not by all the local representatives of the international community, but at least by those groups which had special links with the community in Madagascar. Such groups might show considerable differences in cultural background ; for example, in the three areas mentioned, those with an European background ; the Hottentots ; the varied background of some in Mauritius ; and to these may be added the group which knew of them by repute rather than by direct contact, the Mongol Buriats. Second, as *donors*. It was hoped that their personal qualities backed by their story, which they both embodied and could express in words, would contribute to the local community in two main ways. On the one hand, they would provide a stimulus to arouse interest and support of all kinds. Evidence already given under the geographical headings makes it clear that this hope was not disappointed. On the other hand, it was expected that although only some of the major groups within the Christian community in Britain were closely linked with the refugees, the circumstances would help to break down barriers between certain groups and lead to a greater «unity». This may have happened to some degree, but the lack of adequate evidence prevents any definite statement of what was achieved rather than merely desired. On a small scale, however, unity does seem to have been shown when the refugees were at Ste.Marie. *Third*, as communicators. In three of the geographical areas, Madagascar, Mauritius and the

Comoro Islands, they made deliberate efforts, brief or extended according to circumstances, to communicate Christian beliefs and ways (as understood from within their Malagasy culture and in the light of experience elsewhere), and to bring persons who did not already form part of it within the international Christian community. In this aim, they did have some success, especially in Mauritius.

Image of Madagascar and the Malagasy

A group of Malagasy who travelled in what was in some areas a blaze of publicity among certain groups could not but have an effect on the image of Madagascar and the Malagasy held within other cultures. The range and depth of knowledge about such matters varied in the areas visited. The area where most was known was Mauritius. There impressions could be gained by those with a different background from two main sources : from the thousands of resident Malagasy (despite the fact that as already mentioned their culture, notably language, might be slightly deformed) ; and from new of current events. On a very much smaller scale there was a somewhat similar situation in the Comoro Islands, where there was a further source of information in the history of the attacks made by Malagasy raiders until about twenty years before. In South Africa too there were Malagasy, though it seems unlikely that their presence, along with many. from other nations, led to any widely held conceptions about the island. In Britain considerable knowledge was available within the constituency of the L.M.S. It was, however, almost entirely literary knowledge, except for those who, for example, had seen the Malagasy youths at the L.M.S. annual meeting in 1821. In Siberia, the local Christian may possibly not have known even the name until the story of the refugees came to the fore.

A detailed sketch of what the image of Madagascar and the Malagasy may have been at that time in each of the areas mentioned cannot be attempted here. But as bearers of Malagasy culture within the international Christian community, the refugees affected in some degree that image as held by others. They made the words Madagascar and Malagasy come to life. In South Africa the records refer to little but language. In Siberia there was no direct contact ; but the true likeness of the engraving, which was probably the first representation of Malagasy seen in that area, must have fixed a clear though limited image in the minds of some. In Mauritius the appearance and style of life of Malagasy was already well-known. The refugees were a very small group within a large population of Malagasy ; their appearance and activities might therefore be expected to lack the impact which novelty made on persons in Britain. But they (with, it must again be noted, some others) stood out because of the special work which they undertook. Even though they were working among fellow-countrymen, the Malagasy did not live in an enclave cut off from the surrounding community. The nature and prominent of their work, especially in view of the long period for which it was undertaken, could not but have

some effect. In Britain it is clear that a strong total impression was made by their appearance, dress and language. It is true that there is an absence of comment on any particular Malagasy «customs» which others may have seen them observing. But it can be confidently held that, to go no further, certain ways of doing things in every day life, for example, would be so ingrained that they would not be quickly given up and would be noticed by others. Not only were they themselves a group of Malagasy ; but also they were living with missionaries who would naturally continue to practice such customs themselves in their association with them. It would be difficult to justify even an approximate estimate of the total number of persons in Britain who may have derived a transformed and clearer image of Madagascar from the refugees. But it can be pointed out that the circumstances of the refugees concentrated on the island and its people the attention of persons who wished to know more.

Image gained of other lands and peoples

It was not, however, simply a matter of the eyes of other nations being opened to Madagascar. The refugees themselves and up to a point others through them gained impressions of other lands and peoples. The refugees came from Imerina. In that area there were three main sources of knowledge about other lands : by personal contacts with foreign residents and visitors, notably, the missionaries and a few others, with the visitors including some from an Islamic background ; by knowledge of techniques and cultural ways introduced by such foreigners and often adopted with skill and enthusiasm ; and by news of recent and current affairs concerning, for example, the agreement to forbid the export slave-trade, a naval attack on the east coast (which failed) and strained relations with some European powers at certain times. In the case of most individuals all this probably did not add up to any very clear picture ; but such as it was, it was the image held. The central conception, the power of which overrode almost everything was, seems to have been the clear distinction between, on the one hand, Madagascar which was *anivon'ny riaka* (i.e. an island surrounded by sea) and, on the other hand, everything else with was *any an-dafy* (i.e. over the waters).

It would be normal for the refugees before their flight to share such ideas with the general public ; but most of them had the great advantage of having had close contacts with the missionaries and their work. This would make clearer and warner the image of the foreigner, as compared with others who, while they could see the foreigner living and working in their midst, still saw him externally, from a distance. The refugees then had the further advantage of being themselves able to cross the dividing line formed by the ocean, to travel and gain direct experience. That experience related to three main types of culture : *European,* chiefly in Britain ; *African,* through contacts with Hottentots and possibly with others at the Cape, as well as some of African extraction

in Mauritius ; and *Islamic*, in the Comoro Islands. Having regard to all the circumstances, it would be unreasonable to expect them to have given a lengthy systematic account of their views on foreign lands and cultures, even though at least Andrianisa, who probably became the best educated of them all, could have written a valuable account. The few direct comments they made in surviving records (one or two of which have been quoted above) suggest that whatever they may have thought of, for example, the size of the towns, housing and methods of transport, they were chiefly concerned to indicate how greatly impressed they were by such aspects of life as character (demonstrated in personal kindness), religious liberty and religious devotion.

The image they gained of British culture was not purely external and objective. For in some degree certain aspects of it became a part of themselves, just as up to a point the missionaries had absorbed certain aspects of Malagasy culture. This process was not confined to one period, but, beginning with some contacts before the flight, continued in the relationships in Britain and was further forwarded by other contacts in Mauritius. The degree of « Europeanisation » seems to have varied, but in no case was overwhelming. Probably Sarah Razafy, if only because of her early death, was the least affected ; Andrianisa, with his various official duties, was eventually probably the most affected. Certain changes in living conditions were inevitable in Britain, but there is no indication that Malagasy dress was given up, to be worn only on public occasions. In Mauritius, housing, food and dress would be very similar to conditions on the east coast of Madagascar (and therefore of a Malagasy style) even though housing, especially, might not be identical with the refugees' own region of Imerina. Various skills (relating, for example, to reading, writing and machinery) were acquired, together with some facility in foreign languages. But the major change was in their religious outlook. They rejected the general pattern of religion as practised within their own culture. Instead, starting from the same basic point of religious belief in a broad sense they accepted a different (Christian) development and interpretation. This was inevitably and perhaps too closely linked in practice with certain European forms of cultural expression, but which in essence was not purely a matter of a particular culture, but of universal significance.

*
* *

The refugees were only a small group and at first sight might be thought insignificant. But in conclusion attention may be drawn to two points. First, it is a paradox that whereas, overseas, the story of more important official Malagasy groups who travelled abroad in the nineteenth century has long been almost lost sight of, except by academic historians, that of the flight of the refugees has been recounted for the public in several languages at intervals for

nearly 140 years (usually in terms of the story of Mary Rafaravavy, the senior member of the party and the recognized leader). Second, even the story of such a small group can raise and illustrate important issues, some of which have been only lightly touched on, while others have hardly been indicated. The small, seemingly of no great importance in itself, can gain wider and deeper significance when place within a broader context such as, for example, that of cultural contacts.

NOTES

Abbreviations : BM : Board Minutes of London Missionary Society
EM : Evangelical Magazine
FJ : Freeman and Johns.

(1) The plan of the *Cambridge History of Africa* (1975, in progress) is an example of the growing interest in such themes.

(2) The present paper is based on a section of a wider study of «Malagasy Overseas, 1500-1895». Apart from the neighbouring islands of the south-west Indian Ocean, it was to the Americas (North, South and Caribbean) that Malagasy went in the largest numbers : Hardyman : *The Madagascar Slave-Trade to the Americas, 1632-1832.* In *Océan et Méditerranée*, p. 501-521. For the 1836 Embassy, see Mondain : Des Malgaches chez Louis Philippe. For the youths, see Ayache : *Raombana.*

(3) On the basis of a first enquiry into the subject of the refugees, the writer published several articles in 1939 (see Bibliography) ; also a brief paper (dealing as well with the Malagasy youths of 1821) for the Academie Malagache (1939). The present paper incorporates new material and treats the subject in a very much more extended manner. Hitherto unpublished material from the archives of the L.M.S./C.W.M. is published by permission of the C.W.M.

A paper by H. Raharijaona *Le Sort des Chrétiens Malgaches Refugiés en Grande-Bretagne lors des Persécutions* was published in the *Bull. Académie Malgache*, année 1972. A brief account of the refugees themselves is preceded by an outline of the beginning of L.M.S. work in Madagascar and of the persecution of the Christians. This leads H. Raharijaona to raise two important points in connection with the general historiography of the period, including by implication that of the refugees. First, identical accounts are frequently given by different writers ; what then are the sources and how can they be checked ? Second, the stories are presented as the «heroic history of the first Christians», with some marvellous and sometimes improbable incidents. Again, what are the sources and how can they be critically examined ?

With respect to the second point, it is true that the story of the refugees (to take the «event» here under discussion as an example) has indeed become part of the heroic history. An examination of the sources listed in the present paper showed that in its earliest form the story both in its general outline and in detail seems to be straightforward. It does include a number of incidents which can be described as coincidences — fortunate happenings but not in themselves improbable ; and in no way comparable to the types of incidents found, for example, in such an attempt at «heroic history» as that provided by some of the «Apocryphal Gospels». Such incidents are in any case recounted in a plain manner. What has happened is that some writers (notably Rabary, the best-known Malagasy church historian) have used source-material set out at one level of interpretation, but have then introduced comments which have the effect of implying an understanding of the meaning of events at a *different* level of interpretation. This level would be called by some higher, or deeper, or broader ; but others, working with other assumptions and other criteria of «proof», would reject as outside their definition of the ambiguous term «history». In the case of Rabary, special account has to be taken of the «community» (rather than simply the «readership») for whom he wrote and of his intention to provide a sustaining and inspiring history. The manner in which he did this perhaps differs little, formally, from other histories produced during the search of certain other communities for an «identity».

The first point made about sources and their critical examination is very important. Accounts exists of what are stated to have been «historical events». But in order to judge the validity of the account, the question has to be asked : «What is the evidence and how has it been used ?» The answer in any particular case may lead to the confirmation or to a modification of the accepted account, or to a rejection of its main thesis. As for the virtually identical accounts given of the persecution, including the story of the refugees, the short answer would seem to be that for individual incidents and indeed for the general plan and interpretation of a broader event, an early writer's statement (close to some at least of the evidence) has become the first standard version. Later writers have usually not gone back to the sources but have used that early version as their main or only source, reproducing it with little change — though sometimes introducing a greater or lesser amount of «fictionalised» history which then also tends to become part of the story for the next writer. In time the original version or versions tend to become inaccessible and because of that and for other pratical reasons (such as the writer's degree of interest, purpose in writing, time, limits of space etc.) virtually identical accounts become the norm, whether presented in Malagasy, French or English. Sometimes, however, a return may be made to original sources.

H. Raharijaona also raises the question of what may have been the sources used by Rabary — who, it may be said, had the merit of making use of a variety of original sources which were available to him (mostly printed, with a small proportion of manuscript material), but who unfortunately failed to provide any critical apparatus at least for the major work *Daty Malaza*. For that work and for various articles and booklets, including accounts of the refugees, Rabary's sources seem to have consisted, mainly of the following : (a) a «standard» original version, often in English ; (b) the later, derivative «standard» versions ; (c) direct reference to a wide selection of newspaper and magazine articles etc., published at the time (especially a ready-made cuttings collection lent to him by the compiler, and wich eventually became his property ; (d) certain «standard» works on Madagascar in English and French (and one or two in Malagasy ; (e) a number of unpublished documents in Malagasy held either by himself or by others.

A study of the historiography of the refugees (which illustrates some of the above remarks) is not included here. But the references given in the List of Sources and Bibliography form a high proportion of the directly relevant material relating to them which can still be consulted. Certain material which may be presumed to exist is being searched for.

The name of Andrianisa, one of the refugees, was first used in the recent re-naming of the great majority of roads in Antananarivo. But their flight was recalled much earlier in the erection of the Protestant Church at Salazamay, Tamatave. See Ranaivo *Taribato*, p. 4, 30.

(4) For an outline of the background circumstances, the following may be consulted : HOWE : *L'Europe et Madagascar*, p. 145-226 ; Deschamps : *Histoire de Madagascar*, p. 153-171 ; Ayache : *Raombana* ; Ayache : *Esquisse pour le portrait d'une Reine*, in : *Omaly sy Anio*, 1-2, p. 251-270 ; Domenichini, Ramiaramanana : *Ranavalona 1ère et les Hainteny*, in : *Annales*, 9, p. 15-26 ; Ellis : *History of Madagascar*, vol. 2 p. 199-537 ; Ellis : *Martyr Church*, *passim*.

(5) The basic document is the refugees' own account of their chief experiences before and during the flight, as presented in the *Narrative of the Persecution of the Christians in Madagascar*, especially p. 150-270. Of the authors, David Johns arrived in Madagascar in 1826 and left in 1836. But from Mauritius he

paid brief visits up to his return to Britain in 1838 ; and again (after the publication of the *Narrative* in 1840) up to 1843. Joseph John Freeman arrived in 1827 and left in 1835.

It may be suggested that the probable broad stages of composition of this English text and of the main derivative versions in Malagasy and French may have been as follows. 1) Oral evidence in Malagasy given by the refugees in a Malagasy ambience to the former missionaries, in a style familiar in Malagasy Christian life. There would be ample opportunity to give such material to Mr and Mrs Johns on the long voyage, with further opportunities on arrival to talk not only with them but also with Mr and Mrs Freeman. The missionaries may have written much of the story down virtually as dictation (in Malagasy or in a close English version), or may have made full notes. 2) This written version was then re-written to some extent, in English, with a/ the addition of some relevant facts known from their own experience on the spot and perhaps also from later correspondence ; b/ some editorial activity in the omission of certain details as indicated in the Preface (« to avoid the danger of the narrative being made a clue» in the hands of the Government) ; and with an adaptation of style and interpretation to make the finished narrative appropriate to the missionary constituency in Britain. 3) The fullest derivative versions were produced by Rabary and Mondain, in slightly different ciscumstances: Rabary translated into Malagasy and adapted for a twentieth century Malagasy constituency the English text which, as just described, largely originated in a Malagasy original. Mondain used the English text in a similar manner, but for a French Protestant constituency, which was obviously less knowledge about conditions in Madagascar. Each treated the main source with some editorial freedom by, for example, providing extra relevant information, such as the identification of names, fear of the Government being no longer an issue. Also involved was the level of interpretation mentioned in note (3).

(6) There seems to have been criticism on the part of some that the flight was arranged not so much because the Malagasy themselves wished it but rather because one or more of the missionaries had so decided. The emphatic statement to the contrary made by Freeman and Johns (*Narrative*, p. 273) might be rejected as self-justification. But 1) a desire to escape had been expressed in correspondence by, for example, Andrianjafy as early as 1837 ; 2) there were other cases of flight before and after this particular group of refugees ; 3) they themselves took active steps when, for example, they sent messengers to Tamatave « to see whether there was any probability of their getting away from the country » (*Narrative*, p. 243).

Ramiandrahasina was a « plebeian from Avaradrano » (Ilafy) ; and a « judge and a colonel in the army », who had gained a good reputation in his post at Tamatave. See Raombana BI (10) p. 40 (FJ *Narrative*, p.271). At considerable risk he had already helped the two Christians who visited Johns at Tamatave in 1838 and who planed the escape. See also notes (55) and (67). The chief document concerning the flight from Antananarivo and the escape through Tamatave is again the account derived from the refugees in FJ *Narrative*, p. 249-270. The name of the captain, who deserves to be known was deliberately suppressed in the book, but is given by Jones (12 June 1839). The evidence of Raombana (BI (10), p. 44) is a little less precise concerning the occasion of the flight of this group of refugees, but makes it clear that Eivent was prepared to help the escape of « all » (Christians) in Tamatave ; and implies that he helped these refugees.

Probably all or most of the unidentified French residents at Ste Marie were Roman Catholics. Their sympathy suggests not only human compassion but also perhaps an interest in the (Protestant) refugees as fellow-Christians.

(7) Much information about each member of the party is given in FJ *Narrative, passim*, supplemented by references in the *Evangelical Magazine*. But some further details from local sources were supplied by Rabary publications in Malagasy from 1905 on. See, for example, *Ny Daty Malaza*, 1, pp. 20, 100 and *Rafaravavy Mary*, p. 21. The father of Rafaravavy, Andrianjaza, was a wealthy judge, whose house stood on the site of the «Maison Laborde», Andohalo, Antananarivo. Mondain (*Rafaravavy Marie*, p. 11) states that she was born in 1808, but gives no evidence ; FJ *Narrative*, p. 177 indicates that her daughter may have been born about 1827, which may imply an earlier birthdate. Rasoamaka was presented to an audience in Bristol as «one of the Royal Family (who) lost the whole of his influence and property in consequence of having embraced Christianity» ; and was thought to be between 20 and 30 years of age : *Bristol Mirror*, 21 Sept. 1839. (Thanks are due to Miss M. Thomas, of Bristol, who searched newspaper file and transcribed references to the refugees' visits. See note (17).

It is to be noted that «all adopted new names», that is, English names derived from the Bible, in addition to the original Malagasy name. The reasons for the choice of Mary and of Simeon are explicitly given in EM 1839, p. 355. It is curious that Rabary, despite the evidence of her own signature reversed the order of the names of Mary Rafaravavy ; further, in his first (1905-1906) article he evidently tried to indicate the English pronunciation through Malagasy orthography (Mery), but later reverted to the form she used herself. Mondain also reversed the names and gave a French version (Marie).

(8) In 1836 the missionaries had agreed with some of their Malagasy friends that it would be best to retire to Mauritius so as «not to exasperate the government» (FJ *Narrative*, p. 153).

David Jones was one of the first two L.M.S. missionaries who arrived in Madagascar in 1818. His colleague died of malaria almost at once, but Jones, after recuperating in Mauritius, became the doyen of the mission. He left for Britain in 1831 but in 1837 was sent out to Mauritius again. Edward Baker arrived in Madagascar in 1828 as a printer and left in 1836 for Mauritius. The position of these two missionaries in 1839 was that they had been «advised to remain at the Mauritius, waiting for an opening to return to Madagascar, and that in the mean time they be instructed to occupy themselves as much as possible in communicating religious instruction to the black population in the former island» (BM 24 June 1839). The financial help provided for the refugees in Mauritius was nearly £90. For a general account of the stay in Mauritius, see FJ *Narrative*, pp. 276-278. For the Malagasy in Mauritius, see note (66).

(9) The various arguments and comments are to be found in : Johns 19 Oct. 1838 ; Jones 20 Nov. and 8 Dec. 1838 (the latter a Private letter) ; Powell 31 Nov. 1838 ; Mrs Johns 13 Nov. 1844 ; FJ *Narrative*, pp. 276-278. After the death of Johns, Baker (27 Nov. 1843) implied that a major difficulty was caused when the Directors gave Johns «entirely personal instructions, without recognizing persons in Mauritius» — evidently a reference to the method of decision-making by some sort of committee formed by the missionaries then resident there. Later Baker apologized for the remark because of possible misunderstanding (5 Aug. 1844). But it seems likely that he would have held that his remark was certainly true if applied to the question of the refugees in 1838. The rescue of Malagasy Christians as a deliberate policy is further evidenced by, for example, FJ *Narrative*, p. 287 ; BM 20 June and 13 July 1840 ; and the special fund which the Directors allowed to be raised.

(10) At first sight it seems strange that Jones should have advanced as one reason why Johns could benefit from a visit to Europe was that he could in any case do little without a better knowledge of French — when it might be expected that Malagasy (in which Johns was fluent) was the essential language. But in an illuminating passage Baker explained the circumstances which were relevant both to Johns and to work which the refugees themselves were to take up later in Mauritius (Baker 26 Dec. 1839) :

« The fact is that the Malagasy, who have partly forgotten their mother tongue, through having remained so many years in Mauritius, do not understand very well preaching in the Malagasy language, on account of so many words introduced into the Rova vocabulary unintelligible and therefore uninteresting to them ; such as fahamarinana, righteousness ; fahamasinana, sanctification ; fanahy, soul ; helo, hell ; and many others. On this account some told Mr Jones they would prefer to hear a sermon in French, rather than in Malagasy, which induced him afterwards to preach always in French ; yet using occasionally some creole expression to make them understand better ». Baker added, however, that conversation was frequently in Malagasy. Later he wrote that he himself « never ceased to preach... in Malagasy and English » (Baker 8 Aug. 1844).

(11) Jones, 7 Dec. 1838.

(12) James Cameron was an all-round artisan missionary, 1826-1835 (and later, 1863-1875). George Chick was a blacksmith, 1822-1835. R. Kitching worked for the Mission as an « artisan » alongside the others from 1828 to 1835. Strictly, it was a special appointment and he was not one of the « missionaries » ; but because of his work and his close association with them, the technical distinction falls into the background. John Philip was Superintendent of L.M.S. work in South Africa, 1820-1850 ; a forceful figure, he became prominent in defending the rights of Africans.

The decision about the refugees is given in Philip 20 Feb. 1839 and FJ *Narrative*, pp. 281-282.

(13) The date of arrival was 25 May 1839. The meeting at Henley, taking place « within a few hours », was held on 28 May (*Missionary Register*, 1839, p. 78) ; the meeting with the Directors was reported in BM 3 June 1839.

(14). The public meeting held on 4 June 1839 was referred to in BM 27 May 1839 and FJ *Narrative*, pp. 282-283. It was very fully reported in EM 1839 pp. 351-369, where it received the same detailed treatment as was accorded the famous annual « May Meetings » of the Society, and also in *Missionary Register* 1839, pp. 287-290. The main speeches were by J.J. Freeman, A. Tidman, J. Burnet and Dr. Ross.

The welcome to the Malagasy aroused such interest that there are two points to be noted about the attendance at the meeting. First, the attendance figures. According to FJ *Narrative* p.282, « Ten thousand British voices bade them welcome to England's shores ». But that figure seems so far above the capacity of the hall that an explanation is called for. The capacity of Exeter Hall appears to have been somewhere between 3,000 and 4,500 persons (Carlile *Spurgeon*, p. 120 and Bacon *Spurgeon*, p. 5). Two suggestions may be made. Either (1) Freeman gave the figure of 10,000 in good faith as a genuine estimate, but in fact made a serious error. Or (2) he was using a deliberately exaggerated expression. That might have been based on Biblical phraseology. But as Freeman was himself acting as interpreter at the meeting, he may well have used such a figure as being a well-recognized Malagasy expression (not to be understood literally) and then repeated it when writing in English. The only

direct evidence is Tidman's reference to «these assembled thousands». The true figure was therefore close to 4,500, as being the maximum capacity. Second, even this lower figure raises a point of interest. Very few meetings devoted to the theme of Madagascar *alone* and attended by several thousand persons have ever been held outside the island. The welcome to the refugees was almost certainly the largest *indoor* meeting ever held up to that time. If it was ever equalled, it was probably only by another meeting held in the *same* building in 1883, in connection with the «Shaw affair» at Tamatave, when feelings in London ran very high.

Besides the welcome meeting, it was suggested that within L.M.S. circles «prayer meetings» in connection with Madagascar should be held (BM 10 June 1839 ; EM 1839 pp. 362-263).

(15) BM 4 June and 25 Nov. 1839 ; 17 Feb. 1840.

(16) There were three major cases of bad health among the party while they were still in Britain. Andrianomanana was described in 1840 as suffering from «an indisposition», the nature of which was not explicitly stated, but which was serious enough to lead to his premature return to Mauritius with Johns. Rasoamaka was ill during the meetings in Bristol and had to remain there for some time ; he was thought to have contracted small-pox (*Bristol Mirror*, 21 Sept. 1839 ; Wicks *History*, p. 24). But the most serious case was Sarah Razafy. She should have returned at the same time as Andrianomanana, but a doctor found that «her lungs were the seat of tubercular disease». Her condition deteriorated so much that the doctor said it was his duty «*not*» to expose her to the want of any comfort on board a ship, but to nurse her here, and relieve her as much as possible from suffering during the remainder of her days». (Evans, BM 28 Dec. 1840). Despite the gift of a «respirator» she died on 26 Dec. 1840 (not 1841, as given in Clark : *Tantara*, p. 90). Tuberculosis was evidently the chief health hazard for Malagasy visitors to Britain. Two of the youths had died of it in the 1820's. Rafaravavy was to die of it in 1848 in Mauritius. The death of Ratsarahomba in 1850 was attributed to «lung trouble» (Freeman, 11 Aug. 1850). It is possible that in each case the seeds of the trouble were sown during the stay in Britain, but no explicit evidence has been found.

(17) For the policy concerning travel, see BM 4 June 1839. The refugees visited a large number of towns, as indicated by FJ *Narrative*, p. 283 : «... many of the chapels and congregations of our country have had an opportunity of seeing one or more of the refugees...» Rasoamaka also spoke of going «to and fro» in the country (EM 1841, p. 569). No systematic statement about their travels has been found and the present list has had to be compiled from many scattered details. There may well have been other towns and some of them may have been mentioned by Rafaravavy in her note-book and by Rasoamaka (see note (37)). The list is arranged according to broad geographical areas rather than by chronology (though in many cases dates have also been found).

London :
London : Exeter Hall ; EM 1839 p. 351 ; Kings Weigh House ; EM 1841 p. 566 ; Bishopsgate ; BM 28 Oct. 1839. *Walthamstow* : see note (41) ; Henley : *Missionary Repository*, 1839, pp. 76-79 ; *Ongar :* BM 11 Jan. 1841. *Croydon :* Rabary : *Rafaravavy Mary*, pp. 43-44 ; *Dunmow :* EM Oct. 1840, p. 519. *Norwich* ; Brightwell : *So Great Love*, p. 171. *Cambridge :* BM 26 Aug. 1839. *Bristol : Bristol Mirror*, 21 Sept. 1839, 19 Sept. 1840. *Wales* ; BM 24 June 1839. *Birmingham :* Dale : *Nonconformist*, 11 Jan. 1883 ; EM Sept. 1839 p. 467. *Coventry :* Extract from autograph album of Rasoamaka. *Nottingham ; ibid. Leicester ; ibid. Doncaster ;* Clark : *Tantaran'ny Fiangonana*, p. 82n. *Hull :* BM 4 June 1839, 17 Feb. 1840. *Manchester :* BM 4 June, 17 Feb. 1840 ; Rafaravavy memento ; *Leeds :* Sewell ; *J. Sewell*, p. 35 ; Turner memento. *Newcastle-on-Tyne :* Boag : *Faith*, p. 18. For a possible visit to Scotland, see note (35).;

(18) BM, 22 July 1839.

(19) Rasoamaka and Ratsarahomba were to spend six months at the school conducted by Mr Bickerdike at Woolwich ; Andrianomanana and Andrianisa were to go to the Borough Road School (organized by the British and Foreign School Society) where the youths had attended in 1821. When these latter arrangements proved impracticable, it was thought «inexpedient to separate» the four men or to send them far from London. Advantage was therefore taken of the existence of another B.F.S.S. School at Walthamstow, organized by Mr Wittingham. However, for the last six months spent in Britain, Ratsarahomba (perhaps with one of the others also) was transferred to the establishment organized by R. Cecil at Ongar, where some future missionaries were trained. (BM 22, 29 July, 26 Aug. 1840 ; 11 Jan. 1841). Among these was David Livingstone, who had left a little more than a year before the arrival of the Malagasy (SEAVER : Livingstone, pp. 25-30). In view of the close link with Freeman, it is possible (though explicit evidence is lacking) that the Malagasy attended the ordination of Livingstone at Albion Chapel, Finsbury (London) on 20 Nov. 1840, conducted by Freeman and Cecil.

(20) The printing press was provided (on loan) by Mr Hall, one of the family with which the refugees seem to have a specially close association. See FJ *Narrative*, p. 290 and BM, 11 Oct. 1841. «Nurture is implied in the various arrangements made. Andrianomanana was baptised at Walthamstow (Maundrell, *CMS Record*, Oct. 1864, p. 232) ; Andrianisa was baptised at the Tabernacle, London, *Diary*, 1883, p. 24).

(21) BM, 11 Oct. 1841. The Malagasy «presented to the Board a copy of sundry articles they had printed while residing in Walthamstow». None of these «articles» has been preserved in the archives. However, the translation of a short tract addressed to Christians in Madagascar is given in FJ *Narrative*, pp. 290-295. There appears to be no known copy of the original Malagasy tract.

(22) The deep and continuing interest in the refugees was shown by the attendance at the farewell service in a building smaller than Exeter Hall, of which it was said that «the chapel was crowded by a most respectable auditory» ; and by the fulness of the report in EM, 1841, pp. 566-571. The refugees embarked with Mrs Johns in London on the *Thomas Snook* on 12 Oct. 1841 and after some delay at Plymouth finally left Britain on 7 Nov. (EM, 1841, pp. 578, 630).

(23) For brief references to some of their activities after leaving Britain, see later sections on Mauritius and other areas. For the death of Rafaravavy, see J. Le Brun and J.J. Le Brun, letters of 26 April 1848 and EM, 1848, pp. 554-555. For Ratsarahomba, Freeman : *Tour*, p. 371 ; Freeman, 11 Aug. 1850; and EM, 1850, pp. 678-680. For Rasoamaka, Clark : *Tantara*, p. 90, Rabary : *Daty Malaza*; II, p. 10.

(24) The method of communication with the Hottentots using Malagasy and Dutch (FJ *Narrative*, pp. 279-281) was used again in Britain, in Malagasy and English (Luke : *Early Years*, p. 127).

Ratsarahomba and Rasoamaka appear to have become the most accomplished in English while still in Britain. In 1839 Rasoamaka needed an interpreter at Bristol, but at the farewell meeting was able to speak in English (*Bristol Mirror*, 21 Sept. 1839sand EM 1841, p. 569). Andrianisa said that on arrival he could scarcely read at all in English or Malagasy ; but at the farewell meeting he said he could read in both language. Rafaravavy evidently made slower progress, though later she claimed to have some competence in English.

(25) Views about kindness and liberty are expressed, for example in the following remarks : «... a country wherein multitudes live who are kind and

compassionate... a country of liberty, where none are prohibited from praying to the Lord of life...» (from the printed letter sent to Madagascar, FJ *Narrative*, pp. 290-291 : «We see that in this country the Gospel of Christ is allowed to circulate freely» (Razafy, at the welcome meeting). Rasoamaka referred also to kindness shown, at the farewell meeting ; and the same theme appears in the letter sent by the refugees to Shagdur in Siberia (EM, 1841, p. 564).

(26) The remark about «mere curiosity» was made by Tidman at the welcome meeting (EM, 1839, p. 356).

(27) The refugees' feelings about personal relationship with their hosts indicated in their letters, as Ratsarahomba EM 1843, pp. 139-140 ; and in the letter printed for their compatriote (FJ *Narrative*, p. 291).

(28) The main documents relating to their attitude are the reports of the welcome and farewell meetings (EM, 1839, pp. 351-369 and EM, 1841, pp. 566-571), the letter in FJ *Narrative*, pp. 290-291 and that to Shagdur (see note (25)). Mrs Johns (13 Nov. 1844, implies a nuance in the refugees' private views as well as in her own : (the Queen) «is not naturally so cruel as Mr Freeman has represented her... The refugees when in England never blamed the Queen — but the Officers...» This view needs further enquiry. But it indicates a particular case of the relevance of an important theme which seems not to have been adequately studied yet : the precise part played *in fact* in decisions taken in the name of the Kings and Queens of Madagascar in the nineteenth century by those individual rulers themselves.

One expression of the refugees' concern for their fellow-Christians is to be found in the printing in London in 1840 of the Malagasy New Testament and of Luke and Acts. It was at their request that these were produced, and 50 copies were sent immediately as a first instalment to Mauritius (Darlow and Moule : *Historical Catalogue*, p. 1032).

(29) Rasoamaka at the farewell, EM, 1841, 569 ; he also said : «Your privileges make us think more and more of our countrymen», (p. 568). Other phrases illustrating the idea of service include the following : «... that education which the Society are anxious to give them to fit them for future usefulness in their Native Land» (BM, 4 June 1839). Rasoamaka said of himself and Rafaravavy : «Be it where it may, if there is but a place for us we will go there to teach those of our country» (EM, 1843, p. 50 ; letter dated April 1842). The appointment of Rasoamaka and Andrianomanana as teachers is given in BM, 13 Sept. 1841 ; Andrianisa and Rafaravavy were also to be remunerated.

(30) No further information is available about the husband of Rafaravavy. Evidently the couple did not meet when she was on the west coast in 1842. Razafy's husband, Andrianilaina, remained a prominent worker alongside the refugees after their return. As for the wives who remained in Madagascar, Baker said (12 April 1839) that he was forwarding letters from them. Razanaka, wife of Andrianomanana, had been an invalid and on that account he had decided at one time that he would not try to escape abroad. (FJ *Narrative*, p. 285 ; Rabary : *Daty Malaza*, p. 105). But, as was reported by Ratsarahomba, she herself reached Tamatave in 1842 in an attempt to escape. A ship's captain was willing to take her and her companions. The attempt failed as, in the circumstances, the only way to reach the ship was by swimming and only one, Ravita, could swim and was taken to Mauritius (EM, 1843, p. 242). The later history of Razanaka is unknown, as is that of Rasoa, wife of Rasoamaka (Rabary *Daty Malaza*, p. 105). Raminahy, wife of Ratsarahomba, had for a time been children's nurse in the home of David Griffiths. She was one of the party of Christians who were arrested when they tried to escape in 1840 and was be-

headed in Antananarivo on 9 July 1841, Rabary : *Daty Malaza*, p. 111 ; EM, Dec. 1840, p. 623.

(31) There is no reference to the refugees in PALMER Index to the TIMES for that quarter. In Walthamstow there was at that time no local paper in which the visit might have been reported (A.R. Hatley, letter to J.T. Hardyman, 1 Aug. 1945).

(32) The magazines referred to contained so much material on the work of overseas missions (notably missionaries' letters, public addresses and book reviews) that their readers were able to acquire an unexpectedly wide-ranging and detailed knowledge of many parts of the world. For references to the interest aroused in the refugees, see, for example, EM 1939, p. 351 ; FJ *Narrative*, p. 283 (« ... everywhere a lively interest has been created in their favour ») ; Rafaravavy also said : « ... here among you... I have witnessed the zeal and interest felt on behalf of my country » (EM 1841, p. 570). In Bristol statements by Rafaravavy at a meeting «exerted the most lively interest» (*Bristol Mirror*, 26 Sept. 1840). Again, it was reported that a « Working Man » who has been a penny-a-week subscriber to the L.M.S., after reading of the welcome meeting, sent no less than £5 as a special donation (*Missionary Register*, 1839, pp. 488-489).

(33) Particular interest attaches to the request from Clunie, of Manchester (BM 4 June 1839). The last of his Malagasy pupils (later known as Raombana and Rahaniraka) had returned to Madagascar in 1828. Though there is no positive evidence, it is possible that they continued to correspond until the missionaries left in 1836. But the alacrity with wich Clunie requested a visit by the refugees so many years after his previous direct contact with any Malagasy shows his continuing interest in the link with Madagascar. There may have been a similar continuing interest displayed by Rev. J. Blackburn, who took part in the welcome meeting, if it could be shown that he was the J. Blackburn with who the Malagasy in Manchester in the 1820's were especially friendly.

(34) Sibree *Recollections*, p. 73.

(35) An approximate estimate of the money involved may be gained from scattered references in the lists of contributions to the funds of the Society in the *Annual Reports* and from certain other references. Contributions which were in some way linked with the presence of the refugees in Britain were made for four main purposes. 1) For the support of the refugees while in Britain over £230 was given ; just over £104 of this total came from Walthamstow. The number of contribution from Scotland may indicate a visit there. 2) For the «rescue» of Malagasy Christians Freeman and Johns collected £100, to which they added £250, representing profits from the sale of the *Narrative*. The money went towards the repayment of a loan of £500 granted at Freeman's request by the Society as «an amount adequate to the expense involved in the rescue of native Christians now in danger of martyrdom». (BM 20 June, 13 July 1840). 3) For the support of the refugees who were to serve as e.g. teachers on their return to Mauritius. A main contribution for this purpose came from Leeds (£64.14s.) and was later used to train Ramiandrahasina (see note (67)). The general funds also benefitted in two ways : first by the collections taken at the welcome meeting (when the sum of £120.3s.2d. was regarded as « ... affording a strong proof of the sterling character of the interest felt on this occasion) ; and at the farewell meeting (£40). And second, by the stimulus to contribute to the general funds. The value of these sums may be approximately gauged in present-day terms by the statement that a passage to Madagascar might cost up to £50 per person (BM 13 Sept. 1841).

(36) Gifts in kind were provided by «Ladies» in, for example, Ramsgate, Southampton, Doncaster and Brighton and in some cases, at least, were evidently stimulated by direct contact. They consisted chiefly of «wearing apparel and other useful articles» (e.g. EM 1841, p. 579). Bibles were provided by the British and Foreign Bible Society ; a letter of thanks from the refugees to the Society is printed in *Missionary Register*, 1839, pp. 414-415.

(37) The desire for mementoes was expressed on both sides. a/ of the Malagasy, at least one, Rasoamaka, had an autograph album. It passed into the possession of J. Duffus and still existed at the turn of the century ; but on enquiry by J.T. Hardyman it was no longer to be found in the 1940's. It is not clear whether the note-book kept by Rafaravavy also doubled as an autograph album. It was first referred to by Rabary in 1913 and a few lines are photographically reproduced on the cover of his booklet on her. The writer does not know where this note-book now is nor even whether it still exists. b/ The Malagasy may well have contributed to other people's albums ; one such example is the page written by Rafaravavy at Bristol (see note (45)). Rafaravavy also wrote in the fly-leaf of a Bible (Griffiths in *Chronicle*, 1931, p. 152) c/ a more personal memento was a lock of her hair given by Rafaravavy to Miss E.A. Turner in Leeds in 1839. With an explanatory note this eventually came into the possession of E.C. Baker, who left it in a safe in Antananarivo. It was last seen by the present writer about 1947. An attempt to verify its present whereabouts has not yet succeeded.

(38) See references in note (17) concerning Birmingham (Dale) ; Hull (Sibree) ; Leeds (Sewell). Prout, in *Madagascar and its Martyrs*, p. 28, may also have been speaking personally in referring to « the well-remembered Rafaravavy ».

(39) At the age of 93, in 1926, Mrs Harriet Johnson, of London, wrote in a letter of the important place which « Madagascar » held in her « memories... of early days »... « I knew Rafravary and Sara » (*sic*). A further reference to visits to London with Freeman suggests that she lived at the time at Walthamstow. It has not been possible to trace an article she wrote in 1926 about these links with Madagascar.

(40) The views of the Missionary Society and of its supporters was indicated by various speakers at the welcome meeting (EM 1839, pp. 351-369). See also EM 1841, pp. 567-568 ; Philip, 20 Feb. 1839 ; BM 3 June 1938 ; FJ *Narrative*, p. 283.

(41) Freeman was closely linked with the refugees in three main roles : as a former missionary, who knew them (except perhaps Andrianisa) in Madagascar ; as *minister* of the church with which they were connected in Walthamstow ; and as a *Secretary* of the Missionary Society (a post which he accepted in 1841 in addition to his duties at the church).

The British and Foreign School which the refugees attended was held in two rooms built at the back of the church. The Lancastrian method of instruction was followed. In taking pupils from overseas the school was following the practice of the Society's main school in London. (Letters of 5 and 10 April 1939 to J.T. Hardyman from J. Brightman, of Walthamstow, writing from experience as a B.F.S.S. teacher 1874-1880). It is difficult to estimate the extent to which the refugees when teaching later in Mauritius and, briefly, in Madagascar may have been influenced by the method used in Walthamstow.

Cash contributions from Walthamstow at the time totalled £104, compared with just over £126 for the rest of the country. See note (31). For the baptism see note (20). A brief account of the refugees in Walthamstow is given by Budden : *Marsh-Street*, pp. 46-48.

(42) The importance attached to the funeral of Razafy can be judged by the decision that no less than « six members of the Southern Committee, together with the officers of the Society, and all the Society's Missionaries now in London, be invited to attend ». In the event, « a large concourse » attended, including several Directors and four missionaries. Addresses were given by Freeman and Knill ; and a further address was given in the church on 3 Jan. 1841. (BM 28 Dec. 1840 and 11 Jan. 1841). An extended obituary was published in EM, 1841, pp. 99-101. A number of those attending the funeral had links with Madagascar. Five were themselves Malagasy. Three (Mr and Mrs Freeman and Mrs Johns) had been missionaries (and it is possible that some of

their children, born in Madagascar, also attended). The sister of Knill was married first to Hovenden, who had died as a missionary in Antananarivo, and then to his colleague Chick. G. Bennet had visited Madagascar as an L.M.S. Deputation in 1828.

Razafy was buried, as though she were a relative, in the family tomb of J. Hale at Walthamstow. The inscription reads : Razafy/A Christian Refugee/ From Madagascar/who fell asleep on/ 26 Dec. 1840. The inscription is now hardly legible (cf. Hanson : *The Congregational Churches*, pp. 9, 14). The condition of the graveyard, including the Hale tomb, has seriously deteriorated ; its future, under development plans, is uncertain. (Letters to J.T. Hardyman : from A.J. Hatley, 21 July 1969 ; from C.H. Tebboth, 24 Jan. 1969, 16 Oct. 1975, 21 June 1977).

(43) For example, Rafaravavy and Ratsarahomba corresponded with Miss Hall (and possibly with other friends) ; cf. EM 1845, pp. 599-600.

(44) Miss Hall and others in Walthamstow sent gifts for the erection of the Memorial Churches ; cf. EM 1863 p. 21).

(45) The document was written by Rafaravavy during her visit to Bristol in September 1840 (cf. note (37)). It consists of a page taken from the autograph album of her host J. Jack. Because of the link with the refugees it was presented to Marsh Street Church, Walthamstow about 1817, when the wife of the minister was a member of the Jack family. (Letter of H.R. Moxley to J.T. Hardyman, 10 Oct. 1945 and reproduction of the document in Budden *Marsh Street*, opposite p. 47 and details there given). The document seems not to have been seen for many years.

(46) Articles by J.T. Hardyman in *Walthamstow Guardian*, 9 June 1939 and in *Marsh Street Magazine*, June and July 1939.

(47) A very large stone was found years later in the garden of the house once occupied by Freeman. It came to be regarded as the «Madagascar Stone» and was preserved at the entrance to the Church. The refugees are not to be directly linked to the stone. But it is probable that the interest in their story helped to create the psychological climate in which the hypothesis about the stone was accepted. The matter was examined in articles by J.T. Hardyman in *Walthamstow Guardian*, 14 July 1939 and *Marsh Street Magazine*, Oct. 1939. The theory that it came from Madagascar is not probable, particularly in the light of expert geological evidence. The stone was destroyed when the church was demolished.

(48) The main addresses were, of course, those given at the welcome and farewell meetings in London (see notes (14) and (22)).

(49) The most important prose work was the *Narrative* by Freeman and Johns. cf. the comment in the anonymous review in EM July 1840 p. 326 : «... will be read very extensively and with profound interest... such a work cannot fail to create a powerful sensation in the minds of all friends of Christian missions». It unexpectedly produced an effect in Siberia.

(50) There were the various notes and letters in e.g. the *Evangelical Magazine* ; and, for children, in the *Missionary Repository*. There appears to have been a pamphlet in two parts of 8 pages each, entitled *Escapes of Rafaravavy*. It is probable that Mrs Luke was the writer. It is likely to have been one of the series of «Missionary Stories» published by Snow ; but there seems to be no known copy.

(51) For example, there were poems by C.R. in *Missionary Repository*, 1840, pp. 23-24 ; by E.M.I. *ibid.* 1843, pp. 177-178 ; by J.J. Freeman in EM 1840, p. 17 ; by J. Edmeston in (Anon.) *Madagascar and its Martyrs* (1842).

(52) The refugees were included as the fourth episode in Hatley *Light Must Shine*, a pageant of local (i.e. Walthamstow) episodes in L.M.S. history. (Performed at Walthamstow 24 Oct. 1945).

(53) George Baxter invented a method of colour-printing in oils which yielded some fine prints, many of which concerned overseas (largely missionary) subjects. (The subject of the pictorial representation of the refugees is reserved for separate treatment).

(54) The tablet was erected in Highbury Congregational Chapel, Bristol. It has been held, probably correctly, that its existence owed much to the visits of the refugees to Bristol (1839 and 1840). For example, «The whole story made such a profound impression in Bristol that when Highbury Chapel was built in 1842-1843... a tablet was erected in honour of Rasalama and those who similarly suffered». (Wicks : *Bristol Missionary Society*, p. 25 ; followed by Lloyd *Bristol and the L.M.S.* p. 3 ; cf. Ayres : *Highbury Story*, p. 94). In fact, however, the tablet was not placed in the church until several years later. The exact date is not given in the church-records ; but as the tablet refers to the Malagasy Christians put to death in 1849 the probable date would be about 1850 (and certainly before 1857, the date of the next major persecution, as there is no reference to the events of that time). The building has been sold. The tablet was removed and stored elsewhere. It may have been mislaid, as it is reported that when it was required several years ago, it could not be found.

(55) Raombana B1 (10), pp. 40-44. A reward of 1000 bullocks was offered to any captain who would bring Ramiandrahasina back to Madagascar (Le Brun 1 July 1846).

(56) Raombana B 1 (10), p. 50. Freeman believed that the penalty would be «that of being burned alive». (EM 1841, p. 568).

(57) Jones 12 June 1839, Powell 31 Nov. 1839 ; Raombana B 1 (10), p. 154. A letter from Mrs Johns (26 Sept. 1843) is of interest, first because she was prepared to deal directly with Ranavalona in the matter of the refugees ; and also because two of the Malagasy who had been trained in Britain in the 1820's were brought into the transaction, namely, Raombana and Rahaniraka, the Queen's Secretaries. Mrs Johns said she «desired the Twin brothers to tell her everything we had done as regards the Refugees &c &c». This implies some change in the official reaction as also does the way in which Rafaravavy (in connection with a letter about Johns) «was anxious to sign her name and I told the Brothers — if they thought it best — to scratch it out and only send my name...» (Mrs Johns, *ibid*).

(58) Jones 2 Jan. 1839. He had been asked to translate the letter, which is referred to by Raombana B1 (10), p. 44.

(59) Raombana *ibid*. pp. 44, 47-54. For similar correspondence concerning 1840, see pp. 157-160.

(60) John Le Brun served as an L.M.S. missionary in Mauritius, 1814-1833. His statuts then changed to that of minister of the church in Port Louis ; but in 1841 he was given new respondability as an «agent» of the L.M.S. He was concerned with Madagascar from the time of his arrival. In 1845 he said he had «a great mind» to go with the refugees to work in Madagascar ; but it was never possible to carry out that plan (Le Brun 9 July 1845).

(61) The references to work in Madagascar (as also for Mauritius and the Comoro Islands) are only illustrative. See, for example, 6 Oct. 1838 ; Rasoamaka and Rafaravavy EM 1843, pp. 241-242 ; Ratsarahomba EM 1843, pp. 242-243 ; Johns, and Rasoamaka, EM 1843, pp.529-530 ; Mrs Johns 3 Jan. 1843 ; Journal of Ratsarahomba 1847 ; Ratsarahomba EM 1848, p. 152 ; Rabary : *Ny Daty Malaza* vol. 1, p. 140 ; Boudou : *Les Jésuites*, vol. 1 pp. 268-270.

(62) In the early years of the L.M.S. mission, internal ecclesiastical authority (as distinct from pressures exerted by, for example, Radama) rested locally with the missionaries and ultimately with the Directors. One example of Malagasy «converts» exercising authority within a particular sphere of responsibility was that of the teachers. Certain «natural leaders», with added moral

authority derived from their Christian character, came to the fore within the Christian community, Rafaravavy among them.

Some of the refugees while still in Britain were appointed by the Directors to special posts. In Mauritius, changes in appointments seem to have depended chiefly on the missionaries there present and on J. Le Brun. With respect to work in Madagascar, Le Brun thought at one time that the refugees would do better if there were «a head to direct them» and had hoped that he himself would be such a leader (Le Brun 9 July 1845). But when they were in fact on their own, as indicated, he respected their position (Le Brun 24 Oct. 1845, 2 Oct. 1847). But while he and others could show confidence and be quick to praise, this did not mean that they could not also, when they thought it appropriate, express hesitation and criticism. For example, Baker wrote of a case of unseemly conduct ; of incapacity (perhaps due to ill-health) ; of what he thought a decline in zeal (perhaps due to disappointment). But alongside these remarks was «the highest testimony» given to another» and «great confidence in the sterlingness» of the «work and piety» of yet another. (Baker, 27 Nov. 1843).

The responsible posts held and the work achieved by the refugees (together with e.g. Ramiandrahasina) might qualify at least some of them to be regarded as the first Malagasy «evangelists», who later became very prominent in the ecclesiastical organization as being concerned with sustaining and extending Christian work in a large area, often far from their base. In this way they carried out the words of Burnet at the welcome meeting, who told the audience that the European missionaries having left, the refugees would be «your ready Missionaries» (EM 1839, p. 359). On the other hand, it has been claimed by the present writer that the «first Malagasy (Protestant) evangelist» was Rabesihanaka (cf. centenary of 1967, Hardyman : *Rabesihanaka*). The apparent discrepancy is resolved by the fact that the work undertaken by the refugees could be described as «mission appointment» ; whereas Rabesihanaka was the first a/ to have been sponsored by a local Malagasy Church (though with help from the L.M.S.) ; b/ to have been sent to work not on the central plateau (where he had been preceded by one worker south of Antananarivo), but in a distant area, in a different community.

(63) An outline of the simple organization of local Christian communities during the period of persecution is given by Ellis *Madagascar Revisited*, pp. 233-236.

(64) Mrs Johns, 3 Jan. 1843. The career of Andrianisa is summarized in *Ny Diary Malagasy*, 1883, pp. 24-25 ; *Ny Daty Malaza*, vol. IV, pp. 80-81 ; the high regard in which he was officially held is indicated in *Madagascar Times*, 22 Oct. 1887, p. 309.

(65) Emphasis has been laid on the desire of the refugees to serve their fellow-countrymen, whether in Madagascar or elsewhere. There is no reason to doubt their sincerity, which is further substantiated by what they achieved. On the other hand, Baker had to report to the L.M.S. Secretaries (8 Aug. 1844) that some Malagasy including Ratsarahomba, Rafaravavy and Andrianomanana «... are often asking me if I cannot take them with me when I finally leave, to Australia». Such a request he could not agree to as, in addition to the expense involved, he realized «the odium of having removed them from their proper sphere of missionary usefulness». The reference in Baker's letter is too brief to make it possible to judge fairly the motives and intentions of the refugees concerned. Presumably the enjoyable and useful experience in Britain must have played some part.

(66) There was a large Malagasy community in Mauritius said by Freeman in 1841 to be «not less than 20,000», presumably a correction of his own statement a year before (FJ *Narrative*, p. 270) that there were «not fewer than 10,000...». They fell into two categories. First, those who themselves, or whose parents, had been introduced as slaves and remained such until emancipation. Second, 700-800 immigrant labourers. «Numerous veesels had been

sent from Mauritius to carry those who wished to emigrate. «... although the Queen has not given her consent to their transit, vast numbers are willing to avail themselves of the opportunity of settling as free labourers... and it is expected that some thousands will become located there in that capacity». That «large body of Malagasy, beyond the power and threats and cruelty of the Queen will come under the Christian instruction» of the refugees. (Freeman, in : EM 1841, p. 568).

Freeman indicated their status as being that of «*native teachers* ; not ordained Missionaries». The distinction is related to that between the European ordained missionaries and their artisan colleagues, special training being required for ordination. The description of the refugees as «ready Missionaries» (quoted in note (62) was evidently a general reference.

It was of course realized that work within the large Malagasy community would not necessarily be easy. For example, Jones and Baker indicated (26 Dec. 1939) that they had «been able to persuade but a few to attend the schools and preaching of the gospel. Many certainly did attend, more from curiosity than anything else, during the short stay of the Malagasy Christians in November 1838. After they were gone Andrianilaina endeavoured to keep them together and to teach them, but they all left him except two». cf. note (10).

(67) Ratsarahomba gives glimpses of his religious work, and teaching ofliteracy in French, Malagasy and English, in EM 1843, pp. 139, 242 ; 1845 p. 600. Rafaravavy's work at Moka is referred to in Freeman : *Tour*, p. 275 ; Johns, 27 May 1843 ; Le Brun, 26 Nov. 1844 ; Rafaravavy in : EM 1845, p. 600. Andrianomanana is mentioned at a late date in *CMS Record*, Oct. 1864, p. 232. Ellis (*Three Visits*, p. 68) recalls Rafaravavy's work at Moka, but curiously fails to say whether he had or had not met Andrianomanana and Andrianisa during his visits to Mauritius. Despite absence in France for health reasons during much of 1840, it seems more probable than not that Ellis met the refugees in Britain, especially as he had so recently published his *History of Madagascar*.

Of the other Malagasy Christians associated with the refugees in work in Mauritius (and elsewhere), the most able was probably Ramiandrahasina (see notes (6) and (55). Le Brun described him as «a very cleaver (*sic*) man, yea a man of superior ability» (Le Brun 1 July 1846). After arriving in Mauritius he was employed «acquiring such knowledge in the art of printing and bookbinding as may be, it is hoped, of very essential service in the future strategy of the mission...» (FJ *Narrative*, p. 273). A year later he was given an official position, as reported by Baker (17 Dec. 1840) : «The Malagasy are coming in considerable numbers. Not less than 500 are here already... Ramiandrahasina is to be appointed superintendent and guardian of them, in the Police Department». Probably he would not have had the linguistic qualifications needed for this post were it not for the fact that a sum of over £60 which had been raised in Leeds as a result of interest shown in the refugees whom Ramiandrahasina had himself helped to escape was used in Mauritius to pay for his training in French and English. In 1846 Le Brun said that he was «an interpreter in the Inland department» (4 July 1846). Later he worked among the Malagasy in the Comoro Islands.

(68) For brief indications of major groups of Malagasy in the Comoro Islands, linked with Andriantsoly and Ramanetaka, who in turn fled there, see Grandidier *Histoire Politique*, vol. 1, pp. 204-210, 252-253, 265-266 ; *Firaketana*, s.v. Andriantsoly. For work in the Islands, see BM 20 June 1840 ; Johns 13 May 1841 ; Le Brun 25 Sept. 1843, 24 Oct. 1845, 2 Oct. 1847, 12 Jan. 1848.

(69) See note (12).

(70) The L.M.S. mission in Siberia is briefly described by Lovett : *History*, 2. pp. 585-600. Shagdur is mentioned in the L.M.S. *Annual Report*, 1840, p. 68 : «The native assistant Shagdur exerts himself with unabated zeal for the

evangelization of his countrymen. In March last he accompanied Mr Swan to the district town, Udinsk, where he remained after the departure of Mr S. (*sic*) to preach the Gospel,.

The closure of the mission and the departure of the missionaries, which strengthened Shagdur's fellow-feeling for the Malagasy, are reported in the *Annual Report* for 1841, pp. 73-74 : « ... by a decree of the Russian synod, confirmed by the Emperor, the Society's Mission... has been suppressed. The cause assigned for this intolerable proceeding was that the Mission, in its relation to that form of Christianity already established in the empire, did not coincide with the views of the church and government». Shagdur's letter is published (in an English version) in EM 1841, pp. 563-564. Dated January 1841, it was presumably brought by Swan, who arrived in Britain on 20 June 1841. He was evidently the translator of that letter and also of the reply dated Oct. 1841, sent by the refugees (EM 1841, pp. 563-564). There is no evidence about what happened to the original letters. See also letters from Swan 10 July and 23 Nov. 1841.

SOURCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

Note : unless otherwise indicated, English titles were published in London French titles in Paris ; Malagasy titles in Antananarivo.

I – ARCHIVES

A. Archives of the London Missionary Society (Council for World Mission : C.W.M.)

Board Minutes (B.M.) : 1839-1841.
Africa Correspondence : Incoming Letters : 1839.
Home Correspondence : Incoming Letters : 1840-1841.
Mauritius Correspondence : Incoming Letters : 1838-1850.

Note : apart from Philip (Africa) and Swan (Home) all overseas letters addressed to the L.M.S., cited simply by the name of the writer, come from the Mauritius correspondence.

B. Hardyman J.T. : Personal Correspondence

Letters to and from : Brightman J., 1937-1939 ; Hatley A.J., 1969 ; Hatley A.R., 1945 ; Moxley H.R., 1945 ; Tebbott C.H., 1969-1977.

C. Refugees' Documents

Mary Rafaravavy : Notebook. See note (50)
Joseph Rasoamaka : Autograph album. See note (37).

II – PRINTED

A. *General Background*

AYACHE S. Raombana l'historien. Fianarantsoa, 1976.

AYACHE S. Esquisse pour le Portrait d'une Reine. In : *Omaly sy Anio*, 1-2, 1976, pp. 251-270.

DOMENICHINI-RAMIARAMANANA, Ranavalona 1ère et les Hainteny. In : *Annales, Univ. Madagascar*, Letter, Antananarivo N° 9, 1968, pp. 11-45.

ELLIS W., History of Madagascar, 1838, vol. 2.

ELLIS W., The Martyr Church, 1870.

GRANDIDIER G., Madagascar : Histoire Politique et Coloniale, 1952, t.1.

HOWE S.E., L'Europe et Madagascar, 1938.

MONDAIN G., Des Malgaches chez Louis Philippe, Antananarivo, 1928.

B. *Primary and other Special Sources*

ANON., Special General Meeting of the London Missionary Society. In : *Evangelical Magazine* (EM), 1939, pp. 351-362.

ANON., Report. In : *Bristol Mirror*, (Bristol), 21 Sept. 1839 ; 26 Sept. 1840.

ANON., Report. In : *Bristol Mercury* (Bristol), 21 Sept. 1839 ; 26 Sept. 1840.

ANON., Illness and Death of Razafy (Sarah), one of the Christian Refugees from Madagascar. In : EM 1841, pp. 99-101.

ANON., Razafy, or Sarah, a Malagasy (*sic*). In : *Missionary Repository for Youth*, 1841, pp. 37-39.

ANON., Valedictory Service on the Departure of the Malagasy Refugees. In : EM 1841, pp. 566-571.

ANON., Madagascar and its Martyrs, 1842.

ANON., J. Andrianisa. In : *Ny Diary Malagasy*, 1883, pp. 24-25.

ANON., Tantaran'Ingahy Andriambahiny. In : *Teny Soa*, 1892, pp. 137-140.

ANON., Andrianisa J. in : *Firaketana*, 1940, vol. 2, pp. 137-138.

ANON., Andrianomanana S. in : *Firaketana*, 1940, vol. 2, p. 142.

AYRES W.F., The Highbury Story, Bristol, 1963.

BACON, C.H. Spurgeon, 1967.

BATEMAN C.H., The Refugees. In : *Children's Missionary Newspaper*, 1844, pp. 34-35.

BOAG L., Faith's Transcendent Power. Newcastle upon Tyne, 1945.

BOUDOU A., Les Jésuites à Madagascar, 1942, t. 1.

BRIGHTWELL C.L., So Great Love. 1874.

BUDDEN H.D., The Story of Marsh Street Congregational Church, Walthamstow, Margate, 1923.

BURNET J., Address, In : EM 1841, pp. 359-361.

CARLILE J.C., C.H. Spurgeon. 1933.

Children's Missionary Newspaper, 1843-1844.

CLARK H.E., Joseph S. Sewell, 18.

C.R., Poem (addressed to Andrianomanana and Rafaravavy). In : *Missionary Repository for Youth*, 1840, p. 24.

DALE. R.W., Adress, In : *Noncoformist and Independent*, 11 Jan. 1883.

DARLOW T.H. & MOULE H.F., Historical Catalogue of the Printed Editions of Holy Scriptures in the Library of the BFBA. 1903.

EDMESTON J., Sonet on Rafaravavy. In : ANON. Madagascar and its Martyrs. 1842.

E.M.I., The Embarkation of the Malagasy Christians. (Poem). In : *Missionary Repository for Youth*, 1843, pp. 177-178.

E.M.J., The Meeting of the Hottentots and the Malagasy, 1838. In : Madagascar and its Martyrs, p. 70.

Evangelical Magazine, 1838-1851. This title is used to cover also the part of each issue entitled «Missionary Chronicle». Abbreviated as : EM.

FREEMAN J.J., Address. In : EM 1839, pp. 352-256 ; 1841, pp. 568, 570-571.

FREEMAN J.J., A Hymn for the Malagasy Refugees. Supposed by them to be addressed to British Christians. In : EM 1840, p. 17.

FREEMAN J.J., A Tour in South Africa. 1851.

FREEMAN J.J. & JOHNS D., Narrative of the Persecution of the Christians of Madagascar, 1840. Abbreviated as : FJ *Narrative*.

GRIFFITHS R., Some of my Bibles. In : *Chronicle*, 1931, pp. 151-152.

HANSON S., LAW A.D. & TONKIN W.G.S. The Congregational Church and Burial Ground at Marsh Street Watlhamstow. 1969.

HARDYMAN J.T., The Stone in the Corner. In : *Marsh Street Magazine*, Oct. 1937.

HARDYMAN J.T. Walthamstow Refugees a Century ago. In : *Walthamstow Guardian*, 9 June 1939.

HARDYMAN J.T. Refugees at Marsh Street. In : *Marsh Street Magazine*, June & July 1939.

HARDYMAN J.T. Refugees from Madagascar. In : *Observer*, 9 July 1939.

HARDYMANSJ.T. Walthamstow's Ancestral Altar from Madagascar. In : *Walthamstow Guardian*, 14 July 1939.

HARDYMAN J.T. Stone from Madagascar. In : *Notes and Queries*, 15 July 1939.

HARDYMAN J.T. Les Malgaches en Angleterre. Communication to the Academie Malgache, 1939.

HARDYMAN J.T. Ny Kristiana Malagasy Nandositra ny Fanenjehana ka tonga hatrany Angletera. In : *Mpanolotsaina*, Oct. 1939, pp. 180-185.

HATLEY A.R. Light Must Shine, 1945.

HATLEY A.R. Madagascar in Walthamstow. In : *Chronicle*, 1956, p. 27.

JEFFERSON, Address. In : EM 184.1, pp. 167-168.

JOHNS D. The Malagasy at Mauritius. In : EM 1842, pp. 569-569.

JOHNS D. Expulsion of the Native Teachers, Rafaravavy and Joseph, from Nosimitsio by the French. In : EM 1843, pp. 529-530 ; cf. *Missionary Repository for Youth*, 1843, pp. 78-79.

LLOYD H.C. Bristol and the London Missionary Society. Bristol. 1848.

LUKE J. Escapes of Rafaravavy. See note (50).

LUKE J. Early Years of My Life. 1900.

M.F. Have You Seen the Malagasy Christians ? In : *Missionary Repository & for Youth*, 1839, pp. 76-79.

Madagascar Times. Antananarivo. 22 Oct. 1887.

MAUNDREEL H. Letter In CMS *Record*. Oct. 1864, p. 232.

Missionary Register, 1839.

Missionary Repository for Youth, 1840-1843.

MONDAIN G. Un siècle de Mission Protestante à Madagascar. 1920. cf. RABARY : Ny Martiora Malagasy.

MONDAIN G. Rafaravavy Marie (1808-1848).

PALMER. Index to the Times. 1829.

PROUT E. Madagascar : Its Mission and Its Martyrs. 1st ed. (Anonymous), 1863.

RABARY. Rafaravavy Mery. In : *Mpanolotsaina*, Oct. 1905, pp. 210-227 ; Jan. 1906, pp. 26-42.

RABARY. Ny Martiora Malagasy. Edition of 1913.

RABARY. Ny Daty Malaza. 1929-1930. Vols. 1-2.

RABARY. Rafaravavy Mary. 1932.

RAFARAVAVY. Letter to Shagdur. In : EM, 1841, pp. 563-564.

RAFARAVAVY et al. Letter to Malagasy Christians. In : Freeman & Johns, Narrative, pp. 290-295. See note ( ).

RAFARAVAVY et al. Letter. In : EM 1843, pp. 49-50.

RAFARAVAVY AND RASOAMAKA. Letter. In : EM 1843, pp. 241-242.

RAHARIJAONA H. Ireo Kristiana Malagasy Nandositra tany Angletera noho ny Fanenjehana tamin'ny Andron-dRanavalona Reniny. Address given at Ambohitantely, Antananarivo, 26 March 1972.

RAHARIJAONA H. Le Sort des Chrétiens Malgaches Refugiés en Grande Bretagne lors des Persécutions. In : Bull. de l'Académie Malgache, t.L-II, Année 1972, (1973), pp. 1-4.

RAOMBANA. History of Madagascar. Duplicated edition of AYACHE S. : Section B1.10.

RASOAMAKA. Letter. In : EM 1843, pp. 50-51.

RASOAMAKA & ANDRIANILAINA. Letter. In : EM July 1851, pp. 31-32. cf. *Madras Christian Instructor*, Madras, Sept. 1851, pp. 358-359.

RATSARAHOMBA. Letters. In : EM 1843, pp. 139-140 ; 1845, pp. 599-600; 1850, pp. 543-544' 718.

ROSS. Address. In : EM 1839, pp. 361-362.

SEAVER G. David Livingstone. 1951.

SHAGDUR. Letter to Refugees. In : EM 1841, pp. 562-563.

SIBREE J. Fifty Years Recollections of Hull. Hull. 1884.

TIDMAN A. Address. In : EM 1839, pp. 356-358.

WICKS G.H. The Bristol Missionary Society. Bristol. 1912.

C. *Other Versions of the History of the Refugees*

(Note : page references are given only for articles)

ANON. The Malagasy Refugees. In : *News from Afar*, 1835, pp. 53-54.

ARNOLD-FOSTER F. Heralds of the Cross. 3rd ed. 1885.

CLARK H.E. Tantaran'ny Fiangonana eto Madagasikara. 1887.

ELLIS W. Faithful into Death. 1876.

EPPLER C.F. Madagaskar. Gutersloh. 1874.

FLETCHER J.J.K. The Sign of the Cross in Madagascar. 1901.

GARLICK P.L. Pioneers of the Kingdom. Part III. 1935.

GRIFFITH R. Children of Madagascar. ND.

HUTCHINGS E.M. Talks on Builders of the Kingdon. 1929.

MEARS J.W. The Story of Madagascar. Philadelphia. 1873.

MONDAIN G. Rafaravavy, Une Chrétienne en Exil à l'île Maurice. In : *L'Ami des Missions*, 1904, pp. 10-11.

SHARMAN A. The Martyrs' Isle. 1909.