

was at his instance that the House added the all important words, "or to the people."

Mr. Boutell was given free access to an extremely valuable collection of Sherman MSS. collected by Senator Hoar of Massachusetts. One memorandum he prints in *fac simile*, which Sherman handed to Madison during the debate on the bill to establish the first Bank of the United States. It states in a few words the argument afterwards elaborated by Chief Justice Marshall in the great case of *McCulloch vs. Maryland*. The book is also enriched by a number of family stories which tradition has preserved. The best of them is told in connection with a visit which Washington once made at Sherman's house. As he rose to go, Mehetabel Sherman, a girl of twelve (and afterwards the mother of William M. Evarts, of New York), ran to open the front door for him. Putting his hand kindly on her head as he passed out, Washington said, "You deserve a better office, my little lady." "Yes, sir," she replied with a curtsey, "to let you in."

Mr. Boutell has preferred a topical rather than a chronological arrangement of his material, and it is doubtful whether Sherman's was a character that can be best treated in that manner. He tells his story clearly, however, and without padding, and although the work bears some evidence of haste in its preparation it is one of substantial value to the historical student.

SIMEON E. BALDWIN.

*George Washington.* By WOODROW WILSON. (New York: Harper and Brothers. 1897. Pp. ix, 333.)

*The True George Washington.* By PAUL LEICESTER FORD. (Philadelphia: The J. B. Lippincott Co. 1896. Pp. 317.)

HERE are two volumes on the Father of his Country, written by two very clever authors, appearing simultaneously, but treating their subjects very differently. Professor Wilson, by a brilliant summing up of the claims of his hero, has justified the crowning of him as Prince of Men by that well-nigh universal acclaim which has pronounced him the "Best of Great Men, and the Greatest of Good Men." As a literary artist he has made with his pen as true a representation as did Houdon with his chisel.

The author commences with a fine chapter on the character, manners and customs of the Virginia society in which Washington was reared. As the immigrant ancestor of Washington was a royalist, and many royalists came to Virginia during the days of the Commonwealth, there was a temptation to enlist with those who maintain that Virginia got her character from her cavaliers. In doing so, however, our author has ventured on disputed ground. The late Hugh Blair Grigsby, than whom no one was more deeply versed in Virginia history, in his *Discourse on the Virginia Convention of 1776*, ably maintains that the character of Virginia society was first formed by the men of moderate means who came

early to the colony, and that while many royalists came during Cromwell's time, a number of these returned on the restoration of Charles II., and many adherents of the Commonwealth came in their stead; and he calls attention to the fact that the valley of Virginia was entirely settled by Germans and Scotch-Irish, while many Huguenots settled in eastern Virginia. The truth probably lies between the different theories, and Virginia character was simply pure Anglo-Saxon, with a slight admixture of other European elements, developed in a mild climate, on a generous soil, and under a system of agricultural labor which made every landowner an English commoner, independent in thought and action. This development the author points out.

In the chapter entitled "A Virginian Breeding" the author pictures the domestic circle and the early friendships which so potently shaped the career of Washington. In doing so he gives due credit to his mother and brother Lawrence. The mother, left a widow before George was twelve years of age, he describes as "a wise and provident mother, a woman of too firm a character and too steadfast a courage to be dismayed by responsibility," and who "had shown a singular capacity for business." Of the brother he says that, though but twenty-five when his father died and left him the head of the family, he "proved himself such an older brother as it could but better and elevate a boy to have." We then have given us the traits of the boy that was father to the man. "He was above all things else a capable, executive boy. He loved mastery, and he relished acquiring the most effective means of mastery in all practical affairs. His very exercise-books used at school gave proof of it. They were filled, not only with the rules, formulæ, diagrams and exercises of surveying, which he was taking special pains to learn, at the advice of friends, but also with careful copies of legal and mercantile papers." The high tone of the boy soon drew to him the best men in the community, and among them Thomas, Lord Fairfax, a man of large landed estate in Virginia upon which he had come to reside in 1746; a man of taste and culture, who had written with Addison and Steele for the *Spectator*. From him the boy learned "the scrupulous deportment of a high-bred and honorable man of the world; the use of books by those who preferred affairs; the way in which strength may be rendered gracious and independence made generous." Left by his father in moderate circumstances, young Washington realized the necessity of applying himself to business at an early age, and so matured was he in the development of business traits of a high order that at sixteen Lord Fairfax employed him to survey a large tract of land on the Shenandoah; a dangerous enterprise, as it lay in a rough frontier region. The task quickly and accurately performed brought him other business, which kept him busy for three years. He could hardly have had a better training for after life. It fitted him as an engineer when he afterwards entered military life. Upon the death of his brother Lawrence he found himself named as an executor of his will and the residuary legatee of his large estate on the death of his child. He had already been commis-

sioned a major in the militia in the place of his brother. Thus at the age of twenty Washington was fully launched upon the stern business of life and placed under responsibilities difficult to be borne by matured men. How well he met those responsibilities our author shows, and in doing so traces the development of his noble character.

To the cares of business, thus early thrust upon him, were added within a year the responsibilities of public services of a grave character. In 1753 the French undertook to occupy the territory bordering on the Ohio, claimed by the English. Governor Dinwiddie was directed by the home government to warn them peaceably to depart, and if they did not heed the warning, to drive them off by force of arms. Young Major Washington was selected to serve the notice to quit, and he performed the task amidst great difficulties. His journey of 250 miles was through forests, often without even an Indian trail, amid snow and rain, over swollen rivers, and through the haunts of treacherous savages. Washington, with a guide and a small party, promptly appeared at a French outpost and received from the officer in command a flat refusal to the request to retire from the disputed territory. The next step to be taken was to drive off the intruders, and in the spring of 1754 we find Washington as lieutenant-colonel, with a small force, making his way over the Alleghanies for the purpose of executing this task. Camped at Great Meadows, just across the ridge of the mountains, while waiting for Col. Fry to join him, Washington with forty men came upon a party of thirty Frenchmen, May 28, 1754, and an engagement ensued in which the French were overcome, and Jumonville, their commander, was killed. This was the beginning of the war that was waged in Europe and America, and ended in 1763 by the surrender to the English of Canada and all the territory east of the Mississippi claimed by the French. Thus the skirmish at Great Meadows, in which Washington first snuffed the breath of battle and drew French blood, resulted in the final supremacy of the Anglo-Saxon race in North America. The man who thus commenced this momentous struggle was destined to wrest from England, within less than thirty years, her American colonies, including the very territory on which that struggle commenced.

But the flush of victory at the Great Meadows soon turned to the pallor of defeat. The French at once sent against the rude fort a force double that of Washington. After exhausting his ammunition, the gallant colonel was forced to surrender on July 4, 1754, but on terms highly honorable, under which he withdrew his little force and returned to Virginia. Though the expedition had failed, because unsupported, Washington came back with increased reputation. The next year we find him with the unfortunate Braddock, rescuing his shattered army after its terrible reverse near Fort Duquesne. These early experiences taught Washington a lesson which was of infinite service in after life. He learned early how to bear defeat. In 1758 Col. Washington accompanied Gen. Forbes in another expedition against Fort Duquesne. Now they found the fort burned and deserted by the French, and Gen. Forbes hoisted the English flag and re-named the post Fort Pitt.

Washington returned to Mount Vernon, now his property, and in January, 1759, married Martha Custis, who added largely to his estate and immeasurably to his happiness. Soon we find him in the House of Burgesses, urging the claims of his soldiers to the pay withheld from them, and the watchful guardian of every interest of the military of the colony. Now he had time to indulge his passion for agriculture in the management of the large estates inherited from his brother and belonging to his wife. We find him fond of the manly recreations of the Virginians of his day, and in all respects a Virginia gentleman of the highest type. But the quiet of domestic life was soon to be replaced by political troubles of the gravest import. The determination of the English ministry to tax the colonies, manifested in the stamp duties imposed by Parliament, aroused America. The Virginia Burgesses rang the alarm-bell in the adoption, on May 30, 1765, of the resolutions offered by Patrick Henry, which looked toward resistance to the act. As is well known, this young man of twenty-nine, who had been a member of the House only a few days, carried his resolutions after a heated debate, in which all the older men who had been leaders in the body were arrayed against him. Our author leaves us in doubt as to Washington's vote on that fateful day, the beginning of the end of English rule of her American colonies. He was in his seat, as his diary shows, and that he voted with Henry may be fairly inferred from his letter to Francis Dandridge, September 20, 1765, in which he styles the act "unconstitutional," the ground taken by Mr. Henry.

With a rapid review of the continued troubles between Great Britain and her colonies; the author brings us to the Continental Congress, the first clashing of arms, and the appointment of Washington to be commander-in-chief of the American army. He then brings out with remarkable distinctness his claims to true greatness, not only in his genius as a soldier but in his control of the political bodies and the leading men, whose aid was indispensable to the success of the Revolution. The story of the Revolutionary War, as told by Professor Wilson, reads like a grand epic poem with Washington as the hero. No one, indeed, can be familiar with the history of that memorable struggle without being impressed with the belief that but for Washington the cause of the colonies would have failed.

At its close, unlike Cæsar, he met the suggestion of a crown with so much indignation that it was never renewed. Retiring to Mount Vernon, with the fond hope of spending his remaining days in quiet domestic life, he found himself too famous to be allowed the rest he coveted. Very soon, too, the weakness of the Confederation became painfully evident, and those who had won free institutions became alarmed about their preservation amid state jealousies and anarchical tendencies. Washington now bent his energies towards the realization of a federal government which would be strong enough to ensure the general welfare, while leaving to the states the management of their local affairs. Such a government he had recommended in 1783 in a letter to the governors of the states on the disbanding of the army.

The work of the National Convention accomplished in framing the Federal Constitution, Washington set himself earnestly to work to have it adopted. Beyond question, the statement of Count Moustier, the French minister to the United States, was true. He wrote in 1789, "The opinion of General Washington was of such weight that it alone contributed more than any other measure to cause the present Constitution to be adopted." Professor Wilson, in describing the struggle for adoption, does not do justice to the Virginians who opposed the unamended Constitution. He says, "It disturbed him (Washington) keenly to find George Mason opposing the Constitution—the dear friend from whom he had always accepted counsel hitherto in public affairs—and Richard Henry Lee and Patrick Henry, too, in their passionate attachment to what they deemed the just sovereignty of Virginia." These three statesmen did not oppose the Constitution as a plan of government. They saw plainly, however, that the guards against encroachment by the great powers brought into existence upon the rights of the people and of the states were not sufficient; and they proposed amendments, which they wished engrafted before adoption, to strengthen those guards. The amendments they suggested were urged by the Virginia Convention and the most important were adopted very soon by the states. These constitute the first ten amendments, and nine of them are for the protection of the individual citizen, eight being taken from the Virginia Bill of Rights. The tenth alone refers to the states and reserves to them, or to the people, the powers not delegated to the United States, or prohibited to the states. The wisdom of these amendments has been amply vindicated in the history of the national government, and has been acknowledged by courts and jurists. It is high time that historians should give due honor to those far-seeing statesmen who insisted on their adoption.

The account of Washington's administration is mainly taken up by Professor Wilson with relating his wise sending-off of the new government, and his firm resistance to the tendency of the country to take active sides in the passionate struggle in Europe, caused by the French Revolution. No one now doubts the great wisdom of his administration. The last scenes in the life of the hero and statesman are well told.

On the whole, it may be said that Professor Wilson has given us no new facts, but he has taken the well-known events of Washington's life and, with a pen of genius, has thrown around them a fresh charm. The volume is beautifully printed and illustrated, and will add permanently to the author's well-established reputation.

The volume of Mr. Ford is cast in an entirely different mould. He holds that Washington has been described as a demi-god, and he proposes to humanize him. He frankly admits, however, that the process has made Washington appear all the greater to him. The result of his inquiry is, therefore, the proof of the right of the Father of his Country to the continued admiration of the world in full measure. But in introducing us into the private life of Washington, the author has not always been just to those in intimate relations with him. In his first chapter he

attempts to dwarf Mary Washington's influence on her son in his youth, and quotes her querulous complaints in her old age—she lived to be eighty-three—when she was doubtless failing in mind, as indicative of her character when a young widow. Even her tenderness and anxiety for her young son are charged as faults. That she was a woman of strong character can hardly be doubted, and that she exerted a controlling influence on the character of her son, though he spent some of his youth with his elder brothers, rests on sufficient authority. Washington Irving tells us that she was said to be in the habit of reading good books to her little flock, and her favorite volume was Sir Matthew Hale's *Contemplations Moral and Divine*, which doubtless had great influence in forming their characters. This precious volume, bearing his mother's autograph, Washington preserved to the day of his death. This one service of his mother was sufficient to lay the foundation of his character, which resembled so much Sir Matthew Hale's ideal. It shows, too, that she was not illiterate, as stated by Mr. Ford. Not content with dwarfing the influence of Mary Washington, our author is disposed to belittle Martha also. But as he admits that her husband was satisfied with her, and describes her as the "partner of all my domestic enjoyments," we may feel sure that she was a woman of worth, as well as of culture, else she could not have won or retained her husband's affections.

In the chapter on Washington's relations to the fair sex, the author notices some scandals reflecting on his virtue. One of them he completely refutes; but the other, which is a suggestion in the intercepted letter of Benjamin Harrison written in 1775 and printed in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, he does not explain. To one familiar with Benjamin Harrison's character, the explanation is easy. He was very free in his manner of life and rough in his jokes, and the passage in his letter quoted by Mr. Ford was evidently a rude joke based on the sterility of Washington's marriage.

The author's treatment of the question of Washington's religious belief is not satisfactory. After quoting Thomas Jefferson as the reporter of conversations with Gouverneur Morris, to the effect that Washington discredited Christianity as much as did Morris, and stating that Morris was an atheist, Mr. Ford quotes Madison as saying that he supposed Washington had not formed definite opinions on the subject. He then gives authority to the effect that he was not a communicant, and leaves the reader under the impression that Washington was probably an infidel, if not an atheist. That Mr. Jefferson was an inaccurate reporter of conversations is well established, and it is not probable that Washington confided his religious views to Morris, who was so different from him in his habits and morals. But Washington's public utterances show conclusively that he believed in Christianity as a divine revelation, if he is to be credited with ordinary sincerity. He frequently refers to an overruling Providence in his addresses, showing that he was no atheist. But he had also definite opinions as to Christianity. I need cite only two addresses to show this. In his Farewell Address to the people of the

United States he says, "Of all dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, Religion and Morality are indispensable. And let us with caution indulge the supposition that Morality can be maintained without Religion." In his letter to the governors of the states, June 8, 1783, he says, "The free cultivation of letters, the unbounded extension of commerce, the progressive refinement of manners, the growing liberality of sentiment, and above all, the pure and benign light of Revelation, have had meliorating influence on mankind, and increased the blessings of Society." That he refers to the Christian religion, and to the Christian's Bible in these passages, cannot be doubted. It should be remembered also that on the surrender of Cornwallis he ordered divine service with thanksgiving to God for the victory. That he did not commune is only evidence of his feeling of unworthiness, not of his disbelief in Christianity. But enough of fault-finding. The reader will be too much interested to lay down Mr. Ford's volume until he has read it through. The author has gotten from various sources much new matter which he has mingled with the old, so as to make a charming book. He has vindicated his hero from various aspersions of his enemies, and the searchlight he has thrown upon him has only brought out "the true George Washington" in nobler proportions. The volume is also handsomely printed and illustrated and is of permanent value in Washington literature.

WM. WIRT HENRY.

*The Life, Public Services, Addresses and Letters of Elias Boudinot*, LL.D., President of the Continental Congress. Edited by J. J. BOUDINOT. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co. 1896. Two vols, pp. xvii, 419; vii, 415.)

THIS is not a biography. Although the life of a man like Elias Boudinot, who was so intimately associated with the men and events of a most important epoch in American history, would seem to afford an important theme, his modest kinswoman has contented herself with presenting—connected by a very slender thread of narrative—a collection of letters to and from Boudinot. We learn that, while residing at Elizabethtown, New Jersey, at the beginning of the Revolution, he immediately took an active part in the local committee of correspondence. A curious story is given showing the reluctance of John Witherspoon and other patriots to countenance an irrevocable breach with Great Britain. Being appointed by Congress to the position of commissary-general of prisoners, his difficulties in securing proper treatment of the Americans in New York are described by him, and in this connection he tells of a characteristic interview with General Charles Lee, who submitted to him, while a prisoner, a preposterous plan for the removal of Congress and the whole population to the western country, leaving the British in possession of the coast states. It savors somewhat of his famous "plan" which Lee