

he displayed some considerable defects. He does not appear to have been strong either in foresight or insight. Such prevision as he exhibited consisted not so much in seeing into the facts before him (he never, for instance, completely understood the educational difficulty presented by the collision of theological beliefs), but in his strict faith that economical and moral truths would sooner or later produce their effects, whether men liked these effects or not. But if he was not endowed with any prophetic spirit, he raised politics far above their ordinary level, both by his intense interest in the claims to consideration of classes who, like the inhabitants of India, find it difficult to make their voices heard in the English Parliament, and by his combined belief both in democratic progress and in the necessity that the democracy should hear the truth. He was, in short, one of those men who, to use Mr. Stephen's words, "fear to speak an insincere word, and fear nothing else." The simple clearness of his intellect and the direct energy of his conduct almost blend together. Truthfulness and strength become perfect sincerity displayed in the highest form of public spirit.

The very words "public spirit" lead us on to a peculiarity in Fawcett in which he resembled a past generation, and was unlike the men of his own time. It is, we take it, pretty clear that neither religion, nor certainly theology, had much hold on Fawcett's heart or intellect. It is of course impossible for any one to speak with certainty of the hidden feelings and aspirations of any man, and least of all of one so transparent as he was, seems to have practised considerable reticence in matters of feeling. Still, it is probably not rash to say that Fawcett's interests were a good deal more secular than religious. Some critics of his life seem to have found a difficulty in understanding how a person devoid of all care for theological dogma could yet have risen in many ways so much above the moral level of ordinary men. The end of an article is certainly not the place in which to discuss the problems presented by the contrast between the secular and the religious ideal. One historical fact, however, may in this connection be fairly noticed. The philanthropists or reformers of the eighteenth century, such as Voltaire, Condorcet, Turgot, or Bentham, were either sceptical or indifferent on all matters of theological dogma. But no error is more misleading than the idea that such men were without enthusiasm. The desire for reforms which should benefit mankind, the passion for enlightenment, zeal for the propagation of utilitarian morality—these and other forms of public spirit were their religion. With Fawcett, as with them, public spirit was a true form of faith.

*Incidents and Anecdotes of the Civil War.* By Admiral Porter. D. Appleton & Co. 1885.

ADMIRAL PORTER is not only a distinguished naval commander, but he is also well known as a writer of romances. In this book he has combined the two qualities. The book reads quite like a romance, and yet it is confined solely to the naval exploits of himself and others during the war. It repeatedly disclaims the idea of being in any sense a history, though the Admiral tells us more than once that he has written a history "of all the events that came under my cognizance during the conflict, which may or not be published at some future time." This book is just what its title denotes; a series of anecdotes of the war, a string of old sailors' "yarns," most capitalily spun, and sufficiently related to great events and great people to give them a never failing interest. Some of the language which represents the remarks of Grant and Sherman and others is not to be con-

sidered in the light of a verbatim report, nor are the anecdotes themselves to be judged by the standard of accuracy to which they would be subjected if they were put forth as deliberate historical statements. "These reminiscences are simply for amusement"; as such they must be judged, and there can be little doubt of their being considered a success, or of their value as throwing a side light—and sometimes a strong one—on nearly all the important naval events of the war. The relief of Pensacola, the capture of New Orleans, the operations near Vicksburg, the Red River Expedition, the capture of Fort Fisher, and the final operations on the James River—in all of these Admiral Porter was a chief actor, and he has something new and entertaining to say about all of them.

His opinions about men and events are very freely expressed, though he evidently endeavors to avoid anything that might appear spiteful or malicious. When he comes to speak of Butler and Banks, however, this requires a great effort. He cannot refrain from ridiculing at great length Butler's famous plan of knocking down Fort Fisher by exploding a powder ship in the inlet abreast of it. Some rebels who deserted on the night of the explosion were brought before the Admiral, and he questioned them as to the effect. "It was dreadful," said one of them; "it woke up everybody in the fort." For Banks and his Red River expedition he has hardly less contempt, and he more than intimates that the whole expedition had no military object, but was simply a gigantic cotton speculation. Having written his own "strictly true and complete account of the Banks campaign" (which, however, he has no intention of publishing at present), he reminds Banks that he has never yet made his report, and playfully suggests that "perhaps the General, in his declining years, may think it worth his while to use the talents he is known to possess in an eminent degree, to write a history of that campaign."

Of Lincoln and Grant, and Farragut and Sherman, the Admiral cannot say too much. His respect for them is profound, and his admiration hearty and genuine. He considers Grant's campaign in rear of Vicksburg "the most remarkable and most successful military operation of the war"; and as no accounts of it have ever been written which he considers at all satisfactory, he dashes off eleven pages of poetry in order to describe it properly. The passage of the forts below New Orleans is equally great in his mind as a naval effort, and his praises of Farragut are lavish; but he claims for himself the honor of first suggesting the expedition to the authorities in Washington, and of proposing Farragut's name to the President as the best man to command it. In order to refute the statements of the late Secretary Welles concerning this matter, the Admiral narrates in great detail the circumstances under which his proposals were made.

Of Sherman he speaks in the tone of intimate comradeship, as he well has the right to do, for no two men ever worked more earnestly and heartily in accord for a great cause than these two. They are now the only survivors of the great chiefs of the war time. "Old Tecumseh and myself still hold on, two tough old knots, with a good deal of the steel in us yet, and quite enough vitality to lay out any number of those who pride themselves on what they can do."

None of the Admiral's entertaining stories, however, have the pathetic interest of his last two chapters, in which he describes his intercourse with Mr. Lincoln in March and April, 1865. When the President saw that the war was nearing its end, he left Washington and came to City Point, in order to be in close communication with General Grant, and to be free to act without consulting his Cabinet. He arrived on March

24 and returned on April 10, only five days before his death. His last two weeks were thus passed on board of Porter's flagship, entirely unattended. He declined peremptorily all requests from his Cabinet to be allowed to join him, and refused to see the Vice-President when he came to visit him. He seemed to find in the Admiral a congenial spirit, and sat with him by the hour discussing the events of the day and telling the stories of which they reminded him. Toward the latter part of his visit the Admiral grew very anxious as to the safety of his guest, and never allowed the President to be out of his sight for a moment, night or day. With him—and with him alone—Mr. Lincoln entered Richmond while it was still in flames, the day after the surrender. Owing to a chapter of accidents they reached the city in a rowboat unannounced; on landing they started to walk through the streets.

"There was a small house at this landing, and behind it were some twelve negroes digging with spades. The leader of them was an old man sixty years of age. He raised himself to an upright position as we landed, and put his hands up to his eyes. Then he dropped his spade and sprang forward. 'Bress de Lord,' he said, 'dere is de great Messiah! I knowed him as soon as I seed him. He's bin in my heart fo' long years, an' he's cum at las' to free his chillun from deir bondage! Glory, Hallelujah!' And he fell upon his knees before the President and began kissing his feet. The others followed his example, and in a minute Mr. Lincoln was surrounded by these people, who had treasured up the recollection of him caught from a photograph, and had looked up to him for four years as the one who was to lead them out of captivity."

The rest of this extraordinary and ever memorable visit is told in equally graphic style. It forms a picture well worth preserving, and all the more valuable in that it is drawn by the sole survivor of the scene. While they remained in the vicinity of Richmond several suspicious persons attempted to board the Admiral's ship. One of them, he thinks, was Booth. The frequent recurrence of these visits thoroughly alarmed the Admiral as to the President's safety, and when the latter expressed his intention to return to Washington, the Admiral sent two ships with him as far as Baltimore, and directed the commanding officer never to leave his side until he saw his charge safely in the White House. The mission was successfully performed, and the officer returned to Hampton Roads and so reported to the Admiral. But Porter could free his mind from the idea, after what he seen at Richmond, that the President's life in danger. He therefore determined to go to Washington, take advantage of the intimacy lately established between the President and himself to dissuade him from exposing himself in public, and communicate his suspicions to the Cabinet. Had he started a day sooner perhaps he might have saved the President's life. When he reached Baltimore he heard that the President had been assassinated a few hours before.

*The Founders of the American Republic: A history and biography, with a supplementary chapter on ultra-democracy.* By Charles Mackay, author of 'Life and Liberty in America,' etc. Edinburgh: William Blackwood & Sons, 1885. Pp. 434.

DR. MACKAY'S account of the founders of the American republic is agreeably written, appreciative, and generally accurate. The founders under consideration are Washington (in two chapters), Adams, Jefferson, Franklin, and Madison. Perhaps he rates Jefferson too high, and does not do full justice to Adams as a political thinker certainly he takes pains to set forth all Adams's personal foibles and defects of temper, and says not a word of Jefferson's faults of character, which we suppose to have been as great and as manifest. We think, also, that he undervalues

Washington's intellectual powers and military abilities. But if Washington and Adams are depreciated, it is only by comparison with the hearty admiration bestowed upon the other three.

It is not necessary to read the chapter upon "The Dangers of Ultra-Democracy," because we all know well enough what those dangers are, and we do not see that Dr. Mackay tells us anything about them which we have not already been told a hundred times. Nevertheless, the chapter is worth reading, if only to see what notion of the war of the rebellion it is possible for an intelligent Englishman to entertain in the year 1885. The author is a hearty believer in the rights of nullification and of secession, which he considers the corner-stone of our liberties, and represents General Jackson (of whom he gives an account which reads like a caricature) as a fanatical champion of centralization. We cannot quite make out, however, whether he regards nullification and secession as a right under the Constitution, or only as the natural right of revolution. We suppose the latter, inasmuch as (p. 359) he speaks of the "compact" established by "the Washingtonians, Federalists, and Centralizers," as holding "its ground, after a certain unstable fashion, till the election of Mr. Lincoln." Apparently, then, the Constitution in operation until 1861 was the work of Washington and his school, and they were certainly no believers in nullification. If, then, secession was an act of revolution, it is hard to see why the supporters of the Union are censured for suppressing it.

In the following extract the author's confusion of ideas has resulted in a remarkable confusion of language; but we hasten to say that it is the only ungrammatical sentence we have met with, Dr. Mackay's style being as a rule clear and correct: "From the very first the friends of these conflicting principles were at variance, and on more than one occasion the upholders of the rights of the several States and commonwealths that claimed to be supreme within their own boundaries, and called themselves Democrats, was at issue with the Washingtonians and Federalists, who called themselves Republicans, and would have established what was virtually an autocracy and not a democracy, if their idea of the one Republic, paramount to the thirteen Commonwealths, found acceptance" (p. 359).

On page 393 he says that "The time has come when the whole truth should be told, not alone as to the real origin, but as to the conduct of this unfortunate and needless war." Dr. Mackay's qualifications for accomplishing this desirable task may be judged from his statements that Bell, as well as Douglas and Breckinridge, were Democrats (p. 389); that Theodore Parker's was the "one only voice" raised in denunciation of Webster's pro-slavery attitude; that Mr. Lincoln's name "had scarcely been heard of beyond the limits of the State of Ohio" (p. 389); and that "the Southern army was composed of none but volunteers" (p. 395).

In other parts of the work we find a few errors, most of them of no importance. On page 101, Cornwallis's occupation of Yorktown is stated to have been after Washington reached Williamsburgh. On page 139, Washington is said to have been called from his retirement to take command of the army, "in view of an approaching rupture with Great Britain," it being really on occasion of an actual declaration of war against France. On page 302 the Hartford Convention is said to have "loudly and all but unanimously expressed its determination to secede from the Union [but how could a convention secede from the Union?] unless the central Government agreed to a peace with the mother country." Curtis for Custis (p. 25); Artemus for Artemas Ward (p. 63), confounding the humorist and the General; Poor Robin for Poor

Richard (p. 296); and Livingstone for Livingston (p. 373) are no doubt slips of the pen; but as to the assertion (p. 401) that "the will of a bigoted and cruel majority led, in Europe and America, to the burning of witches," we should be glad to have mentioned the instances, with their date.

To expose all the errors and misstatements of this closing chapter, it would be necessary to quote nearly the whole of it; but we have room for only the following extraordinary paragraph, which, we think, requires no comment. It refers to the years before the rebellion:

"Mr. Horace Greeley, the celebrated editor of the New York Tribune, who exercised a powerful influence over the Anti-Slavery and Republican party of the North and West, openly and persistently advocated separation. In lines that were continually recited in speeches and writings by the Abolitionists, he described the American flag as a 'flaunting lie' and 'a blood-stained rag' that ought to be torn down from every battlement and steeple in the North, and that should be hoisted half-mast high in sign of its degradation, in every American ship on the ocean. He advocated the independence of the Northern States, or any portion of them; or, if independence were not attainable, their incorporation with Canada, and a return to their allegiance to the 'Old Country'—anything rather than continuance in a union with the Southern States, that maintained and endeavored to extend negro slavery."

Now, Horace Greeley ran for the Presidency against General Grant, and on page 403, by way of depreciating Jackson's and Grant's qualifications for this office, we are told that their military achievements "proved sufficient to render nugatory those which were founded upon the culture, experience, and wise statesmanship of the vastly superior men who were opposed to them."

*A History of the United States for Schools.* With an introductory history of the discovery and English colonization of North America. By Alexander Johnston, author of a 'History of American Politics,' Professor of Jurisprudence and Political Economy in Princeton College. Henry Holt & Co. 1885. Pp. xx, 473.

PROFESSOR JOHNSTON tells us in his preface what is the special purpose which has led him to add another to our many school histories of the United States. It is, in a word, because they all more or less miss the end of a text-book of history. They are in great part story books, vainly trying to compete for the pupil's interest at the imaginative period with books devoted to that single end. "History," he says, "is a task and a method of mental discipline; our school histories attempt to relieve it, as no one attempts to relieve grammar or arithmetic, by story telling." To the colonial period has been hitherto assigned an inordinate space. So much room has been given to Smith and Pocahontas, Putnam and the wolf, "that the real history of the United States is cramped, marred, and brought to a lame and impotent conclusion." "For much the same reasons, other topics not essential to the main subject, such as the tribal institutions of the Aborigines, and the Spanish conquests of Mexico and Peru, have been left untouched." Certainly; why not? Why should our school histories, or, for the matter of that, our grown-up histories, confound the Western Continent with the United States? Why should they give the impression that the history of the soil we live on is continuous from 1497 to 1887—a time when it is practically a blank? It comes to this, that boys and girls know who Cortes or Atahualpa was, and do not know who William Tyndale or Henry of Navarre was; and yet if United States history for schools must include the sixteenth century, the two latter should be among its central figures, and not the two former.

Let us hear another capital paragraph from Professor Johnston's preface: "As the book is not

intended to be a story book, so it is not intended to be a picture book. The pictures in this volume have been introduced with regret, and only as a yielding to the present prejudice, which denies an effective audience to the school history not so illustrated. It is to be hoped that the time will soon come when the space now surrendered to the graphic additions of the average school-boy's pencil will be utilized to better purpose." Perfectly true. In fewer words: school committees can be persuaded by pictures to "introduce" a book, over the convictions and perhaps protests of competent teachers, who know them to be a nuisance and a humbug.

The preface quoted entire would be the best introduction and recommendation to this excellent text-book, which is intended to teach the rising citizens of the United States what their country is and has been in her steady, peaceful development. The critical periods and the brilliant exploits have not been omitted—they have been alluded to with appreciation and spirit in their right places; they have been mentioned in such a way as to tempt any one who loves such episodes to find out more about them. But they are exhibited as episodes—the occasional threads of gold or black in the cheerful but not gaudy fabric that forms the staple of our true history. As we took occasion to remark in a review of another meritorious history of the United States, we have in our national records abundant room for sentiment, but not an inch for sentimentality—the *sentiment*. Mme. de Staël, which Castlereagh so well translated by "blarney." Professor Johnston's book strikes us as preëminently manly—for that matter, womanly, too; it is not the childish article which would apparently suit some "eminent educationists" who think a teacher's business is to amuse the little ones, and keep them amused up to the time when they have children of their own.

Where all is good it is hard to specify; but we would particularly select the development of the Southern colonies, the land operations of the war of 1812, the political movements from 1838 to 1848, and the comparative exhibition of the campaigns of the Civil War, as especially indicative of impartiality and due proportion in the writer's mind. In these, and indeed throughout, the writer is careful to put in, properly subordinated in type, the little circumstances so likely to be overlooked. We open at random, and find on page 167 a capital paragraph about the Jeffersonian Republicans; on page 286, a valuable note about city police; on page 318, a significant remark about the common necessity to McClellan and Lee of protecting the capital.

A variety of things we could wish altered or away. Must Governor Arnold's poor old mill again be inflated to bolster out the Vinland myth? Maclure determined the Northwest Passage in 1850 (not 1854). The States-General of France should not be named a Parliament (surely Professor Johnston knows what the French Parliaments were); and the King who got rid of it in 1614 was Louis XIII, not Louis XIV. It should be recorded that Endicott was reproved by his General Court for cutting out the cross, and that he submitted. The original form Carolina for Carolína is omitted—probably by a misprint. It is news to us that "William the Testy" was ever Sir William Kieft, or that Sir John Burgoyne was present at Saratoga. The romance of "Evangeline" ought not to have been allowed to stand as history with no allusion to Mr. Parkman's corrections. It should have been stated that Virginia ratified the Constitution most probably in the belief that she was the ninth State, while New York held a very different position, taking no part in the first Presidential election. But we have no wish to seem to detract from the merit of the book—the best