SOME NEW BOOKS.

King Alfred.

To the series entitled "Saintly Lives" a volume entitled *Alfred the West-Saxon, King of the English* is contributed by DUGALD MACFADYEN (E. P. Dutton & Co.). The editor of the series, Mr. R. F. Wharton, explains in a prefatory note that he has no intention of confining the selection of subjects to any particular denomination of religion. He says, what is true enough, that, while it is hard to conceive a saintly life without religion, it is possible to find saintly lives in religions of very different kinds. He goes so far as to say that if a saintly life without religion can be lighted on it shall be included in the series; the inference is that we may reasonably look for a biography of Marcus Aurelius or of Epictetus, neither of whom can be said to have professed any religion. It is, at all events, satisfactory to know that in this series no saintly life will be excluded on the plea of heterodoxy. Catholics, Protestants, Greek Christians, and, for that matter, Nestorians, should be comprehended, and Buddhists and Mohammedans as well. Why not followers of Confucius, also, since, from an ethical point of view, they can, undoubtedly, exhibit examples of sainthood. With regard to the book before us, we should note that the author makes no profession of an ability to exhibit Anglo-Saxon scholarship; nevertheless, the narrative is founded on the English chronicles and the earliest obtainable records. Moreover, so far as this has proved possible, the author has presented the original materials themselves in an orderly fashion, instead of working them over and putting them in another dress.

I.

Alfred was the fifth son of Æthelwulf, King of Wessex and of Osburh, his first wife. He was born at Wantage in Berkshire in the year 849 A. D. Of his father we know enough to see that some of the characteristics of the subject of this biography were hereditary. Æthelwulf had the reputation of leaning to the contemplative, rather than to the active, side of life. Roger de Hovenden asserts that he had been Bishop of Winchester, until, being compelled by necessity, he was made King. His father, Egbert, had thought him overfond of churchmen as councillors. There is no evidence, however, of lack of vigor in his conduct of the kingship. He fought against the invading hosts of the Northmen when he was under-king in Kent, and, after he had succeeded to Egbert's throne, he helped to inflict on one pirate host at Ockley in Surrey a crushing defeat. It was said that more Danes fell there than had ever before fallen on English ground. There was nevertheless, a side of Æthelwulf's character with which is is probable enough that his Witan (wise men) had little sympathy. From one cause or another, he came under the spell which the name of Rome exercised in the Middle Ages, and put aside the many claims of his kingdom to make time for a pilgrimage to the city of St. Peter and St. Paul. Before he departed he granted a tenth part of the rents from his private domains for ecclesiastical and charitable purposes.

It was this grant which was afterward misrepresented as a donation of the tenth of the whole revenue of the kingdom, and as the legal origin of tithes. Mr. Macfadyen finds some evidence to show that Æthelwulf was a man of wider vision than most of his contemporaries, and that he entertained a far-reaching scheme for combined action on the part of England and the successors of Charles the Great for defence against the Northmen. It has been suggested that such a motive led to his visit to the court of Charles the Bald on his return from Rome, and to his marriage with Judith, Charles's child-daughter. That the union of the Saxon King, already on the further side of sixty, with a girl hardly more than 12 years of age, was the seal of a defensive alliance between Æthelwulf and Charles is in keeping with the custom of the times. Of Alfred's mother, Osburh, we do not know much. She was the daughter of Oslac, the King's cupbearer, who came of the royal house of the Jutes, settled in the Isle of Wight. The one incident (recorded by Asser) in which Alfred and his mother play individual parts, which throws light on his introduction to book learning, has been challenged by English and German critics, but seems worth reproducing because one cannot perceive any reason for inventing it. "On a certain day [he was then 12 years old, and had thus far remained illiterate] his mother was showing him and his brothers a beautiful book of songs, with rich pictures and fine painted initial letters, and she said to them: 'Whichever of you shall first learn this book shall have it for his own.' Then Alfred, moved by these words, or rather by a divine inspiration, and allured by the illuminated letters, spoke before his brothers, who, though his seniors in years, were not so in grace, and answered: 'Will you really give that book to the one of us who can first understand and repeat it to you?' Upon which his mother smiled and repeated what she had said. So Alfred took the book from her hand and went to his master to get it read, and, in due time, brought it again to his mother and recited it; so it became his own."

Apparently the chief part of Alfred's formal education should be associated with the visit which he made to Rome. If we accept one reading of the authorities, this visit lasted from the time of his arrival with Bishop Swithin of Winchester to the time of his departure with the father—almost two years. According to his chronicler, Leo IV. anointed him as the future King of the West Saxons, a ceremony which must be regarded as an indiscretion or an act of faith on the part of the Pope, inasmuch as Alfred was several steps removed from the succession to the throne. It is certain that we hear no more of the papal consecration, and that nobody in England based on it a claim that Alfred should succeed his father. We may assume that, while in the Eternal City, the boy learned to speak a little Latin, and so acquired the key to most of the learning obtainable in his time. To his residence in Rome may probably be traced the love of literature which led him afterward to translate and edit for his own people what he regarded as the classics in science and literature and religion.

It was not only the visit to Rome that must have made a deep and lasting impression on the mind of the West Saxon youth; on his way home he sojourned with his father for several months at the court of Charles the Bald, King of the Western Franks. Of the three Carlovingian courts then existing, Charles the Bald's was the only one which inherited the nobler traditions of Charlemagne's. Here Alfred would catch a glimpse of the best aims and influences of mediæval monarchy. The author of this biography would trace Alfred's views of the duties of a good King back to their fountainhead through Charles the Bald and Lewis the Pious to Charles the Great. Unquestionably the kind of kingship which we find exemplified in Alfred had its first European type and representative in the great Emperor. Like his grandfather, Charles the Bald liked to have about him men of learning. At the very time of Alfred's visit the royal secretary and favorite adviser was Servatus Lupus, whose extant letters are said to contain quotations from almost every known classical writer. An intelligent boy could not fail to notice the deference paid at Charles's court to men whose importance came neither from birth nor power, but from ability and character.

The events of the fifteen years which intervened between Alfred's boyhood and his accession to the throne were of great moment for England. When Æthelwulf returned from the Court of Charles the Bald with Judith as a bride and Alfred in his train, he found his people unwilling to receive him. The great men of Wessex had sworn an oath in Selwood Forest to set his son Æthelbald on the throne. Æthelwulf left his son in undisputed possession of Wessex, and retired to Kent, where he ruled as under-king for two years. On his death the clergy of Wessex heard with horror that Æthelbald had married his father's young wife. Judith had no children by her first or second husband, however, and, in 860 King Æthelbald died. It is interesting to recall that her blood runs in the veins of the present King of England. Whether Judith was divorced from Æthelbald is uncertain, but it is a fact that she returned to her father, ran away with Baldwin I. of Flanders, and from her the Matilda, daughter of Baldwin V. of Flanders, who married William the Conqueror, was descended. Alfred's daughter married Judith's son: this is the link which enabled Queen Victoria to trace descent from Alfred the Great.

The peculiar provisions of Æthelwulf's will might at this point have raised a serious difficulty. He had for the first time in English history assumed the right to bequeath the crown as a personal property. He had provided that the crown should go at the death of Æthelstan, his eldest son, to Æthelbald, from the last named to Æthelred, and from him again to Alfred—to the exclusion of the children of each. Æthelbert, who came between Æthelbald and Æthelred in order of age, was to become under-king of Kent on his father's death, and to remain there. The Witan (wise men) true to the traditions of the military chieftainship which was the root of the Anglo-Saxon kingship, and recognizing the need of having a united kingdom, should the Danes attack Wessex, decided to ignore the testament, and to choose their Kings in succession from the royal family. There seems to have been no jealousy on the part of the brothers, but each loyally seconded the work of the ruler for the time being. On the death of Æthelbald in 860, Æthelbert was brought from his under-kingdom of Kent, and became King over both Kent and Wessex. He was succeeded by the next brother, Æthelred, in 866. Alfred was now 17 and was acknowledged as "Secondarius" in the realm, a title which seems to describe the part which he actually played as his brother's right-hand man, signing royal warrants next to him, acting as chief officer of the staff in war, and as first Minister in time of peace. It was fortunate that the two surviving sons of Æthelwulf did not quarrel, for a crisis in the history of England was at hand. In the years 866-869, the Danes had overrun Northumbria and East Anglia, and were now threatening Mercia and Wessex.

II.

Alfred's conflicts with the Danes fall into three periods, two of them about equal in length, lasting seven years apiece, while the third is as long as the other two put together. The first begins with success and ends in defeat. The second begins in defeat and ends in victory. In the third Alfred, having learned the lessons of both defeat and victory, holds the enemy in check and secures the peace of his kingdom, both internally and externally. Alfred's first meeting with the Danes in the field came in 868, when he was in his twentieth year, and before he had succeeded to the throne. It was the year of his marriage to the daughter of Ethelred Mucil (i. e., the Big), Earl of the Gainas, the folk whose name survives in that of their town, Gainsborough. It was on the occasion of his wedding that Alfred was seized with a mysterious malady which the physicians of the time could neither cure nor explain, except on the hypothesis of demoniac possession. If, as seems probable, the disease must be identified with epilepsy, it adds a pathetic interest to his life, that we must think of him as doing his work with the knowledge that he was liable to be seized at any moment with an epileptic fit. It was in this year that the Danes, leaving Northumberland, invaded Mercia, which called upon Wessex for help. Æthelred and Alfred responded to the call at the head of their levies, but the campaign was inconclusive. The Danes could not be driven out of the fortified town of Nottingham, but were bribed to give Mercia a respite while they turned their attention to East Anglia, the conquest of which was completed in 870. In the spring of the following year the Danish invaders of England, in conjunction with some Norwegian Vikings, came up the Thames and laid siege to Reading. Æthelred and Alfred led the men of Wessex to the rescue of the place, but, after some minor successes, were beaten in a fiercely contested battle. Not long afterward, however, the Danes, who had penetrated westward, suffered in their turn a severe reverse at a point which has been identified with the White Horse hill in Berkshire. The Danes were by no means annihilated, however, but within a fortnight resumed the aggressive and threatened Winchester, the capital of Wessex. At Basing the Danes were victorious, but encountered so sturdy a resistance that they ventured no further into Hampshire. In the next battle, which was fought at a place named "Meretune," identified with a hamlet called Marton, on the Roman road from Winchester to Marlborough, King Æthelred was mortally wounded, and the West Saxon forces, retreating, left the Danes in possession of the field.

Alfred's accession made no long break in the warfare. Within a month after his brother's death he met the Danes again, but although he took them by surprise he was ultimately beaten off. Such serious losses, nevertheless, had been sustained by the invaders in the course of the year that they were now as anxious for peace as the men of Wessex. A treaty was concluded, and it may be inferred that Alfred had to pay heavily, from the facts that he debased the coinage to replenish his coffers, and that so grievous a tax had to be laid on landowners that some of them preferred to surrender their lands to the King rather than defray it. The Danes retired from Reading upon London, which was reckoned then as belonging to Mercia and not to Wessex. It was only for Wessex that the withdrawal of the Danes was the beginning of a three years' respite. Mercia was incapable of offering resistance, and London remained in the hands of the Danes till ultimately Alfred reconquered it, resettled it and gave it the chance of becoming the capital of England.

In the summer of 877 part of the Danish host divided the Mercian land among them so far as there were claimants for it. Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire, Lincolnshire, Leicestershire, Rutland and Northamptonshire all retain traces of this Danish settlement in the frequent occurrence of the termination "by," which was the Danish equivalent of the Saxon "tun." The centre and high-water mark of Danish influence in Midland England was to be found in the five Danish boroughs, Derby, Leicester, Nottingham, Lincoln and Stamford, which seem to have been linked in a kind of confederation. The Norse settlement of Northumbria had been equally systematic. There Halfdene, a Norwegian King, son of Lodroc, drove back the Picts and Strathclyde Britons, who were pressing on the Northumbrian borders. It may have been with the purpose of avoiding such turbulent neighbors that he made no attempt to settle in Bernicia, the contemporary name for the country which we now know as the Eastern Lowlands of Scotland. There he left English Aldermen to rule unhampered. In southern Northumbria, on the other hand, Halfdene parted the lands among his followers. The whole of the province of Deira, with its centre at York, became a Scandinavian district. Here the life of an English thegn was assessed at but half the value of a Northern "hold." The "byes," such as Barnby, Grimsby, Ormsby, Tolesby, Thoraldby and Swainby take their names from Norse settlers, such as Beorn, Grim, Orm, Tol, Thorold and Swein. The trithings, or ridings of Yorkshire, retain the Norse word "thing" for the assembly of the county, which there has completely displaced the Saxon word "moot."

During the short breathing space that Wessex had obtained, Alfred recognized that his kingdom would be saved or lost at sea. To fight the northern enemy successfully, he must be able to watch their coming, give forewarning of their movements, intercept their supplies or cut off their retreat. It is rightly regarded as one of Alfred's principal achievements that, during the three brief years of peace, he managed to call into existence a small fleet. Where he got the vessels is uncertain, for the beginning of shipbuilding in England seems to have belonged to a later part of his reign; he may have purchased ships from the Frisians, whom he employed later, or he may have hired detached Northmen. At all events, he was able to intercept a small Danish fleet, which was, apparently, aiming at the mouth of the Thames, and put it to flight. The Danes, finding the mouth of the Thames well watched, crept along the coast until they encountered a favorable landing place at Wareham in Dorsetshire. Here Alfred undertook to blockade them, and a treaty was made by which the invaders pledged themselves "speedily to depart his kingdom." But, on one pretext or another, the Danes broke their oaths, seized Exeter and retained possession of the town during the winter of 876-77. In the following spring a Danish armada, comprising 120 ships, sailed round the coast, intending to land at Wareham, and reenforce the host shut up in Exeter. When the great fleet reached Swanwick (Swanade), it met with a tremendous gale which drove all the vessels on the rocks. The Danes now lost control of the Channel, and Alfred had at his mercy the garrison of Exeter, although this was reenforced by the Northmen who had been left behind at Wareham. The Danes recognized that they were beaten, and surrendered on condition of being allowed to leave Wessex. They withdrew into Mercia, and apportioned among themselves some of the rich lands in Gloucestershire and Warwickshire. The West Saxon army was disbanded, and the men, supposing that their work was done, returned to their farms. Winter had set in, and, according to the rules of war then current, campaigning ought to have been at an end. Suddenly, however, the Danes, probably reenforced unexpectedly, stole over the Mercian border and took Wessex by surprise. They went where they would, overrunning the western kingdom, and "sat down there." There were no battles, no stormings of towns, no sieges; everywhere the West Saxons were found unprepared, without an army, and, when confronted by troops of armed Danes, they were obliged to surrender. Many of them gave up the struggle as hopeless and fled. According to the chronicler, "Mickle of the folk over sea they drove, and of the others the most deal they rode over; all but King Alfred; he with a little band hardly fared after the woods and in the moor-fastnesses." Only in Hampshire, Wiltshire and Somerset were a few found faithful to Alfred. As for the rest of Wessex, it seemed for some months as if it were only a matter of time before the Danes would do with it as they had done with Northumbria, and Mercia, and East Anglia.

III.

Some time between January and Easter, 878, Alfred found his way to a patch of firm ground in the midst of the marshes formed by the Parret and the Tone. This gave him an easily defended inland fortress, and here at Athelney he made his headquarters. Long afterward, when better days had come to Alfred, he had many stories to tell of the hard fare and strange adventures of the Athelney period. Some of these are related by Mr. Macfadyen, but, as none of them is quite free from suspicion we need not reproduce them. What we know is that about Easter time the little force which had been collected in the isle of Athelney began a guerrilla warfare and six weeks later were ready to face the risks of a campaign in the open field. In a battle at Eddington the Danish invaders of Wessex were beaten, and after a fourteen days' siege their commander, Guthrun, surrendered on terms which opened a new era in the conflict between Dane and Saxon. The Danes were to give as many hostages as Alfred wanted and to ask for none in return; they were also to quit Wessex for good, and Guthrun declared his willingness to receive baptism and become a Christian. In the definitive treaty concluded soon afterward at Wedmore, the boundaries between Danish and English Britain were fixed. The compact secured Alfred's rights over not only the whole of Wessex, Kent but also over London and a wide district running well into Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire. Watling street, the old Roman road which ran across the Midlands from London to Wroxeter, near Shrewsbury, by way of the Trent Valley, seems to have separated the English from the Danish part of Mercia. The same treaty made the Dane and the Saxon equal before the law; that is to say, the price paid for killing either was the same.

Although the treaty of Wedmore gave London to Alfred, we read that in 883 the King had to "sit down against the army at London," and it was not until three years later that he could begin to rebuild the city. The Roman walls, which had been partly destroyed and partly allowed to fall into decay, he reconstructed with material supplied by the church of St. Alban, which an earlier Saxon King had reared. He rebuilt the bridge which joined the northern and southern shores of the Thames, and to defend the bridge raised a tower at the southeast corner of the restored wall. It was on the site of this tower that William the Conqueror, approving Alfred's judgment, established what is still known as the Tower of London. Henceforth the possession of London made it easy for the English to hold the Thames, and the control of that river assured the protection of Kent, Wessex and English Mercia.

The work of regeneration which Alfred did for the English was subjected to a severe test in 893-896. We refer to the stubborn struggle with Hasting the Northman and his "grand army," so-called because Hasting was the one man who at the moment was capable of uniting the northern world under his banner. Hasting, it may be remembered, was not a Dane, but a Northman, apparently a son of Earl Atle of Gaular in Norway. Twelve months after his landing in Britain, his followers and the Danes, already settled in east England, were in open alliance. Precisely what attitude was taken by the Northmen planted in Northumbria is uncertain. What we know is that, after some vicissitudes in which Alfred had the advantage, the "grand army" of the Northmen melted away, and in 897 serious peril to Wessex was, for a time, at an end. The sun of Alfred's day set in a great peace. The last years of his life were memorable for the felicity which has no history. In 901 we find this entry in the English Chronicle: "This year died Alfred, son of Æthelwulf, six days before the Mass of All Saints. He was King over the whole English nation except that part which was under the dominion of the Danes. He held the kingdom one year and a half less than thirty years. And then Edward, his son, succeeded to the Kingdom." The author of this book points out that the Chronicle understates the length of the reign, which was within a month or two of thirty years.

IV.

What Alfred did for the laws of England may be thus summarized: In the first place he made a collection of the Kentish and West Saxon, and Mercian statutes, amending the old common law that had been handed down unwritten. There were the laws of Kent, consisting of the Dooms of Æthelbert, the first Christian King and the additions made by his successors in that kingdom; the laws of Alfred's own predecessor Ine of Wessex, and the collection of judgments rendered by Offa, the great Mercian King. In the second place Alfred added some laws of his own which were to run for all three Kingdoms, Kent, Wessex and English Mercia; such, for instance, as the law of treason, whereby the value of the King's life was greatly increased. It is to be noted that Alfred's laws became the basis of the judicial system for the Welsh in the west of England, as well as for the West Saxon and the Mercian. It was not so much as a legislator, however, as an enforcer of the laws that Alfred was serviceable to the people. He made it clear that the whole might of the King lay behind the judicial system, and that the executive power was able to compel obedience.

We have seen that Alfred rebuilt London. We also know that architects of earthwork forts and town fortifications of timber and stone set the stamp of the King's constructive mind on every part of Wessex. Asser records that a considerable fraction of the royal revenue was paid to the "workmen whom he had collected from every nation and had about him in large numbers, men skilled in every kind of construction." Other references in the Chroniclers give glimpses of goldsmiths, coiners and illuminators of manuscripts. An example of his goldsmiths' work, known as King Alfred's Jewel, has come down to us, and is now preserved in the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford. This is a polished crystal of an oval form, rather more than two inches in length and half an inch thick, inlaid with a mosaic enamel of green and yellow. It may have been a part of the King's sceptre. It bears an inscription to the effect "Alfred ordered me to be made." In the British Museum there are 452 coins issued in Alfred's reign. The King's money was coined at Bath, Canterbury, Exeter, Gloucester, Winchester, London and Oxford. The mention of the last place calls to mind the fact that, although it cannot be claimed for Alfred that he founded the university, it is quite possible that he was the founder of the city of Oxford. His son Edward gave it a fortress, and in less than a century from this time the old line of the city wall must have been clearly defined. We note in passing that the artistic work on Alfred's coins is inferior not only to that on the later coins of Athelstan, but also to that on the earlier coins of Offa, who is said to have employed Italian coiners.

On the other hand the work of the illuminators and writers of manuscripts was comparatively good. The manuscripts of Alfred's day, which have survived, are well written. The characteristics of the chirography are freedom, lightness and elegance. The monks of Athelney and the nuns of Shaftesbury, both Alfred's foundations, were specially devoted to the work of the Scriptorium. There is extant a manuscript produced by the monks of Alfred's monastery at Winchester, and there is also a volume of Gospels and other readings produced at Canterbury, which are said to be as good as anything done in Europe in the ninth century. It is well known that Alfred caused a number of books to be copied and distributed for the instruction of his people. Several of these are now accessible in scholarly editions. The Universal History of Orosius, which was written early in the fifth century, and translated and edited by Alfred, has been published for the Early English Text Society. The translation of Bede's "Ecclesiastical History of the English," probably prepared under Alfred's orders by one of the Mercian scholars in his service, has also appeared in the same series. An attractive edition including a translation of Alfred's version of Boethius "On the Consolations of Philosophy," has recently been put forth by the Clarendon Press. Before the millenary celebration of Alfred's reign is over, there is reason to expect that the materials for an Alfred Library will be reasonably complete.

In addition to the "Pastoral Care" of Gregory the Great, Alfred caused to be translated for his clergy another book of the same Pope's known as the "Dialogues." The veneration which in old English literature attaches to the name of this Pontiff is partly due to the fact that it was he who in 597 sent Augustine to bring the Gospel to Britain. Alfred's claim to be responsible for the slightly abbreviated edition of Bede's "Ecclesiastical History of the English" rests on a statement made by Ælfric a hundred years later. A recent investigator finds in the book internal evidence to show that, although in Alfred's day, it was translated not by him but in northern Mercia and probably at Lichfield. The "List of Martyrs," attributed to Alfred, was almost certainly in use in his time, and was probably then composed. The only other book which has a good claim to bear the stamp of the King's mind is that known as the "Blooms or Blossoms of King Alfred," which consists of an adaptation of St. Augustine's "Soliloquies," and of his Epistles to Paulina in the "Vision of God," together with extracts from his "City of God," and from Gregory and Jerome. Many passages appear to be comments by the King himself.

South Carolina During the Revolution.

We have previously referred to the two volumes by DR. M. McCRADY, respectively entitled "The History of South Carolina Under the Proprietary Government" and "The History of South Carolina Under the Royal Government." These two books, which, between them, constituted a contribution of unusual value to our colonial history, are now worthily supplemented by a volume of nearly 900 pages which recounts part of *The History of South Carolina in the Revolution* (Macmillans). The present section of the narrative contemplated by the author covers the period from 1775 to 1780, or, in other words, from the battle of Lexington to the appointment of Gen. Greene to the command of the Continental forces relied upon to cope with Lord Cornwallis in the Carolinas. Here again we encounter repeated proofs of the research and insight exhibited by Dr. McCrady in his previous works. The task which he has undertaken was one that needed to be performed, and no competent reader will deny that he has accomplished it with admirable efficiency and notable success.

I.

From the outset of the Revolution the patriotic party in South Carolina was in an unfortunate condition. Its leaders, the members of the Council of Safety and the delegates to the Continental Congress, were divided among themselves as to the nature of the Revolution in which they were involved, and the extent to which they wished to carry it. Conspicuous in the extreme wing of the patriotic faction were William Henry Drayton, Arthur Middleton, Col. Charles Pinckney and Thomas Ferguson. These men advocated every vigorous plan, while Rawlins Lowndes, James Carson, Miles Brewton, Thomas Heyward, Jr., and Thomas Bee usually favored moderate measures, and John Huger, Benjamin Elliott and William Williamson took part with one or the other coterie, as in their judgment seemed best. The subject upon which the difference in the sentiments and purposes of the members of the Committee of Safety early disclosed itself was the expediency of placing Charlestown and its harbor in a condition of defence. The dissension among the influential men in the tidewater region was not the only circumstance of ill augury for the success of the Revolution in this province. In an earlier volume the author has recounted how the early German settlers had pushed into the interior and occupied the territory formed into the townships of Orangeburg and Saxe-Gotha, whence they had extended further, and, following the Congaree, had crossed into the fork of the Broad and Saluda rivers; and how these first settlers had been considerably augmented by another German emigration in 1764, which had been greatly assisted by the English Government and public-spirited citizens in London. In July, 1775, it was ascertained that these people were not at all inclined to join the movement on the coast against the Government of Great Britain. Their opposition was both negative and positive. They had no appreciation of the theoretical question of abstract right in the matter of taxation and representation. The Government they were living under gave them far greater freedom than they had been accustomed to in Germany. They cared nothing about the Stamp act because they were not engaged in commerce, and, consequently, would not have needed to use stamps. As for tea, they did not drink it, and, therefore, did not see why they should go to war about a matter which did not practically concern them. Then, again, they asked with what grace the people on the coast could appeal to them to join in a war against taxation without representation in the British Parliament, when, though they had petitioned for it, they were without representation in the Commons House of Assembly in Carolina. To conciliate these people some of their countrymen had been sent from Charleston to reason with them, but the envoys accomplished nothing.

It was also soon ascertained that the opposition to the uprising against the mother country extended much further back into the interior, and was particularly strong in the fork of the Saluda and Broad rivers, where the German element, coming up from the coast, had met the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians coming down by the way of the foot of the mountains. They, too, had been without representatives in the Colonial Assembly and had few in the Provincial Congress which now had assumed to overthrow one Government and set up another over them. They, too, like the Germans, had had no use for either stamps or tea, and took little interest in a dispute which, at their distance from the coast, appeared to be only a struggle for political power. One of these men, Thomas Browne, a Scotchman, was cruelly treated by the Augusta Committee of Safety, and, subsequently, out of resentment, he entered the royal service, and raised among his coreligionists a corps of royalists called the King's Rangers, and was thenceforth known during the war as an active and bloodthirsty partisan officer. So general was the disaffection from the Broad to the Savannah rivers that, in our author's opinion, had the Royal Governor, Lord William Campbell, gone up boldly among the people of this section, and acted with promptness, the proceedings of the Provincial Congress would have come to nought.

The middle of September, 1775, was an eventful era in the Revolutionary history of South Carolina, for on the 15th day of that month, the Provincial troops, by order of the Council of Safety, took possession of Fort Johnson, commanding the entrance of Charlestown Harbor. The Commons House of Assembly was dissolved by the proclamation of Gov. Campbell, while his Excellency, alarmed for his own personal safety, left Charlestown [the name of the town was thus spelled at the time], and took refuge on board a British sloop of war lying in the roads. We may here mention that, on Sept. 17, the first American flag in South Carolina was hoisted over Fort Johnson. It was designed by Col. Moultrie, and was of a blue color, with a crescent in the dexter corner.

The first battle of the Revolution in this province took place soon afterward. On Nov. 9, 1775, the aggressive party carried through the Provincial Congress a resolution directing the officer commanding at Fort Johnson, "by every military operation, to oppose the passage of any British naval armament that might attempt to pass." Access to the town, however, beyond the range of the guns of Fort Johnson was practicable for the small royal armed vessels, Tamar and Cherokee. An attempt to reach Charlestown in this way resulted in a naval engagement, which, curiously enough, like the first collision between the States in 1861, ended without a single casualty.

An independent government had existed in South Carolina since the 8th of July, 1774, when the Provincial Congress, which met in Charlestown, appointed an Executive Committee, upon which it conferred executive powers, to be exercised until the Congress should meet again. By the measure adopted on March 26, 1776, South Carolina was the first colony to set up a formal Government in opposition to the King's, and to provide for it an organic law. The plan of government then framed was styled "a constitution," but, as Dr. McCrady points out, it was in no sense a constitution as we in the United States now understand that term, to wit: an instrument emanating from the people, the original source of all power, enacted by their immediate representatives chosen for that specific purpose, organizing a Government, regulating its administration and defining its powers; an instrument unalterable, except by the people who ordained it, in convention assembled, or in pursuance of specific provisions describing the manner in which changes should be made. This scheme of government did not emanate directly from the people of South Carolina if, indeed, it can be said to have emanated from them at all. It did not profess to be permanent. It did not impose any limitation or restriction upon the Legislature which adopted it, nor upon any succeeding one; as a matter of fact, the first General Assembly chosen under its provisions abrogated it, and by a simple act substituted another. These so-called constitutions of 1776 and 1778 ought not, therefore, to be regarded as Constitutions at all. They were merely plans of provisional government framed for the occasion and had no more force than an ordinary act of the Legislature. They have given rise to misunderstanding on the part of several historians. In a footnote Dr. McCrady directs attention to the fact that Prof. Bryce in his "American Commonwealth" observes that Virginia and South Carolina have had five constitutions each. The truth is that South Carolina has had but two constitutions of her own voluntary adoption. As it is stated in the text before us, the so-called constitutions of 1776 and 1778 were in no wise entitled to the name. The constitution of 1790 continued for seventy-five years; although three conventions of the people were held during that time, it was not changed by them. Again, the so-called constitutions of 1865 and 1868 were imposed by the Federal Government, and enforced through its military authority. The constitution of 1790 and that of 1895 are the only two constitutions proper adopted by the people of South Carolina.

II.

Did South Carolina authorize her delegates to the Continental Congress to sign at Philadelphia the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776? Dr. McCrady makes it clear that they had received no such authorization from the Legislature or the Executive of their State. Thus it came to pass that, when Thomas Jefferson from the committee appointed for the purpose reported to the Congress his draft of the Declaration of Independence, the delegates from South Carolina found themselves in an embarrassing position. They knew that their constituents had joined in the revolutionary movement from the first more out of sympathy with the New England colonies than from any actual pressure of hardship and wrong upon themselves. No doubt, the British Government had grossly abused the appointing power and had refused to allow the additional courts required for the increased population of South Carolina until that colony should have bought off the patent officeholders who had been forced upon it. These, however, were local grievances which the Continental Congress in all its discussions had not thought worthy of enumeration among the wrongs which were denounced and which, indeed, were acts so inaccordance with the spirit of the times as scarcely to be complained of by the Carolinians themselves. The grievances, moreover, were of a character which, there was ground to hope, might be remedied by a change in the British Ministry without resort by the Carolinians to the extreme remedy of revolution. The stern and cruel commercial code which was at the bottom of the quarrel between England and her transmarine dependencies was not felt acutely in South Carolina, though rice was one of the enumerated articles.

The people of that country were planters and not sailors and were content that the mother country should have the carrying of their produce. The merchants of South Carolina, unlike those of the Northern colonies, were almost to a man opposed to revolution. Again, the people of South Carolina had been forced to realize from the outset that, though they might be led into a war from sympathy with the wrongs of the Northern colonies, those colonies were too far distant to assist them in return. Moreover, three of the delegates had just come from home, where they had heard the new State constitution discussed, and they knew that Gadsden's avowal of his desire for independence had been expressly repudiated in its preamble. Nevertheless, when the Continental Congress met on July 2, 1776, and the question was again submitted whether it would declare the independence of the colonies, the four delegates from South Carolina agreed to brave the consequences at home and to vote for the Virginia Resolutions, in order to preserve unity among the colonies. Fortunately for the delegates, an event had taken place at home which had vastly changed the conditions of local parties and affairs. Let us see what had happened at Charlestown.

III.

It will be remembered that when Boston was evacuated by the British on March 16, 1776, the fleet under Admiral Graves, bearing the army which had occupied the town, lingered for some days in Nantucket Roads, but at length disappeared from the coast. What could be the destination of the troops thus withdrawn from Boston was a question which deeply interested Washington. As early as Feb. 4, however, the mystery had been partly solved by the appearance in New York harbor of Sir Henry Clinton, who, with a part of the squadron, had left Boston not long before its evacuation. From New York he continued his cruise southward, avowing his destination to be North Carolina. Arriving at Cape Fear he was joined by Sir Peter Parker's squadron about the beginning of May. Sir Peter's fleet was intended for the subjugation of the southern provinces. Gen. Howe, indeed, had despatched a vessel from Halifax, to which place he had retired from Boston, to intercept the fleet and order it to join him there. But the vessel was delayed and did not reach Cape Fear until the fleet under Parker and Clinton had sailed for Charlestown. It is well known that the attack failed, owing mainly to the admirable defence, on June 28, 1776, of Fort Moultrie, or Fort Sullivan, as it was then called. Curiously enough, Gen. Charles Lee, who was in command of the revolutionary forces in and around the city, had been on the point of removing Moultrie from the fort on the preceding evening, and persisted in the intention as late as the beginning of the action. What our author thinks of the man by whom the first decisive victory was gained by American arms will be found set forth on page 148: "Col. Moultrie was an able and exceedingly gallant officer in action; but he was of easy manners and careless disposition, content to leave to others the performance of duties which should have received his own personal supervision. He was a poor disciplinarian and lacked the elementary soldierly characteristic of promptness and punctuality. We must not omit to mention, however, in extenuation of his neglect in this matter, that before and during the action he was suffering with gout. Had it not been for his firm and gallant conduct Sullivan's Island would have been abandoned and the glorious victory of Fort Moultrie would not now adorn the history of South Carolina; but nevertheless, by his indifference and carelessness that victory was jeoparded, and might have been lost had not the enemy's vessels got aground while attempting to round the cove in order to enfilade the fort, as Lee anticipated. Had it not been for Moultrie's indomitable spirit, Charlestown would have been surrendered to Gen. Prevost in May, 1779; while it was owing to the above mentioned defect of his character that the battle of Stono was lost in June of that year."

The British force engaged in the attack upon Charlestown in 1776 consisted of 2,200 Regulars under Sir Henry Clinton, besides all the marines and sailors belonging to a fleet of two fifty-gun ships, five frigates and four other vessels, carrying in all 270 guns. On the side of the patriots there were arrayed 1,400 North Carolina Continentals, 500 Virginia Continentals, 1,950 South Carolina Regulars, 700 Charlestown militia and 1,972 country militia. We scarcely need remind the reader that the British were repulsed with great loss, and, for the time, renounced the idea of taking the city. That is why Dr. McCrady would rank the battle of Fort Moultrie among the three most complete and epoch-making American victories of the Revolution, excluding Lexington, which ushered in the war, and Yorktown, which ended it. It was the first absolute victory. The next was Saratoga and the third was the culmination of a long series of smaller affairs at King's Mountain. Bunker Hill was a gloriously fought battle, and did much to establish the confidence of the Americans in the efficacy of their own ability and valor; yet the outcome of the struggle was the capture by the British of the point of vantage which they had undertaken to win. Princeton and Trenton were brilliant military strokes which did much to revive the failing spirits of the revolutionists at the time; outside of this they were not productive of any decisive or lasting results. "The victory of Fort Moultrie in its moral aspect was as valuable to the cause as Bunker Hill, but it was far more so in the consequences which followed and the advantages it secured. At Bunker Hill the Americans had exhibited the highest qualities of valor and steadfastness, but the object of the struggle was not attained; the position was ultimately abandoned. At Fort Moultrie they had fought with no less valor and fortunately with the most brilliant success. They had not only resisted, but utterly defeated the supposed invincible British Navy. The little log fort had withstood the broadsides of some of the largest vessels in his Majesty's service, but the material results were far greater. The expedition which so confidently set out to crush and subjugate the Southern colonies was utterly defeated, and these colonies were relieved for three years from invasion, to remain a source of strength and supply to their friends at the North while the war waged there. The victory at Saratoga put an end to the grand strategy by which the New England States were to be cut off and permanently separated from the others, thus, it was confidently believed, practically to end the war. The culminating victory of King's Mountain recalled Cornwallis from the further prosecution of his victorious career, and put an end to the grand movement by which the war was to be carried 'from South to North,' and gained time for the coming of the second French fleet. The battle of Fort Moultrie was the first of these great achievements and victories, nor was it the least brilliant of them."

IV.

The second, and this time successful, attack upon Charlestown took place in 1780. Upon his return to New York from Philadelphia in 1778 Sir Henry Clinton, now Commander-in-Chief of the British forces, turned his attention to the South, and sent Col. Campbell to coöperate with Gen. Prévost from Florida in operations against Georgia. These operations had resulted in the capture of Savannah and the practical restoration of royal authority in Georgia, and had nearly brought about the fall of Charlestown. Our author deems it not surprising that Sir Henry upon assuming the chief command in America should have turned back to the scheme of establishing a government in the back parts of North and South Carolina, the inhabitants of which were yet believed to be loyal to the British Crown. Events subsequent to the attempt made in 1776 had rather strengthened confidence in the feasibility of the plan, and it was assumed that, if the King's arms could once reach those regions, the people would flock to the royal standard, and large reenforcements would be obtained. From that point with increased numbers the royal army might proceed to Virginia, and thence on to the Chesapeake. This project of carrying his Majesty's arms "from South to North," a project long entertained, Sir Henry now undertook to carry into effect. The movement was to be combined with another favorite idea of the British Ministry, to wit, "the conquering of America by Americans." The first step in this campaign was the acquisition of the city of Charlestown, and to this end Sir Henry Clinton was now to put forth all his powers.

On Dec. 26, 1779, Sir Henry Clinton, assured of the departure of the French fleet from the waters of Carolina and Georgia, turned over the command of the King's troops at New York to Lieut.-Gen. Knyphausen, and, taking Earl Cornwallis with him, embarked with four flank battalions, twelve regiments—British, Hessian and provincial—a powerful detachment of artillery, 250 cavalry and ample supplies of stores and provisions. Vice-Admiral Arbuthnot, with a naval force superior to anything in the American seas, sailed as a convoy to the expedition. On Feb. 11, 1780, the British troops were disembarked on John's Island, about thirty miles below Charlestown. Such was the caution of Sir Henry Clinton in establishing and fortifying posts to preserve communications with the sea that it was not until March 29 that the advance guard of the army crossed the Ashley River and landed on Charlestown Neck. Hearing that reenforcements had been sent to Gen. Lincoln, who was in command of Charlestown, and that hourly additions to the American force were expected from Virginia and the Carolinas, Sir Henry Clinton on his part determined to call for reenforcements. By June 10, 1780, it was stated that the royal army under Sir Henry Clinton amounted to 13,572 men, but this was after the arrival of Lord Rawdon with the reenforcements from New York for which Sir Henry called. Our author points out that this was the largest British force engaged in any single operation during the Revolution, if we except the expedition against Philadelphia in which Sir William Howe had between 15,000 and 18,000. The British army during the siege of Boston numbered 10,000. At the Battle of Long Island Sir William Howe had 9,000, with which he landed, and was reenforced by Sir Henry Clinton from Charlestown with possibly 3,000, making his whole force 12,000. Burgoyne's army was about 9,000.

It is well known that the second attack upon Charlestown was successful and resulted on May 12, 1780, not only in the loss of the city, but also in the surrender of its defenders. Sir Henry Clinton first reported that the prisoners taken by him numbered about 6,000 men in arms. The return of prisoners, however, made by Major André, Deputy Adjutant-General, amounted to only 5,684. Our author points out that this return comprehended in the militia every adult freeman in the town, including the infirm, invalids and disaffected. Gen. Lincoln in a letter to Washington gave his reasons for undertaking the defence of the town and cooping himself up on its narrow peninsula, from which nothing but a decisive victory could release him. He might have adopted the alternative course of abandoning the town at the outset, taking the field with his army and putting himself in a position to meet and receive the reenforcements he believed to be coming, with which he might have contested the possession of the State. In Dr. McCrady's opinion Lincoln's reasons for remaining in the city will not bear examination. "The question at this time was not as to the importance of the town, nor as to the value of the stores it contained. There was no doubt about either. The question was as to the practicability or possibility of its defence. This question Lincoln himself decided wisely or unwisely, when he abandoned the harbor to the enemy. It should have been as plain to him as it was subsequently to Washington that the fate of the town was involved in that of the defence of the harbor. With an overwhelming force in the rear of the town it was useless to continue its defence when the harbor was given up. When he withdrew the fleet but one avenue of escape remained—yet there was one—that across the Cooper River at Lempriere's Point, or, as it was also called, Hobcaw, but this became daily more and more precarious and would be closed by Sir Henry Clinton's land force as soon as his reenforcements arrived, if not before by Admiral Arbuthnot from the sea. The opinion which Washington so cautiously expressed to Laurens before the event he still held and expressed years afterward when he viewed the situation on his visit to Charlestown. If the town and its stores were worth risking the loss of Lincoln's whole army in a siege, it was worth the risk of the loss of the Continental frigates in resisting the entrance of the British fleet into the harbor. It would have been better to have had them lost in an engagement, in which they might have at least done some compensating injury to the enemy's vessels than to have had them ignominiously sunk in the channel; better that their guns should have gone down in an action on the bar than to have remained to swell the trophies of the enemy on the capture of the town." The author adds: "The truth seems to be that Lincoln was himself a brave, amiable man and no doubt a valuable officer under Washington, but he possessed neither the indomitable will and heroic courage of Moultrie nor any of the great qualities of leadership which Sumter, Marion and Pickens were soon to display."

After the surrender of Charlestown, the important strategic points in the interior of the State were promptly occupied by the British forces under Lord Cornwallis. On June 4, 1780, Sir Henry Clinton wrote to Lord George Germain, Secretary of State: "I may venture to assert that there are few men in South Carolina who are not either our prisoners or in arms with us." Our author admits that this was true. There was not a Continental officer or soldier in the field. The militia were disbanded. The Revolutionary party was completely broken up. There remained of the patriots but one man to continue the struggle: that was John Rutledge. "There can be little doubt that at this time wise rulers might with care and moderation have reestablished the royal authority. Had Lieut.-Gov. William Bull been sent back from England, whither he had gone, and reinstated in his Government with full powers such as the Revolutionists had conferred upon John Rutledge, had military rule been superseded and the violence and rapacity of the army put down, South Carolina might probably even at this late day, have been reconciled again to become a British province." Besides the dispersion or capture of all the leading Revolutionists in the State, and the prevalence of the loyal and penitent sentiments expressed in the address to Sir Henry Clinton and Admiral Arbuthnot, signed by 210 representative Carolinians, there was another powerful motive inducing the people to hasten their submission.

V.

This was the widespread belief that, in order to secure the independence of the others, Congress had determined to sacrifice the Southern States. The mere fact of the failure of Congress to send assistance at all adequate to meet the powerful efforts put forth by the British in their second invasion of South Carolina was in itself sufficient to give rise to such an impression. According to Dr. McCrady, however, there is strong reason to believe that the apprehension had a substantial basis in fact. Gen. Thomas Pinckney, then a Major in the Continental service, who was with Gov. Rutledge at this time, relates that, while at Camden on their retreat from Charlestown the Governor received a letter from a member of the South Carolina delegation in Congress, informing him that despondency for the fate of the Southern States was universally felt in Philadelphia; *but that he still indulged the hope that Carolina would remain a member of the Union.* This guarded and diplomatic language, necessarily employed in a correspondence running the danger of interception, was subsequently explained by John Mathews, who was then a member of Congress and succeeded Rutledge as Governor. In after life Mathews repeatedly declared that through the intrigues and at the suggestion of the French Ambassador it was at the time contemplated by some members of Congress to purchase from Great Britain peace and independence for a large portion of the United States by the sacrifice of the Carolinas and Georgia. That the subject had been broached and discussed in Congress there is no doubt.

The French envoy, M. de la Luzerne, writing to the Count de Vergennes, thus refers to it: "After the taking of Charlestown the English practised much greater moderation toward the inhabitants of the South than they had done toward those of the Middle and Eastern States. Their plan was to sever the Carolinas and Georgia, and they seemed at this time to have abandoned the idea of reducing the Northern States. They commenced publishing a gazette at Charlestown, in which they circulated insinuations that the Northern States had abandoned the South, and that they were about to make an arrangement with England which would exclude the Carolinas and Georgia. *The members of Congress are divided as to their interest and objects. Some are for using all efforts for rescuing the South. Others think the people there have shown too little zeal and activity in the cause, and that it is not expedient to put in jeopardy the safety of the North by rendering extraordinary aid to people who are so indifferent about their own independence.* One party speaks secretly about an expedition against Canada, another magnifies the difficulties of taking New York, one insists on an expedition to the South during the summer, another is for a combined enterprise against Quebec. The British at the South talk of peace, and encourage the people to return to their former allegiance. *It is possible that the British will make a proposition to the ten Northern States tending to assure their independence, and their scheme will be to form into a new Government the two Carolinas, Georgia, East Florida and the Bahama Islands, which together would make a possession.*" There is still more direct evidence forthcoming in a letter addressed by Duane, a member of Congress, to Gen. Philip Schuyler, one of the committee appointed by Congress to remain near Washington's headquarters. This letter admits that an opinion had been propagated that Congress meant to sacrifice the two southernmost States.

In view of these facts, it cannot be denied that the month of May, 1780, was a most critical period in the Revolution. "What," says our author, "might have been the consequences if wisdom had swayed the British commanders in South Carolina it appalls one to contemplate. Fatigued by the toils of war, disappointed by reiterated disasters, the prospect of success but glimmering at a distance, and by many altogether despaired of, had the newly submitting inhabitants been suffered to enjoy the sweets of repose and the benefits of the security guaranteed by the capitulation, had kindness been substituted for oppression, and persuasion used in lieu of force, though independence might ultimately have been gained, it must have been at a more remote period, and by a far greater sacrifice both of treasure and blood. Fortunately for the American cause, the conduct of Sir Henry Clinton, Lord Cornwallis and Lord Rawdon was so injudicious as to subject them to the pointed animadversions even of British historians. The restoration of the colony to his Majesty's rule, and the reestablishment of peace and prosperity do not appear to have been their first thought. Prévost's pillage had excited their rapacity, and the seizure of plunder and the division of spoils were the first matters which obtained their consideration."

It will be convenient to reserve for a notice of the next and concluding volume of this valuable work the account here given by Dr. McCrady of the disastrous results of the appointment of Gen. Gates to the command of the Continental army intended for the recovery of South Carolina. M. W. H.