Volume II] *October, 1896* [*Number 1*

The American Historical Review

THE COLONEL AND HIS COMMAND

IN the nomenclature of military ranks there is a frequent appearance of meaninglessness that agreeably stimulates speculation. We are set wondering how ideas so definite can have obtained expression so vague or inappropriate. If you have a taste for it, you will smell hidden history and be impatient to take up the scent. And given an inclination for the sport, you cannot do better. There is no hobby that is a more clever fencer or will more boldly fly the most staggering obstacles; and as for country it is some of the finest in the world of letters. A man who has never sipped the delights of old military books — and it is through these the chase will take you — has missed a good thing. There are no others of which you may grow more foolishly fond. For pedantry they are unsurpassed: nowhere can trivialities be found so weightily put or platitude so learnedly supported; and yet continually and in appetizing contrast you may light on shrewd bits of soldierly wisdom, set in a grim kind of humor, and on clear glimpses of the old soldiers' life. You may hear again their swagger and their swearing, their quarrels on trivial points of precedence, and listen to the music of the pikemen's armor as they march, and smell the smouldering matches of the musketeers. Nor can any one deny, and this is a strong attraction, that they are among the most useless and dead of books. Sterne knew them and felt their charm, though perhaps naturally he was a bit ashamed of the weakness and engaged Uncle Toby to ride his hobby. Scott felt it too after his way, and must, I think, have had his pleasant hours with them. *The Antiquary* shows the hand of a genuine lover, and so does *The Legend of Montrose*, though to be sure Dugald Dalgetty is a dunce beside Captain Shandy.

These old treatises on the art of war are mainly of two kinds. Some, ill-printed, with a low-bred air, seem to have been intended honestly as works of instruction for the use of young gentlemen-volunteers desirous of acquiring the military art. Sometimes they are mere drill-books, and sometimes they sound the whole gamut of the science, from the elements of arithmetic to the conduct of a siege. Others again are more pretentious, and glow with brilliant type and costly engravings. These for the most part are the adorning of a dignified retirement after a life of active service — the work of some famous captain who must crown his career like Cæsar with a volume of *Commentaries*. But no matter the author or the tongue, they are all of one family and vie with one another for platitude and pedantry. Indeed for plagiarism the noble captains are shameless. You may trace an aphorism — of which things these learned soldiers were inordinately fond — from author to author, and in the end it is ten to one you will not discover its begetting. For all of them the phalanx and the legion sing in their heads like a haunting refrain, and Hannibal and Cæsar and Alexander are dragged in by the heels through the most unexpected openings and upon every trivial occasion. They will all tell you, one after another, that a sergeant is a most necessary officer, that a captain should have a stout heart and experience in the wars, and so on through the whole cadre; but in spite of their coquetting with scholarship and their childlike reverence for classical origins there is not one will let you learn how ranks came by their names. And it is only by persistent questing over these pleasant hunting-grounds that the trace of such a thing is to be found.

Of all grades that of Colonel is wrapped in the most inviting obscurity. Not but that the dictionaries are quite agreed about it, and that in all languages and with so perfect a unanimity that, however historically impossible the accepted derivation be, it is not to be lightly rejected. As to the actual meaning of the word there is no doubt. It is simply the Italian *colonello*, "a little column." So much is not in dispute, in spite of the existence of another form "coronel," which would seem to connect the word with *corona*. This form, although it has been adopted by the Spaniards, is certainly nothing but a corruption of the other under the influence of the common Romanic tendency known as the dissimilation of recurring l's. The Italians seem always to have kept to the form "colonel," nor does the old French "couronnel" appear in literary use after the sixteenth century. We in England for a long time wavered between the

two, with a preference for the Spanish form; for Spain was our father-in-arms, and the great Spanish captain, Gonsalvo de Cordova, was the Von Moltke of that time. As our literature became more Italianate, and perhaps as we achieved less reverence for Spain as a military power, polite people inclined to spell the word with the "l." Throughout the seventeenth century both forms were in use and continued to confuse plain people till we characteristically settled the difficulty by writing the word one way and pronouncing the other.

So much being clear, the real question is why the officer commanding a regiment should be called "a little column." It is here we quarrel with the security of the dictionaries. Even Mr. Skeat, an example of caution, has no doubt about it and is at one with all the rest. "Colonel," he boldly says, "is so called because he commanded the colonello or 'little column' that marched before the regiment." Dr. Murray in his new *Dictionary* quotes this with approval; and in every other that I have consulted, no matter the language, some such explanation is the only one given. The French Encyclopedists, with more scholarship, flatly refuse to settle the point; and I am therefore encouraged, in spite of the weight of unanimity, to assert that a little consideration of what the Colonel originally was and a little knowledge of old military sentiment will make the accepted derivation appear very improbable; and further, that an inquiry into the time at which the rank began to be used will show that derivation to be a plain impossibility.

The earliest definition of the word that I have been able to discover in any military treatise, is that contained in the *Arte Militare* of Signor Mario Savorgnano, Count of Belgrade. The book was not published until after his death in 1599, but internal evidence shows that the manuscript was composed for the instruction of his nephews about thirty years earlier. "Those are called colonels," he says in his First Book, "who command large Bands (*grosse Bande*) of Infantry." Here of course he must plunge off into a long disquisition on the phalanx and the legion, but having got this off his pen he proceeds to explain very briefly, but with unusual clearness, what these *bande* were. "To-day," he tells us, "amongst the Germans they are called *Reggimenti* and so also say the Swiss, amounting to four or five thousand men; but with the Spaniards and Italians the Bands are usually four thousand, and I approve this number. . . . Over each of them is placed in command one whom we call Colonel with his lieutenant and his captains of four and five hundred." The rank, however, had been in use already many years. At Venice in 1566, that is, about the

time Savorgnano was completing his manuscript, was published one of the humbler sort of works that I have referred to, a fat quarto ill-bound and worse printed, containing a treatise *Della Disciplina Militare*, by Captain Alfonso Adriano, which takes us back to the early days of the century. "I remember," he writes, "that in 1519, when I began to serve under the discipline of the ever most illustrious Marquis of Pescara, the companies of private captains were usually one hundred strong, and he who had two hundred was held amongst those distinguished of fortune. The 'Colonels' (*i colonelli*) were four or at most five hundred strong. But now-a-days, with better judgment, the companies are stronger, especially with the Spaniards, where they are three hundred strong and the 'Colonels' a thousand. The French companies are of four hundred and the German of five hundred." Here then he shows us the *banda* as an aggregate of companies, some of which were stronger than others and were called *colonelli*. These were almost certainly the companies of colonels commanding the "bands." The banda was, at any rate in theory, a brigade of companies commanded by its senior captain, an idea which, as is well known, survived in regimental organization till a very late period. Everywhere else but in the passage quoted, Adriano uses the word as a rank and not as a body of men, and we therefore may take it as certain, without prejudice to the question whether the officer or his command first came by the name, that as early as 1519 the banda was commanded by a colonel, and that his, the senior company, was called *il colonello*, as in France it was long called the *compagnie colonelle*. We may even go further back still. Immediately after the above passage Adriano goes on to speak of his master and father-in-arms, one Giovanbattista della Valle Venafranca, as "an old captain and colonel of Ferdinand the Catholic, King of Aragon." This is fair evidence that the rank existed before 1516, the date of Ferdinand's death. Still it must be noted that Macchiavelli does not use it. His *Art of War* is generally supposed to have been written between 1516 and 1519. Yet for the head of his reorganised *battaglione*, he clings to the old mediæval word "constable," ignoring or being ignorant of the new one. Francis the First, however, immediately afterwards gave the head of his new legion the title of *colonel;* so that we may place the introduction of the word with practical certainty not later than the second decade of the sixteenth century.

As yet however the banda or colonel's command was very far from being the modern regiment. It was still little more than the "battaglione," or mass of infantry in deep formation, which had

come to be the backbone of later mediæval armies, and was still the tactical unit in the days of the "Great Captain." Modified it was no doubt; but, like everything else in those times, it was modified by the classical fever that was raging in Europe, and was still rather the legion or the phalanx than the modern regiment. Macchiavelli, the first of modern writers on the Art of War, avowedly based his organization of a national militia upon the Roman legion, praising the Swiss "who alone in our time have retained any shadow of the antique system." His work became at once a model and a well for all literary and scientific soldiers. Francis the First seems to have based his new legionary organization entirely upon Macchiavelli's book. At any rate Monsieur de Lange, in describing it, helps himself wholesale from the Italian and without a blush. Francis's organization, however, was but short-lived, and would appear to have been the last attempt to bring the old infantry mass into harmony with the exigencies of modern warfare by modifying it upon classical lines.

With the decay of the man-at-arms and the development of light cavalry, no less than with the increased offensive value of infantry due to the growth of fire-arms, practical soldiers must have grasped the importance of giving the battaglione mobility and elasticity. In this direction the first attempt at reform seems to have been a reduction of its strength. In the *Osservanza Militare* of Captain Francisco Ferretti, who published in 1568, its numbers are given at six thousand six hundred; Savorgnano, writing very much about the same time, tells us it was fixed by the Italians and Spaniards at four thousand men. But it was not in this way that the problem was to be solved, at any rate in Italy. There we now begin to note the appearance of an entirely new body, the creation of an entirely new unit, the "*terzo*" or "*tertia*." Here again is one of the mysteries of military history. How or when or whence it came no man tells us, or what is the significance of its curious name. Like "colonel," of course its meaning is plain. It is "a third," but why a third? a third of what? If we were permitted to guess, the solution is easy. With the moderation of the classical fever, I would venture to think the old soldiers began to doubt whether salvation must necessarily be sought in Latin or Greek forms. They may have looked nearer home to their old mediæval system with its threefold division of vanguard, main-battle, and rear-guard, and so have hit upon the plan of getting rid of their cumbrous unit without any such radical change as a soldier's mind abhors. It was so easy to divide it into three: the thing had even the air of reaction rather than of revolution. A specious classi-

cal precedent was to be found in the threefold formation of the legion; and this is, as I would venture to suggest, how the *tertia* came to exist and the transition from mediæval to modern methods was finally set on foot. It is only a guess. There is nothing to support it, though arithmetically it makes a fair show. The Marchese Annibale Porroni, writing about a hundred years after the tertia first appears, tells us in his *Trattato Universale Militare Moderno* that it consisted of from a thousand to fifteen hundred men; so that here we have a body whose normal strength was something like a third of Savorgnano's battaglione of four thousand, and which was something very like a modern regiment.

At the head of the new body, however, we do not find a colonel. Indeed, if the suggested explanation of the origin of the tertia be the true one, it is out of the question that we should. A colonel could not be set over a third of his old command. The new leader was called *maestro di campo;* but the rank was not a new one. Both Ferretti and Savorgnano, who did not know the tertia, describe him still as a member of the general staff with duties akin to those of a modern quartermaster-general, or chief-of-the-staff; and so also Adriano. "The office of Maestro di Campo," he says, "is to be the executive officer (*executore*) of the Captain-General, as a Podestà di Giustitia in a state is to his Prince. . . . He is next in command after the general and has charge of the victuals, camping, and marching." This was quite in accordance with the tendency of staff ranks to become substantive ranks. "Constable" and "marshal" went through the same process, and so did "major" and "major-general," the staff ranks which in turn succeeded "maestro di campo," and were themselves succeeded by "adjutant" and "adjutant-general." Indeed, the consumption of the staff rank for the head of a new body is in itself presumptive evidence that it was carved out of a larger body, to which the new regimental officer was formerly attached as chief staff-officer. And more than this. In the French service was long to be found a curiously recurring phenomenon which gives much color to our conjecture, and that is the constant changing of the rank from *maître-de-camp* to colonel and back again. From the creation of Francis's legions to the middle of Henry the Second's reign the chiefs of infantry regiments were called colonels. Thence to 1661 they were *mestres-de-camp*, and again and again they were changed, apparently with no reason. But the fact is that "colonel" was used when the rank of colonel-general, or commander-in-chief of the infantry, was suppressed or in abeyance. Whenever it is revived we find regiments under the

command of maîtres-de-camp, that is under officers who were nominally the chief members of the colonel-general's staff. Thus we see that by the traditions of the French service the existence of maîtres-de-camp presupposed the existence of a colonel-in-chief over them, and that the bodies they commanded were theoretically units of the colonel's command — a tradition that is hardly to be explained except on the supposition that the tertias were originally carved out of the old banda.

The introduction of the new body is, I believe, usually attributed to Alexander Farnese, Duke of Parma, but on what authority I know not. Still the reform almost certainly took place in his time, and it was under him the tertias made their reputation. As we have seen, Ferretti, Savorgnano, and Adriano, all writing about 1560, knew nothing of the tertia and still describe maestro di campo as a staff officer. At Venice in 1570 was published *Il Soldato* of M. Domenico Mora of Bologna, and here, although the tertia is not mentioned, the maestro di campo is described for the first time as a regimental officer of equal rank with the colonel of a regiment, and it is to the Duke of Parma that Mora dedicates his work. Thus we are able fairly accurately to fix the date at which the tertia was introduced and to guess with some color of plausibility what it originally was. As for the regiment, however, we are still far from ascertaining how it came into existence. It was certainly not the same thing in its origin as a tertia, and it was always regarded as something different, even when tactically and administratively the two things had become identical. The Marchese Annibale Porroni in his dialogue concerning military ranks, contained in his fourth book, treats *maestro di campo* and *colonello* under one head. "What," asks the inquirer, "is the difference between maestro di campo and colonello?" "Nothing," answers the Marquis, "except that in organizing the tertia the officers from ensign upwards are appointed by the captain-general (*i.e.* the commander-in-chief), while in the regiment this prerogative remains with the colonel." The Marquis was a man of wide service under many flags and his book was published in Venice in 1676, so that we may take it he knew the general practice of Europe at the time the regimental system had become fixed, and that he had seen its final development.

So small a matter, however, as the method of appointing officers can hardly have been the real distinction between the two bodies. It has rather the appearance of the survival of a difference that was once wide and real — and leads us to suspect a case of two bodies of different origin and constitution becoming assimilated

cal precedent was to be found in the threefold formation of the legion; and this is, as I would venture to suggest, how the *tertia* came to exist and the transition from mediæval to modern methods was finally set on foot. It is only a guess. There is nothing to support it, though arithmetically it makes a fair show. The Marchese Annibale Porroni, writing about a hundred years after the tertia first appears, tells us in his *Trattato Universale Militare Moderno* that it consisted of from a thousand to fifteen hundred men; so that here we have a body whose normal strength was something like a third of Savorgnano's battaglione of four thousand, and which was something very like a modern regiment.

At the head of the new body, however, we do not find a colonel. Indeed, if the suggested explanation of the origin of the tertia be the true one, it is out of the question that we should. A colonel could not be set over a third of his old command. The new leader was called *maestro di campo;* but the rank was not a new one. Both Ferretti and Savorgnano, who did not know the tertia, describe him still as a member of the general staff with duties akin to those of a modern quartermaster-general, or chief-of-the-staff; and so also Adriano. "The office of Maestro di Campo," he says, "is to be the executive officer (*executore*) of the Captain-General, as a Podestà di Giustitia in a state is to his Prince. . . . He is next in command after the general and has charge of the victuals, camping, and marching." This was quite in accordance with the tendency of staff ranks to become substantive ranks. "Constable" and "marshal" went through the same process, and so did "major" and "major-general," the staff ranks which in turn succeeded "maestro di campo," and were themselves succeeded by "adjutant" and "adjutant-general." Indeed, the consumption of the staff rank for the head of a new body is in itself presumptive evidence that it was carved out of a larger body, to which the new regimental officer was formerly attached as chief staff-officer. And more than this. In the French service was long to be found a curiously recurring phenomenon which gives much color to our conjecture, and that is the constant changing of the rank from *maître-de-camp* to colonel and back again. From the creation of Francis's legions to the middle of Henry the Second's reign the chiefs of infantry regiments were called colonels. Thence to 1661 they were *mestres-de-camp*, and again and again they were changed, apparently with no reason. But the fact is that "colonel" was used when the rank of colonel-general, or commander-in-chief of the infantry, was suppressed or in abeyance. Whenever it is revived we find regiments under the

command of maîtres-de-camp, that is under officers who were nominally the chief members of the colonel-general's staff. Thus we see that by the traditions of the French service the existence of maîtres-de-camp presupposed the existence of a colonel-in-chief over them, and that the bodies they commanded were theoretically units of the colonel's command — a tradition that is hardly to be explained except on the supposition that the tertias were originally carved out of the old banda.

The introduction of the new body is, I believe, usually attributed to Alexander Farnese, Duke of Parma, but on what authority I know not. Still the reform almost certainly took place in his time, and it was under him the tertias made their reputation. As we have seen, Ferretti, Savorgnano, and Adriano, all writing about 1560, knew nothing of the tertia and still describe maestro di campo as a staff officer. At Venice in 1570 was published *Il Soldato* of M. Domenico Mora of Bologna, and here, although the tertia is not mentioned, the maestro di campo is described for the first time as a regimental officer of equal rank with the colonel of a regiment, and it is to the Duke of Parma that Mora dedicates his work. Thus we are able fairly accurately to fix the date at which the tertia was introduced and to guess with some color of plausibility what it originally was. As for the regiment, however, we are still far from ascertaining how it came into existence. It was certainly not the same thing in its origin as a tertia, and it was always regarded as something different, even when tactically and administratively the two things had become identical. The Marchese Annibale Porroni in his dialogue concerning military ranks, contained in his fourth book, treats *maestro di campo* and *colonello* under one head. "What," asks the inquirer, "is the difference between maestro di campo and colonello?" "Nothing," answers the Marquis, "except that in organizing the tertia the officers from ensign upwards are appointed by the captain-general (*i.e.* the commander-in-chief), while in the regiment this prerogative remains with the colonel." The Marquis was a man of wide service under many flags and his book was published in Venice in 1676, so that we may take it he knew the general practice of Europe at the time the regimental system had become fixed, and that he had seen its final development.

So small a matter, however, as the method of appointing officers can hardly have been the real distinction between the two bodies. It has rather the appearance of the survival of a difference that was once wide and real — and leads us to suspect a case of two bodies of different origin and constitution becoming assimilated

by the necessity of adaptation to the same conditions. The right of the colonel to appoint his own officers means that the regiment was regarded as his property. It was a conception which existed till a late period, and survivals of what may be called the proprietary organizations are obvious in most services to this day. At the time when the transition took place no other basis of organization was known; and seeing how deeply the feudal system must have grooved men's minds, especially in Central and Western Europe, the adoption of property instead of tenure as a basis was the natural line for the change. In the South the more liberal Italian could go farther and faster. When the reform became necessary he logically cut up the old unwieldy unit into three, and out of the pieces created an entirely new unit. But of such revolutionary methods the Transalpine mind was incapable, and this is probably the secret of the whole matter. While the tertia represents the Italian, the regiment would seem to be the German method of dealing with the difficulty. We have seen Savorgnano using the word "regiment" to distinguish the German and Swiss form of the battaglione, and at first the regiment seems to have been regarded as an exotic in Italy. We can well understand how the Transalpine soldiers would cling to their old institution, which had made their arms a terror to Europe and placed them in the fore-front of military progress. Quick to see as practical soldiers the value of the new unit, they would be slow to abandon their great invention, and so it would seem they went on in their clumsy way reducing the cumbrous machine until it attained the mobility of the Italian tertia. Thus both the tertia and the regiment were formed out of the old battaglione, but the tertia was produced by cleavage and the regiment by shrinkage. If this is so, it is the more interesting to note that it is not the new logical and scholarly form that survived, but the old solid thing of slow but continuous development that beat the other out of the field. By the end of the seventeenth century the regiment had fully established itself at the expense of the tertia, and that prince of pedants, Sir James Turner, has a loud lament that the unscholarly fashion of modern soldiers compels him to use the barbarous word, whose very meaning and origin was unknown and which he protests was not a hundred years old. But here he was astray; for, as we have seen, although the regiment as he knew it was first called "tertia," "regiment" was the older word of the two.

The whole, of course, is mere conjecture, suggested by the scattered hints of historical value, which the old literary soldiers, in spite of all their pains, have allowed to slip into their pages.

True, the explanation offered fairly accounts for the ascertained facts, and this process nowadays is much confounded with the proof, but of such confusion I would not be accused or even willingly guilty. Still, whether or not it was thus that the modern regiment was evolved from the mediæval battaglione, it is clear that in considering the origin of the rank of colonel we must have in our minds an officer of widely different standing from the one that now holds the title. Originally, as the commandant of a battaglione, he was a highly important general officer, corresponding rather to a general of division, or colonel-general, than to the head of a regiment; and his command, from a part of which he is supposed to have received his name, had hardly a more definite administrative existence than a modern brigade. He was, as colonel, essentially a staff-officer, and it is to misconceive entirely the spirit of those old soldiers, their sensitiveness to forms of precedence, their reverence for the outward marks and symbols of dignity, to suppose that an officer so exalted would have been offered or have accepted a title derived from a mere regimental command. Nor is the evidence that his company was generally known as *colonello* of any moment. Beyond the passage already quoted from Adriano, I have never met with it used of a body of troops at all. Bartolomeo Pelliciari, in his *Avvertimenti in Fattioni di Guerra*, in treating of the colonel of a regiment, tells us he usually had a company reserved to him and gives a full account of its constitution, but he does not say it was called a *colonello;* and what makes it still more probable that it was the officer who gave his name to the company, not the company to the officer, is, that sometimes a regiment was called in Italy a *conellato*, a word that in appearance is a contraction of *colonellato*.

It is, however, unnecessary to deal further with the probabilities, since there is a plain fact which brings us to practical certainty, and that is, that at the time the word "colonel" came into use the word "column" had not acquired its military meaning. A body of troops disposed in line of march was not called a column till at least a century and a half later. When exactly it became a technical military term is difficult to ascertain, but it certainly was not until quite late in the seventeenth century. The Earl of Orrery, who succeeded the great Duke of Albemarle as commander-in-chief of the British army, published, in 1677, as the fashion was, his treatise on the Art of War. In this occurs the following passage: "I would march my army in two or three several bodies divers wayes, which the French call columes, but we, and I think more properly, lines." This is the first appearance of the word in

English literature and must fix approximately the date of its adoption into our service. Seeing how readily and even hastily new military terms have always been adopted from the Continent into England, it is clear that the use of the word cannot have been very old, even in Italy, at the time Lord Orrery wrote. No Italian author of the sixteenth century that I have been able to consult makes use of the word at all; over and over again they describe the method of marching an army or a tertia, but never do they refer to a route formation as a column. There is even reason to believe that the use of the word is not Italian at all; the best old authorities certainly brand it as a Gallicism. We may therefore take it, that on chronological grounds alone the accepted derivation must be wrong. To find the right one is quite a different thing. Thomasseo, in his *Dictionary*, suggests *Columella*, the name given to the head slave of a Roman household. But I think another could be found less far-fetched and less objectionable to military dignity; and this with great hesitation and plain warning that I am bare of authority I will venture to propound, claiming no more for it than that it has at least the negative merit of not being impossible.

It must be remembered that a soldier was not always regarded as a mere part of a great military machine. Until comparatively recent times a soldier was a fighting man, and an assemblage of fighting men made an army. When late in the seventeenth century some daring reformer suggested that pikemen and musketeers should cease to be armed with swords, since they never used them, a howl went up that is only comparable to that which accompanied the abolition of pigtails. A soldier without a sword! they cried. Why, he would be no soldier at all! And so a captain without a company was no captain at all. He was an officer, as the private was a soldier, by virtue of his individual striking power. A general could be no more. No substantive rank higher than captain was known; and no matter how exalted a staff rank a man held, in his soldiership he was no more than a captain at the head of his company. Even till the dawn of the eighteenth century every general officer continued to have, not only his own regiment, but his own company in it. His duties as major-general, or commissary, or quartermaster, were still regarded as something apart and distinct from his soldiership, as in fact non-combatant; and for a symbol of his non-combatant rank — to show, that is, that he was entrusted with duty and authority beyond the command of his company — he carried besides his weapon a staff. It was so the constable bore his truncheon and the marshal his baton, and it is

this symbol that gives us our expression, "staff-officer." When a new staff-officer was introduced into the service a new form of staff was of course necessary to symbolize the new rank. Now let it be remembered that the new rank of colonel was introduced in the very height of the neo-classical fever, which we call the Renaissance. Nothing that was without a classical sanction was respected, nothing that had not a classical form could be admired. An artist commissioned to design a new form of staff could not have produced, for the life of him, anything but a baton modelled more or less closely upon a classical column. It was a form that had seized upon men's minds with a grip and pertinacity from which we are still unliberated. The barest acquaintance with the fashions of the Renaissance is enough to show how completely the beautiful Greek shapes had fenced in artistic invention. The suggestion then, that I would hazard, is that the colonel was so called because he carried as the badge of his rank "a little column." But let it be repeated, that of evidence to support the guess, I have not an atom to show. In vain have I roamed through old military books, in vain have I reviewed whole regiments of old soldiers in their ranks upon gallery walls, but in no book and in no portrait have I been able to find the trace of a baton in the form of a column. The search has been profitless, except as I have said for the pleasant country over which it has led amongst the origins of things that even yet have not lost their picturesqueness, and for the one grain of historical truth that the derivation hitherto accepted cannot possibly be the right one.

JULIAN CORBETT.

BRITISH CONVICTS SHIPPED TO AMERICAN COLONIES

In 1769 Dr. Johnson, speaking of Americans, said to a friend, "Sir, they are a race of convicts and ought to be content with anything we may allow them short of hanging." In the latest edition of Boswell, who chronicled this saying, it is explained by the following footnote: "Convicts were sent to nine of the American settlements. According to one estimate, about 2000 had been sent for many years annually. Dr. Lang, after comparing various estimates, concludes that the number sent might be about 50,000 altogether."[1] Again, in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, under the article "Botany Bay," we read: "On the revolt of the New England colonies, the convict establishments in America were no longer available, and so the attention of the British government was turned to Botany Bay, and in 1787 a penal settlement was formed there." In keeping with these statements is a conversation related in the autobiography of Dr. Francis Lieber (p. 180). The scene was a breakfast in 1844 at Dr. Ferguson's in London. "I remarked how curious a fact it was that all American women look so genteel and refined, even the lowest; small heads, fine silky hair, delicate and marked eyebrows. The Doctor answered, 'Oh, that is easily accounted for. The super-abundance of public women, who are always rather good-looking, were sent over to America in early times.'"

These English views of the United States in the colonial period as penal settlements and convict establishments move incredulity and indignation in Americans, with whom Plymouth stands for a colony of conscience, Massachusetts for an asylum of martyrs, and Virginia for the old dominion of high-bred cavaliers. But a student who would nothing extenuate nor set down aught in malice — *nec falsa dicere, nec vera reticere* — is bound to ascertain how far a convict element really pervaded our early plantations.

In this research he will find little help from our standard histories. Bancroft, in 1887, conversing with the present writer, freely admitted that, when speaking of felons among our settlers, he had been very economical in dispensing the truths he had

[1] Boswell's *Johnson*, II. 312; *Penny Cyclopædia*, XXV. 138.

discovered. Having a handful, he had opened only his little finger. He wrote too early to expect that American eyes could bear the light of full disclosures. Writing of the early Virginians, he said: "Some of them were even convicts; but it must be remembered the crimes of which they were convicted were chiefly political. The number transported to Virginia for social crimes was never considerable."[1] Most other writers have held that, among transports shipped to America, political offenders formed a large majority. Such criminals it was felt were less likely to be stained with moral guilt, and it was patriotic, if not natural, to exaggerate their number.

It seems certain that among the felons sent to New England, by far the largest element was made up of prisoners taken in battle. A letter from Rev. John Cotton to Cromwell, dated Boston, July 28, 1651, states that "sundry Scots taken by him at Dunbar, September 2, 1650, had arrived there and been sold, not for slaves to perpetual servitude, but for six or seven or eight years," etc. That the word "sundry" meant one hundred and fifty we learn from the British *Calendar, Domestic Series*, for 1650. On September 19, the Council of State ordered 150 Scotch prisoners delivered to be sent to New England by John Foot; on October 23, it was ordered that they be shipped away forthwith, and, on November 11, that they be delivered to Augustus Walker, master of the *Unity*, for transportation to New England.[2] In 1650 Dr. Stone, a Massachusetts agent, bought several Scotch prisoners from Tothill jail, London. Again, of the prisoners taken at Worcester, September 3, 1651, two hundred and seventy-two were shipped to New England on the *John and Sarah* from London, and arrived in Boston the following spring. Their names, derived from the "Hutchinson Papers," were printed in the *New England Historical and Genealogical Register* (I. 377).[3]

The number deported to Virginia from among the Scotch made prisoners at the battle of Worcester was much smaller than is generally stated. Thus, in Ballagh's *White Servitude in the Colony of Virginia*, a recent issue of the Johns Hopkins press, we read (p. 35): "Of the Scotch prisoners taken at the battle

[1] *History of the United States*, I. 443.

[2] It is possible that Foot and Walker each brought over 150 Scots, so that the whole number of Dunbar prisoners transported was 300.

[3] These Worcester prisoners are described through mistake by Winsor as having been made captives at Dunbar. *Memorial History of Boston*, I. 304; IV. 659. Both references are to the same misnomer. According to the latter, "in 1652 the *John and Sarah* arrived bringing 272 Scotchmen who had been taken prisoners at the disastrous battle of *Dunbar*," etc.

of Worcester sixteen hundred and ten were sent to Virginia in 1651." Bancroft gives some countenance to such an assertion. But Bruce, though he loves to swell the number of political transports, says, in his *Economic History of Virginia* (I. 608): "After the defeat of Charles II. at Worcester, his soldiers who were seized on that occasion were disposed of to merchants, and at least sixteen hundred were thus conveyed to America. The Parliamentary fleet in which they were transported sailed first to Barbadoes. . . . We have certain information of the arrival of only one hundred and fifty Scotch servants in the Colony when the fleet arrived in 1651." There is no certainty, however, as to even the handful which Bruce specifies. According to the *Domestic Calendar* for 1650, the Council of State, on September 19, really ordered nine hundred Scotch prisoners to be delivered to Samuel Clark for transportation to Virginia, and two hundred to Isaac Le Gay for the same purpose, — but on October 23 it ordered to stay these prisoners, "till assurance be given of their not being carried where they may be dangerous." Furthermore, Gardiner, the latest and most accurate historian of the Commonwealth (I. 464), declares there is no proof that these political felons were sent abroad at all. All we know is that certain Bristol merchants who had contracted to transport a thousand of them to New England, broke their contract. Those unfortunates, he thinks, may have been sent back to Scotland, in accordance with another order which he cites.

Regarding men implicated in Monmouth's rebellion, Ballagh says (p. 35), "a number of them were sent to Virginia in 1685." Bancroft was of the same opinion, and says "the suppression of Monmouth's rebellion gave to the colony useful citizens" with a page more of declamation (I. 471). The truth is that not one of Monmouth's 841 condemned men was sentenced to Virginia or shipped thither. Macaulay, Mackintosh, and the *Calendar* all agree that their destination was "Jamaica, Barbadoes, or any of the Leeward Islands in America."[1] If any were carried to Virginia, it was the remnant that did not prove salable on the islands. Hotten's list mentions Barbadoes and Jamaica often — but Virginia never as to Monmouth's men.

It seems well established that some political convicts had been introduced into Virginia in the time of Charles II. Thus Bruce relates (I. 611) that in 1678, when the uprising in Scotland had been suppressed, a considerable proportion of the prisoners

[1] Macaulay, *History*, I. 602; Mackintosh, *History of the Revolution of 1688*, p. 703; *Calendar*.

were shipped to America. The king in that year addressed a letter to Lord Culpeper, ordering him to permit Ralph Williamson to bring into the colony and to dispose of fifty-two persons implicated in the insurrection, and Culpeper was still further directed to suffer Williamson to land all others guilty of the same offences in Scotland who might be hereafter delivered to him. At the same time, as Bruce adds, the king ordered his provincial officers to treat as invalid all Virginia laws which prohibited the importation of British felons. Such laws may have been suggested by the chronicle that after the fall of Drogheda in 1649 the surviving prisoners were shipped across the Atlantic; that the next winter two vessels set out from London, with prisoners designed for the plantations in Virginia; that in 1653 Richard Netherway of Bristol was permitted to export from Ireland a hundred Tories, who were to be sold as slaves in Virginia; and that other batches, some still larger, of Irish unfortunates were there imported. Yet no proof appears that any of the Drogheda prisoners were transported to Virginia. Cromwell himself mentions Barbadoes as their destination.[1] The Scotch prisoners in the Preston campaign of 1648 were sent to Barbadoes.[2]

Some of the men at that time brought into Virginia from New York as convicts were felons only in the eye of martial law. Thus, previous to the year 1665, the English invaders of Long Island attacked New Amstel on South River. Many of the Dutch colonists they sold as slaves in Virginia.[3] Other convicts guilty of no moral transgressions came from other colonies. Thus, the General Court in Boston ordained that Quakers who had not wherewithal to pay their fines (and they were enormous) should be sold for bondmen or bondwomen to Barbadoes, Virginia, or any of the English plantations.[4]

After the Mar and Derwentwater rising, in 1716, two shiploads of defeated Jacobites, "out of His Majesty's abundant clemency," were deported, — eighty in the ship *Friendship*, and fifty-five in the *Good Speed*, and were sold in Maryland.[5] A most desirable class of political offenders would have come to both Virginia and New England, — and that in great numbers, — through the Conventicle Act of 1664. But that law, which expelled from England a noble army of martyrs, expressly forbade transporting them to either Virginia or New England, and so they were con-

[1] Carlyle, II. 66.
[2] Gardiner, *Civil War*, III. 448.
[3] *N. Y. Colonial Docs.*, II. 369.
[4] Besse, *Sufferings of Quakers*, I. xxxi.
[5] Scharf, I. 385.

signed to the torrid sugar islands.[1] If cargoes could not all be sold there, there is reason to think that the remnant in some way was carried on into continental colonies.

Some political offenders in the eighteenth century were, no doubt, sold into a longer or shorter American servitude. The *Historical Register* for 1718 notes (p. 46) a trial in the Admiralty Court of Mutineers on "a ship bound to the plantations with thirty prisoners taken in the late rebellion at Preston, whom they set ashore at St. Martin's in France," etc. Again, the *Gentleman's Magazine* states, on May 31, 1747, that "430 rebel prisoners from the jails of Lancaster, Carlisle, Chester, York, and Lincoln were transported this month from Liverpool to the plantations. Eight of them were drowned by a boat over-setting, not being able to swim because handcuffed. This number, with the rest, makes above a thousand rebels transported."[2]

But throughout the whole colonial era a large class, and probably a majority, of the convicts shipped to America were not political offenders. Details on this matter will be sought in vain where we have reason to look for them. Thus Hotten's table of contents includes "serving men sold for a term of years," but never shows that any one of them was a felon, except politically. Mr. Bruce, however, in his admirable *Economic History of Virginia*, devotes many pages to an inquiry how far the company under which the first plantation was made had been willing to accept criminal or dissolute persons for transportation (I. 589–600). He cites a declaration of that company in 1609, that they would accept no man who could not bring testimonials that he was moral and religious.[3] Yet in a sermon before that same company the next year, the preacher did not deny that they sent base and disordered men, but added that, "The basest and worst men trained up in a severe discipline, a hard life, etc., do prove good citizens."[4] The company's declaration must have been of a piece with the more modern law that no man not of good moral character shall be licensed to keep a saloon. In the next year, 1611, Governor Dale wrote from Virginia begging the king to "banish hither all offenders condemned to die out of common goales, and likewise to continue that grant for three years unto the colonie (and thus doth the Spaniard people his Indes) it would be a readie way to furnish us with men, and not allways with the worst kind of men," etc. He goes on to show that criminals would be better colonists

[1] Besse, I. xiv.
[2] XVII. 246.
[3] Brown, *Genesis of the United States*, 353.
[4] Ibid., 364.

than "the three hundred he had been enforced to bring over gathered by peradventure."

It does not appear that the governor's request was granted, but there is no reason to think that he changed his opinion as to the colonial value of felons. He remained supreme in Virginia for five years afterward, and did much to build it up. It is not unlikely that he obtained some recruits of the criminal class he preferred. At all events, his suggestion was a leaven whose working was soon manifest. Sir Thomas Smith, in 1617, secured from Oxford jail five reprieved prisoners "to be transported to Virginia, or other parts beyond the seas." Others convicted of felony, as Knott and Throckmorton, delivered to him out of Newgate, arrived in Virginia in 1618.[1] Rogers, sentenced to be hung for manslaughter, was transported to Virginia on the ground that he was a skilful carpenter.[2] Carter and Francke, felons, came in 1622.

In 1619 the king had sent for transportation to Sir Thomas Smith divers young people who had been twice punished but not reformed, and the same year commanded the Virginia company to transport fifty similar criminals at once.[3] Bruce (I. 602) gives particulars concerning a dozen other felons, nine of them females, shipped to Virginia before 1636. Others in the reign of James I. — as Elizabeth Hendsley, or Ralph Rookes — are noted by the British editor of *Middlesex Records*,[4] as "interesting to persons seeking particulars touching the history of Virginia." The same records show others in the forties, and in 1655, under the Commonwealth, name ten felons, — six of them women, transported at once to Virginia, — using for the first time the word "transported" as a substitute for "reprieved," which had been previously used. They also record that in 1665 under Charles II. twenty-four convict felons were ordered to be shipped "within two months for the island (sic) of Virginia, or Barbadoes — or some other part of America inhabited by British subjects."[5]

In 1667 eighteen convicts were transported to Virginia[6] and in 1670 cattle-killers and burners of corn-stacks became liable according to statute either to death or to transportation to the plantations. The provincial authorities of Virginia, the same year, passed the notable act prohibiting the importation of convicts; but this act, like all others of a similar aim in all the colonies, was overruled and nullified by orders from the king to his Virginian and other

[1] Neill, *Virginia Vetusta*, 102.
[2] *Quia est de Arte le Carpentar* (sic).
[3] Neill, *Virginia Vetusta*, 103.
[4] II. 305.
[5] III. 337.
[6] Neill, *Virginia Carolorum*, 329.

provincial officers. For other reasons this prohibition did not prohibit. Planters both in the West Indies and in Virginia, which was reckoned a part of them far on in the eighteenth century, needed laborers, and welcomed a supply from whatever quarter. Negroes were brought from Guinea, — and from the British islands men who had been kidnapped, or had sold themselves to obtain a passage over the Atlantic, or had been sold by sheriffs to shipmasters who would contract to carry convicts beyond seas. All were bought for tobacco and set at work raising more. As Virginia's staple was tobacco, it naturally became a centre of white as well as black servitude, whether its victims were indented or not, and criminal or not. All fared alike.

The reason given in the act itself for the Virginia prohibitory enactment of 1670 is a proof that the convict element there was then not small. It speaks of "the great number of felons and other desperate villains sent hither from the several prisons of England," and adds that through such imports "we are believed to be a place only fit to receive such base and lewd persons."[1] But they still came. Narcissus Luttrell, in his diary,[2] remarks that a ship lay at Leith, going for Virginia, on board which the magistrates had ordered fifty lewd women out of the houses of correction and thirty others, who walked the streets after ten at night. Hugh Jones, a rector at Jamestown, took an optimistic view of felon imports, although, as he says in his book published in 1724, many attempts and laws to prevent too great a stock of them had been made in vain. According to his plan, convicts should be brought over at the expense of Virginia counties, and should thenceforth belong to those counties. From the avails of their labor, funds could be raised in every county. All public charges could be thus defrayed from the labors of their rogues and beggars without any tax upon honest and industrious people. "But such notorious villains as are sent over in chains for robbery or murder should be kept apart in chains still," etc. Satisfied that England was Japheth, the Indians Shem, and negroes Ham, Jones viewed the planting of Virginia as a plain fulfilment of Noah's prophecy, which he printed on his title-page: "God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem, and Canaan shall be his servant" (Gen. ix. 27). President Stith, two decades later than Jones, was more pessimistic, saying that "Virginia had come to be reputed another Siberia or a hell upon earth."

Virginia, in the present paper, has been chiefly spoken of as

[1] Hening, II. 510. [2] November 17, 1692; p. 617

the destination of convicts. It is made thus prominent in all documents which have come to the knowledge of the writer. But he is not ignorant that, according to Dr. Lang, all the nine colonies outside of New England were penal settlements, and that Lodge and other able writers maintain that Maryland received a larger felon quota than any other province. The whole number there, as estimated by Scharf, the Maryland historian,[1] was at least 20,000, about half of them after 1750. In all cases where Maryland has been found coupled with Virginia, the writer has so stated it. The *Historical Register* now and then mentions Maryland alone, saying that on October 4, 1726, about eighty felons-convict under sentence of transportation were taken out of Newgate and put on shipboard for Maryland in America, being joined on the river by several more convicts from Surrey and Kent. In 1665 certain convicts in England petitioned Her Majesty, the queen mother, in hope she would order them sent to her Maryland. As late as 1769, eighty seven-year convicts from Bristol are noticed by Scharf,[2] and Lodge maintains that "such importations continued there after they had ceased in other colonies," though such imports into Virginia were not declared illegal till 1788.

As Bristol, according to Macaulay, was specially infamous for kidnappers, so it shared largely in an allied branch of business, — the traffic in convicts. Hunt, the historian of that city, remarks (p. 142), "Toward the end of the seventeenth century, Bristol aldermen and justices used to transport criminals and sell them as slaves or put them to work on their plantations in the West Indies." A writer in *Notes and Queries*[3] holds this Bristol industry to have arisen still earlier, saying, "When Cromwell [and William, as well] had conquered Ireland, the Irish officers sought safety on the continent, while the rank and file were pressed to enlist in foreign service. As many as 34,000 men were thus hurried into exile. Widows and orphans the government shipped wholesale to the West Indies — the boys for slaves — the women and girls for mistresses to the English sugar-planters. The merchants of Bristol — slave-dealers in the days of Strongbow — sent over their agents to hunt down and ensnare the wretched people. Orders were given them on the governors of jails and workhouses, for 'boys who were of an age to labor and women who were marriageable, or not past breeding.'"[4] In the foregoing notice of Bristol exports, the words "West Indies" probably mean the best American market, no matter where. A curious chapter might be

[1] I. 371. [2] II. 53. [3] 7th Series, III. 58. [4] Walpole's *Kingdom of Ireland*.

written on the word "Indies," and the historic mistakes which have resulted from misapprehensions of that geographical term. In 1652, Peter Heylyn, a standard English cosmographer, printed in his folio concerning the Western Hemisphere: "It is sometimes called the New World. Its most usual yet somewhat improper name is America. The most improper name of all, and yet not much less used than that of America, is the West Indies."[1] The English *Historical Register* for 1715 and long afterward, in its record of current events, constantly sets down under the heading "West Indies," news from Virginia, and even New York and Boston. Some of those whom Bristol vessels had transported were brought to New England and sold there. One result was that, in 1654, a committee appointed by the General Court of the colony of Massachusetts to consider proposals for the public benefit, submitted the following report:—

> This Court, considering the cruel and malignant spirit that has from time to time been manifest in the Irish nation against the English nation, do hereby declare their prohibition of bringing any Irish, men, women, or children, into this jurisdiction, on the penalty of £50 sterling to each inhabitant who shall buy of any merchant, shipmaster, or other agent any such person or persons so transported by them; which fine shall be by the country's marshall levied on conviction of some magistrate or court, one-third to be to the use of the informer, and two-thirds to the country. This act to be in force six months after the publication of this order.
>
> October 29, 1654.
>
> DAN. GOOKIN,
> THOMAS SAVAGE,
> ROGER CLAPP,
> RICHARD RUSSELL,
> FRANCIS NORTON.

A similar act had been previously passed. There is a record of persons who, in 1652, made application for the remission of fines which had been imposed upon them for the offence specified above.[2]

New England legislation concerning the bringing in of transports for sale was very variable. In general, such imports were desiderated. In 1709 the General Court of Massachusetts offered a bounty of forty shillings to any one who would bring in and dispose in service (that is, sell into bondage more or less lasting) any white male between the ages of eight and twenty-five years.[3] No

[1] *Cosmographie*, Part II. 95.
[2] *Notes and Queries*, 7th Series, V. 266.
[3] Mass. *Acts and Resolves*, I. 634.

doubt Massachusetts wished to shut out bad immigrants. Hence a statute had been made in 1700 to fine shipmasters £5 for every passenger whose name, character, and circumstances they had failed to deliver in writing to the custom-house officer, who was bound to transmit that list to the town clerk. These names were those of servants as well as of others. In 1722 this penalty was increased to £100.[1] The rosters thus formed would have been a copious source of historical information. But they have been sought for long and vainly.

The opposition to Irish imports, perhaps never general, had soon worn away. In 1680 the governor of Massachusetts reported to the home government, "There may be within our limits about one hundred and twenty negroes, bought for about £20 apiece, and it may be as many Scotch brought hither and sold for servants in the time of war with Scotland, mostly now married and living here, and about half as many Irish brought at several times and sold as servants."[2] It seems surprising that the census of Scots was but little over one hundred, when more than four hundred of them had been imported within the last thirty years. The dwindling of their number is said to have come to pass from their being, spite of Cotton's humanitarian claims, largely exported and sold again into other colonies.[3] The original consignment of 272 Scots is suspiciously worded, and leads us to fear that if any of them could have been best disposed of in Barbadoes they would not have been sold in Boston.[4] For more than a hundred years afterwards Irish were brought into Boston and sold. No doubt some were felons, and whatever their antecedents they had good testimonials from their sellers. In 1730 Colonel Josiah Willard of Lunenburg, while in Boston, was invited to take a walk on Long Wharf and view some transports who had just arrived from Ireland. He observed a lad of some vivacity, and who was the only one he

[1] Ibid., 452 ; II. 245.

[2] *Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, 3d Series, VIII. 337.

[3] Proof that white slaves — or so-called "servants" — were sold from Massachusetts to the South just at the time when those imported from Scotland arrived is furnished by a document which came to the present writer's knowledge while his article was already in the press. In Boston Courthouse there is a bundle docketed 1650–1652. In this collection, No. 24,743 is entitled, "Filed account of servants." It gives the names, save one, of seventeen "servants at Pensilvania" and of twelve "servants at New York," with values which amount to £417. Though none of these names appear to be identical with the 272 printed in the *Genealogical Register* as Worcester prisoners shipped to Boston, the lists still countenance the opinion that two-thirds of the Scots sold into New England bondage were re-sold out of that region.

[4] *Geneal. Reg.*, I. 377.

found that could speak English. This boy, one of a number who had been put ashore to exhibit their activity to those who wished to purchase, said that he had been kidnapped and then sold by pirates in the Irish Sea to the Boston-bound vessel. Willard bought the boy, brought him up, and gave him his niece as a wife. This story, told by that wife, Susanna Johnson, in her *Captivity*, published at Walpole, N.H., in 1796, is curiously confirmed by Boston newspapers of 1730. The first issue of the *News-Letter* in October, 1730, says, "Entered, Dove, Sterling Capt. from Dublin." In the next issue we read, "Some servant lads on the ship Dove at the Long wharf; their time of service to be disposed of." [1]

If fewer transports were imported into New England than into more southern colonies, the reason was that they sold at higher rates in Southern markets, which also by their staple, tobacco, furnished better return freight to English vessels. Virginia and Maryland were held of more commercial value than all the other United States colonies. Imports were naturally in proportion to exports.[2] Some Northern colonies were planted, — to use an old writer's words, — as emunctories or sinks of states to drain away their filth. One of the earliest United States colonies was in Maine, at the Sagadahoc. Its founder was Chief Justice Popham. Says an old writer, Lloyd, "He provided for malefactors, and first set up the discovery of New England to employ

[1] The following paper is one of many proofs that Irish servants, so-called, sold in Boston in the middle of the eighteenth century, were sometimes convicts, and known to be by the sellers.

THE DEPOSITION OF PETER MONTGOMERRY TAKEN THIS 6TH DAY OF JULY 1749.

Who being duly Sworn and Examin'd, Saith That about the last of September last, in the Town of Belfast in Ireland said Deponent was present, when Katharine McKoy and Mary McKoy were Deliver'd by The Subsheriff and Jaylor of the County of Down to James Potts, Merchant in said Belfast — That the said Weomen were brought aboard his Majesties Barge which barge carried both said Weomen aboard the Eagle sloop commanded by Oliver Airy to which Airy the aforesaid Potts was Security but dont know what [to what amount] to Indemnify him for carrying said transport Weomen to a place not allow'd by Law — That said two Weomen were for a while Confin'd under Deck — That they were used and called Convicts during the passage untill she made Harbour at Boston where said Potts treated the hands and others aboard by way of Bribe to conceal what they knew of said Weomen being Convicts as he Intended to sell them for Voluntary Servants — That the said Deponent was Present when the s'd Potts sold these Weomen and said they were good Spinners and honest Weomen as far as he knew.

PETER MONTGOMERY

Sworn to Inft Court
by sd Montgomery

Copy Examd
Middlecott Cooke Cler.

[2] Scharf, I. 384.

those who could not live honestly in the old." Another contemporary, Anthony Wood, says: "Popham was the first person who invented the plan of sending criminals as founders of colonies, which, says Aubrey, he stocked out of all the jails in England." Thomas Fuller adds: "It was rather bitterly than falsely said concerning one of our Western plantations, consisting mostly of dissolute people, that it was very like England — as being spit out of the very mouth of it."[1] It is not certain whether Bacon thought of Maine or Virginia, or of general custom in planting colonies, when he wrote: "It is a shameful and unblessed thing to take the scum of people and wicked condemned men to be the people with whom you plant."[2]

In the first decade of Philadelphia, as in the infancy of most colonies, all laborers were welcome no matter what their previous condition, character, or other antecedents. Accordingly, in 1685, a shipper who had brought thither transports from England and intended to take them to Virginia, was summoned before the council. But he was armed with indentures which ran that his transports were "bound to serve him or his assignee for four years from their arrival in Virginia or any other part of America."[3] This formula was a natural expedient for giving the sellers of transports the largest choice of markets for their merchandise.

But Pennsylvanians were from early days opposed to receiving convicts. In 1722,[4] May 5, their assembly passed an act for imposing a duty on "persons guilty of heinous crimes, and imported into the province as servants or otherwise." They passed another in 1729.[5] The governor, however, like the chief magistrates in other provinces, was forbidden by the king to approve any act of this sort. In 1731, his instructions were as follows: "Whereas acts have been passed in America for laying duties on felons imported, — in direct opposition to an act of Parliament for the more effectual transportation of felons, — it is our royal will and pleasure that you approve of no duties laid on the importation of any felons into Pennsylvania."[6] Longing for a protective tariff was an original sin in Pennsylvanians, and their opposition to free trade may have been doubled by the determination of King George to force it upon them.

Convicts were exported to New York. In 1693, June 12, the Committee of Trade asked that all the convicts who were in New-

[1] *Historical Magazine*, XV. 339.
[2] *Essay of Plantations*, 1612 and 1624.
[3] *Penn. Colonial Records*, I. 161.
[4] *Colonial Records*, III. 163.
[5] Ibid., III. 359.
[6] *Penn. Archives*, I. 306.

gate for transportation might be sent to New York.[1] In 1677, John Brown, a Quaker, was shipped from the island of Nevis to Long Island.[2] As early as 1630, the Dutch were zealous to build up their colony on the Hudson. With this view the government offered to men of property, or *patroons*, who would emigrate thither, vast tracts of land, and, further, that "their High Mightinesses shall exert themselves to provide the patroons with persons bound to service who shall be obliged to serve out their bounden time."[3] Persons, as the editor remarks, here means vagabonds who live in idleness and crime. Transports were desired in Rhode Island. In 1714, bringing in any Indian as servant or slave was prohibited under a penalty of £50. The reason given for this law was that such importations "daily discouraged the importing of white servants from Great Britain," etc.[4]

We have seen that orders from the Privy Council, or from judges and even inferior magistrates, sent felons convict into American colonies from their earliest stages; but nothing tended so powerfully and continuously and lastingly to bring about such deportations as a statute of 1718.[5] This act provided that persons convicted of clergyable offences, such as burglary, robbery, perjury, forgery, and theft, — after being sentenced to death, — might, if their crimes did not seem too heinous, "at the discretion of the court be transported to America for at least seven years," remaining punishable with death without further trial if they should return before the expiration of their sentence. A reason assigned for this enactment was the great want of servants (still a favorite euphemism for slaves) who might be the means of improving the colonial plantations and making them more useful to His Majesty.

Thanks to early English periodicals, the workings of this Georgian law are clearly traceable from first to last. On April 26, 1718, according to the *Historical Register*,[6] "twenty-nine malefactors at the Old Bailey were ordered to be transported." Before the end of the year, 134 were so ordered. On August 23, 1718, "106 convicts, that were ordered for transportation, were taken out of Newgate and put on board a lighter at Blackwall stairs, from whence they were carried through the Bridge to Long Reach, and there shipped on board the *Eagle* galley, Captain Staples commander, bound to Virginia and Maryland." In 1719, January 19, the names of those "cast for transportation" are given; six of the eighteen were feminine. "May 11, 105 out of Newgate,

[1] *N. Y. Col. Docs.*, IV. 31.
[2] Besse, II. 364.
[3] See *N. Y. Col. Docs.*, I. 99.
[4] *Rhode Island Colonial Records*, IV. 193.
[5] 4 Geo. I., c. 11; Blackstone, IV. 370.
[6] III. 19.

the Marshalsea, and several other country prisons, were put on shipboard, to be transported to Maryland." "October 27, 1720, 92 felons taken out of Newgate, and 62 out of the Marshalsea, were put on shipboard to be transported to Virginia." The notices in the *Historical Register* continue for ten consecutive years. During that decade the number ordered for transportation was 2138. Names are usually mentioned, and not a few are feminine. The destination, when not Virginia or Maryland, is American plantations, or America. "September 12, 1722, 35 were ordered for transportation. Among these was Sir Charles Burton of Lincolnshire, Bart., who was convicted of stealing a cornelian ring set in gold."

After 1727 no printed notice of transports is known to the present writer till the *Gentleman's Magazine* was started in 1731. The record there on Tuesday, March 9,[1] is: "Upwards of a hundred convicts were removed from Newgate to be transported to America." Other periodicals gave more particulars. Thus in the *London Magazine* of 1732 (I. 368) we read: "October 26, sixty-eight men and fifty women felons convict were taken from Newgate, and put on board a lighter to be carried down the river, to be shipped on board the *Cæsar* off Deptford, for transportation to Virginia." In this work, however, court reports ceased after a while; yet onward for more than forty years, even up to the opening of the American Revolution, the numbers "cast for transportation" are chronicled in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, but in the briefest form, usually with no mention of names or sex. A few culprits were noted as from jails in Gloucester, Salisbury, Monmouth, Exeter, Hereford, St. Edmunds, Newcastle, Kingston, Maidstone, Derby, Chelmsford, Winchester, etc. Soon, however, provincial transports were passed unnoticed. But those from the Old Bailey, who averaged more than a score at every session, never failed of a line. The first five volumes show a roster of 887 convict transports, and all subsequent volumes proportional numbers. It would not be safe to reckon the total of involuntary emigrants sent forth from the Old Bailey alone as less than 10,000 between 1717 and 1775.

There must exist sources of information more complete and exact than those the present writer has been able to discover, and showing the proceedings of all provincial courts as well as that in the metropolis. It is hoped that the publication of the present paper will arouse other investigators.

[1] I. 124.

The *London Magazine*, though not so persistent a chronicler as the *Gentleman's*, often furnishes fuller reports. The following is its account — much abridged — of Henry Justice, Esq. : —

Sat., May 8, 1736, came on . . . the trial of Henry Justice of the Middle Temple, for stealing out of the library of *Trinity-College*, Cambridge, a Field's *Bible* with cuts and Common-prayer, value 25 l., Newcastle's *Horsemanship*, value 10 l., several other books of great value, several Tracts cut out of books, etc. . . . The counsel of Mr. Justice were Mr. Winne, Mr. Agar, and Mr. Robinson. [After many objections, pleading not guilty, he was proved so by witnesses; he then claimed to be a member of the Trinity corporation, etc., but the jury found him guilty of felony within benefit of clergy. He was then charged with stealing other books, and after six hours pleaded guilty.] Mond. 10, Mr. Justice being brought to the Old Bailey to receive sentence, desired the court, — Lord Hardwick, Mr. Justice Denton, etc. — that as they had a discretionary power either to transport, or to burn in the hand, etc., he might not be sent abroad, which would, first, be a great injury to his children, and to his clients with several of whom he had great concerns. Secondly, for the sake of the University. He had numbers of books belonging to them, some sent to Holland, and if he were transported he could not make restitution. As for himself, he would rather go abroad, having lived in credit before this unhappy mistake, as he called it. He hoped the gentlemen of the University, several of whom he believed to be present, would intercede for him.

The Deputy Recorder, in a very handsome speech, commiserated his case, — telling him that his education, profession, etc., greatly aggravated his crime. After which he pronounced sentence — that he must be transported to some one of his Majesty's plantations in America — there to remain seven years, — and be put to death if he returned, etc.

It will be observed that the particular colony to which this legal luminary was doomed is not mentioned. Possibly, however, it is not beyond discovery. Seven days afterward, May 17, the *Gentleman's Magazine* chronicle is : —

A hundred felons-convict walked from Newgate to Black-fryars, and thence went in a close lighter on board a ship at Blackwall. But Weathercock the attorney, Messrs. Ruffhead, Vaughn, and Bird went to Blackwall in two hackney coaches, and Henry Justice, Esq., Barrister at law, in another, two hours after the walking felons, attended by Jonathan Forward, Esq. These five gentlemen of distinction were accommodated with the captain's cabin, which they stored with provisions, etc., for their voyage and travels.

The above-mentioned Weathercock, Ruffhead, and Bird had been condemned to death, but their sentence was commuted to

transportation for life.[1] The transatlantic career of Henry Justice has not been as yet ascertained. There is a possibility that he became the instructor of our foremost man. Jonathan Boucher, rector at Annapolis in 1768 and for many years before the Revolution, and tutor to Washington's step-son, Parke Custis, relates that George Washington, with whom he claims "very particular intimacy and friendship," had no other education than reading, writing, and accounts, which he was taught by a convict servant whom his father had bought for a schoolmaster.[2] "Not a ship arrives," adds Boucher, "with either redemptioners or convicts, in which schoolmasters are not as regularly advertised for sale as weavers, tailors, or any other trade; with little other difference that I can hear of, except perhaps that the former do not usually fetch so good a price as the latter."

A similar felon, perhaps a pedagogue, had been advertised thus in 1722: "Ran away from Rev. D. Magill, Upper Marlborough, Maryland, a servant, clothed with damask breeches and vest, black broadcloth coat, broadcloth cloak of copper color lined and trimmed with black, and wearing black stockings."[3] This runaway, having absconded so far that his antecedents were unsuspected, may then, thanks to his imposing outfit, if his demeanor did not belie the promise of his clothes, have secured a position which his reverend Presbyterian master would have envied.

In 1737, the next year after the advent of Henry Justice, when a vessel with transports arrived at Annapolis, she was found to have on board no less than sixty-six indentures signed by the mayor of Dublin (to serve as testimonials), and twenty-two wigs. Both wigs and indentures were denounced as "an arrant cheat detected, being evidently brought for no other purpose than to give a respectable appearance to the convicts when they should go ashore."[4] Supercargoes, who had bought as cheap as they could, sold as dear as they could. For this purpose, like other sellers, they used every art to make their wares as tempting as possible in the eyes of possible purchasers. Not a few of the involuntary immigrants had been kidnapped and spirited away, — and so were martyrs and innocents. More were gentlemen in

[1] *Gentleman's Magazine*, January 29, 1736.

[2] *Notes and Queries*, 5th Series, V. 503; Boucher's *Thirteen Sermons*, a volume of selections from his Maryland discourses, throws much light on the convict element there. In one of them, penned and prepared to be preached before the governor, etc., in 1773, he laments that two-thirds of the Maryland schoolmasters were convicts who were serving out a term of penal servitude; p. 182.

[3] Neill, *Terra Mariæ*, 213.

[4] Ibid., 203.

manners and scholars in culture. This fact made buyers more credulous regarding the certificates of good moral character and the forged affidavits which sellers were always ready to furnish.

The *destination* of convicts is frequently unmentioned, and they were doubtless sent to those of the American plantations to which conveyance could be procured at the cheapest rate. The sheriff invited bids for transportation and shipped off convicts by the lowest bidder, and cared not where they were carried. But occasionally, as in 1753, July 13, when upwards of one hundred transports were shipped, it is added, "from Newgate for Virginia and Maryland."[1] The record of Old Bailey sentences, except in capital cases, is usually, as printed in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, a monotonous formula, — a numerical figure, then "*cast for transportation.*" Frequently only this and nothing more. The most frequent addition is "*to the American plantations.*" Further specifications are either to *Virginia* or *Maryland*, or both. But exceptional felons are shown up in characteristic details. Among these are such as follow.

In 1740, February 10, William Duell was transported for life. He had been hung at Tyburn, November 24, but when laid out for dissection at Surgeon's Hall, came to life. September 18, 1751, Philip Gibson, who had been condemned to death for a street robbery, would not accept the offer of fourteen years' transportation, and insisted on his former sentence, which was that he should be hanged. After the court had argued with him some time, he was continued to consider of it till the next sessions. October 21, Gibson accepted the commutation. September 19, 1750, Escote, a tobacconist, for buying 40,000 pounds of tobacco at sixpence a pound, was sentenced to fourteen years' transportation.

"1767, Feb. 10, fourteen transports from Durham, Newcastle, and Morpeth, were put on board the *Jenny*, Captain Blagdon, bound for Virginia, at which time ten young artificers shipped themselves for America [paying for passage by selling themselves into bondage for a long time after]. One of these indented servants has enlisted into 46 regiments, been whipped out of 19, sentenced to be shot six times, been confined in 73 jails, appeared under the character of quack doctor in seven kingdoms, and now is only in the thirty-second year of his age."[2]

[1] This record is the more notable as being the first one in which the word "transport" is used to mean a convict sent beyond sea. "Felons-convict," or "convicts," were the words before used. The word "transportation" is older, dating from 1597. — Blackstone, I. 137.

[2] *Gentleman's Magazine*, 92.

Not all felons shipped for America arrived there. "In 1748, Feb. 28, thirty-seven convicts, being the remains of 135 that suffered shipwreck in the Downs, bound for Maryland, made their escape out of a lighter in which they were brought back above London Bridge. The jailer has refused to receive them back." No doubt he was of the same type with watchman Dogberry who, when a vagrom man would not stand at his bidding, "called the rest of the watch together and thanked God that he was rid of a knave."

The following transported felon's adventure deserves to be classed with truths that are stranger than fiction: On May 13, 1773, a correspondent wrote the *London Magazine* as follows: —

Some time ago one Sarah Wilson, who attended upon Miss Vernon, sister to Lady Grosvenor, and maid of honour to the queen, having found means to be admitted into one of the royal apartments, took occasion to break open a cabinet, and rifled it of many valuable jewels, for which she was apprehended, tried, and condemned to die: but through the interposition of her mistress, her sentence was softened into transportation. Accordingly, in the fall of 1771, she was landed in Maryland, where she was exposed to sale and purchased. After a short residence in that place, she very secretly decamped, and escaped into Virginia, travelled through that colony and through North to South Carolina. When at a proper distance from her purchaser, she assumed the title of the Princess Susanna Carolina Matilda, pronouncing herself to be an own sister to our sovereign lady the queen. She had carried with her clothes that served to favour the deception, and had secured a part of the jewels together with Her Majesty's picture. She travelled from one gentleman's house to another under these pretensions, making astonishing impressions in many places, affecting the mode of royalty so inimitably that many had the honour to kiss her hand. To some she promised governments, to others regiments, with promotions of all kinds in the treasury, army, and the royal navy. In short, she acted her part so plausibly as to persuade the generality that she was no impostor. In vain did many sensible gentlemen in those parts exert themselves to detect and make a proper example of her; for she had levied heavy contributions upon some persons of the highest rank in the southern colonies. At length, however, an advertisement appeared, and a messenger arrived from her master, who raised a loud hue and cry for her serene highness. The lady was then on an excursion of a few miles to a neighboring plantation, for which place the messenger had set out when the gentleman who brought this information left Charles-town [Charleston].[1]

"1773, Jan'y 19. Five convicts were executed at Tyburn. John Lowe was to have been executed at the same time for return-

[1] *London Magazine*, XLII. 311.

manners and scholars in culture. This fact made buyers more credulous regarding the certificates of good moral character and the forged affidavits which sellers were always ready to furnish.

The *destination* of convicts is frequently unmentioned, and they were doubtless sent to those of the American plantations to which conveyance could be procured at the cheapest rate. The sheriff invited bids for transportation and shipped off convicts by the lowest bidder, and cared not where they were carried. But occasionally, as in 1753, July 13, when upwards of one hundred transports were shipped, it is added, "from Newgate for Virginia and Maryland."[1] The record of Old Bailey sentences, except in capital cases, is usually, as printed in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, a monotonous formula, — a numerical figure, then "*cast for transportation.*" Frequently only this and nothing more. The most frequent addition is "*to the American plantations.*" Further specifications are either to *Virginia* or *Maryland*, or both. But exceptional felons are shown up in characteristic details. Among these are such as follow.

In 1740, February 10, William Duell was transported for life. He had been hung at Tyburn, November 24, but when laid out for dissection at Surgeon's Hall, came to life. September 18, 1751, Philip Gibson, who had been condemned to death for a street robbery, would not accept the offer of fourteen years' transportation, and insisted on his former sentence, which was that he should be hanged. After the court had argued with him some time, he was continued to consider of it till the next sessions. October 21, Gibson accepted the commutation. September 19, 1750, Escote, a tobacconist, for buying 40,000 pounds of tobacco at sixpence a pound, was sentenced to fourteen years' transportation.

"1767, Feb. 10, fourteen transports from Durham, Newcastle, and Morpeth, were put on board the *Jenny*, Captain Blagdon, bound for Virginia, at which time ten young artificers shipped themselves for America [paying for passage by selling themselves into bondage for a long time after]. One of these indented servants has enlisted into 46 regiments, been whipped out of 19, sentenced to be shot six times, been confined in 73 jails, appeared under the character of quack doctor in seven kingdoms, and now is only in the thirty-second year of his age."[2]

[1] This record is the more notable as being the first one in which the word "transport" is used to mean a convict sent beyond sea. "Felons-convict," or "convicts," were the words before used. The word "transportation" is older, dating from 1597. — Blackstone, I. 137.

[2] *Gentleman's Magazine*, 92.

Not all felons shipped for America arrived there. "In 1748, Feb. 28, thirty-seven convicts, being the remains of 135 that suffered shipwreck in the Downs, bound for Maryland, made their escape out of a lighter in which they were brought back above London Bridge. The jailer has refused to receive them back." No doubt he was of the same type with watchman Dogberry who, when a vagrom man would not stand at his bidding, "called the rest of the watch together and thanked God that he was rid of a knave."

The following transported felon's adventure deserves to be classed with truths that are stranger than fiction: On May 13, 1773, a correspondent wrote the *London Magazine* as follows:—

Some time ago one Sarah Wilson, who attended upon Miss Vernon, sister to Lady Grosvenor, and maid of honour to the queen, having found means to be admitted into one of the royal apartments, took occasion to break open a cabinet, and rifled it of many valuable jewels, for which she was apprehended, tried, and condemned to die: but through the interposition of her mistress, her sentence was softened into transportation. Accordingly, in the fall of 1771, she was landed in Maryland, where she was exposed to sale and purchased. After a short residence in that place, she very secretly decamped, and escaped into Virginia, travelled through that colony and through North to South Carolina. When at a proper distance from her purchaser, she assumed the title of the Princess Susanna Carolina Matilda, pronouncing herself to be an own sister to our sovereign lady the queen. She had carried with her clothes that served to favour the deception, and had secured a part of the jewels together with Her Majesty's picture. She travelled from one gentleman's house to another under these pretensions, making astonishing impressions in many places, affecting the mode of royalty so inimitably that many had the honour to kiss her hand. To some she promised governments, to others regiments, with promotions of all kinds in the treasury, army, and the royal navy. In short, she acted her part so plausibly as to persuade the generality that she was no impostor. In vain did many sensible gentlemen in those parts exert themselves to detect and make a proper example of her; for she had levied heavy contributions upon some persons of the highest rank in the southern colonies. At length, however, an advertisement appeared, and a messenger arrived from her master, who raised a loud hue and cry for her serene highness. The lady was then on an excursion of a few miles to a neighboring plantation, for which place the messenger had set out when the gentleman who brought this information left Charles-town [Charleston].[1]

"1773, Jan'y 19. Five convicts were executed at Tyburn. John Lowe was to have been executed at the same time for return-

[1] *London Magazine*, XLII. 311.

ing from transportation. He was, however, reprieved because he had been transported for receiving a shilling for the carriage of a goose that had been stolen, of which theft he declared that he was ignorant" (p. 44).

The last record I discover of a transport chronicled in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, is in October, 1774. Then the Hon. Mrs. Elizabeth Grieve was sentenced for seven years. "Her offence was defrauding divers persons under pretence of procuring them places under the government. She had before rendered herself famous by pretending to be cousin to the Duke of Grafton, and to have various other connections of the first rank" (p. 492). It was very convenient for those who were pestered by poor relations to be able to ship them off over sea. In 1775 the self-same felons, who if convicted the year before would have entered America as slaves, came over as belligerent soldiers. At an earlier date their sentences had been sometimes commuted from transportation to enlistment.

Notices of the landing of convicts beyond the seas are not wanting, though not so frequent as the accounts of their shipment. American newspapers were few, and reporters fewer. But the *Boston Gazette* (May 8, 1753), says: —

> Arrived at *Severn*, Maryland, April 5, the *Greyhound* with 90 persons doomed to stay 7 years in his Majesty's American plantations.
>
> April 19, arrived from Biddeford 27 men and women for the well-peopling this or some other American plantation.
>
> A report that a vessel with servants from Ireland was ashore at the Capes, and that the servants had mutinied and killed all the crew.

Again, 1755, July 10, "More than 100 seven year passengers have arrived at Annapolis." Now and then, Virginia and Maryland editors, as Scharf shows, exchanged ironical congratulations on safe arrivals of cargoes of king's passengers, and seven-year recruits. In a few instances we discover in Scharf the names of those who bought each convict in a shipload.

The *names* of felons transported are seldom mentioned in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, except in those cases when they returned and were sentenced to be hanged. Those names, however, I have ascertained to be all preserved and accessible by American genealogists who go abroad for tracing their ancestry. Accordingly, I have urged Mr. H. F. Waters, who has been employed in London for years in searching out the lineage of Bostonians, to betake himself to the Old Bailey. Its proceedings fill 110 manuscript volumes.[1] Here Mr. Waters may be sure of a harvest; elsewhere,

[1] *Notes and Queries*, 7th Series, IV. 395.

at Somerset House, the Herald's office, the records of archiepiscopal Canterbury, and so forth, he has gathered only gleanings, and those scanty by comparison. I have myself tested the Old Bailey archives. Reading in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, that on July 17, 1731, "3 were burnt in the hand, and 32 ordered for transportation," I asked London *Notes and Queries* to publish the names of the thirty-two transports. My request was printed October 15, 1887.[1] The very next month, November 12, the names of the thirty-two were all published. They were John Aldridge, Elizabeth Armstrong, *alias* Little Bess, Richard Bennet, Martha Brannan, John Brown, Hugh Cambell, Elizabeth Camphill, *alias* Cambell, William Carnegy, John Coghill, Henry Cole, Mary Coslin, Catharine Cox, John Cross, Eleanor Davis, George Emly, James Emly, John Haynes, James Hobbs, Thomas Jones, Antonio Key, Thomas Macculler, Martin Nanny, John Payne, Thomas Petit, Luke Powel, Daniel Ray, Elizabeth Roberts, John Rogers, Mary Row, Thomas Taylor, Anne Todd, Jane Vaughn. In the Old Bailey archives, then, the Japhets who seek for their fathers cannot fail to find a mine little explored and well-nigh exhaustless.

This chain of research is, however, weakened by a broken link. We discover John Smith's name in the Old Bailey books; but who can prove that when sold in America he did not go by another name? The master who had bought a wig for his chattel, would not grudge him an aristocratic name in keeping with that dignifying decoration, especially as it might make a plebeian more salable. It is also possible that the name John Smith, even on the Old Bailey books, is itself a misnomer, and should have been written quite otherwise. Through such a series of aliases genealogical confusion is raised to a second power.

Our countrymen of *Scotch* descent, however, will at the Old Bailey meet with less genealogical helps than those of English origin. The reason is that the statute of 1718, thanks to which so many Englishmen left their country for their country's good, was not extended to Scotland until half a century afterward, in 1768. Dr. Franklin describes himself as protesting to the British Parliament against this extension. The old law, Franklin said, had been a great grievance, but if English felons were to be reinforced by Scotch, the burden would become intolerable. At all events, he claimed reciprocity. If Scotland must send her felons to the plantations, let the plantations send their felons to Scotland. But, speaking seriously, Franklin[2] called the emptying of English jails

[1] *Notes and Queries*, 7th Series, IV. 307. [2] *Works*, X. 121.

upon the colonies the most cruel insult ever offered by one nation to another.

No question regarding convicts shipped to America is so hard to answer as that which relates to the particular colony in which each gang of them was put ashore. Mention of Virginia, Maryland, and Jamaica or Barbadoes is not infrequent, but I could find no notice of any single transport landed in New England except the Scotch and Irish of whom I have spoken. When I wrote to *Notes and Queries* asking for the name of such a New England convict, the name "Elizabeth Canning" was given me. Concerning Elizabeth Canning the notice in the *Gentleman's Magazine*[1] is this: —

> 1754, July 28. Elizabeth Canning is ordered to be transported to some of his Majesty's American colonies, and has been delivered to the merchant who contracted with the court, to be transported accordingly. And 'tis certain that in case she be found at large in this Kingdom before the expiration of seven years, she will be liable to the pains of death.

There is here no evidence that Elizabeth Canning was shipped to New England, rather than to some other American plantation. In a later volume, however, of the *Gentleman's Magazine*,[2] it is stated that "she died at Wethersfield in Connecticut in the year 1773, after having been married to a person of the name of Treat, or some name sounding like that." It is added that notice of her death appeared, in 1773, in Say's *Weekly Journal*. Writing once more to *Notes and Queries* in order to ascertain the name of the vessel in which Elizabeth Canning was transported, I received the following answer:[3] "If we can take the London Journals of 1754 to have been correctly informed, the name of the vessel in which Elizabeth Canning had her passage was the *Myrtilda*, Captain Budden, which cleared from Deal Aug. 26, and her destination was Philadelphia." The names of nineteen others who were sentenced to transportation at the same time with her were also furnished. But it still seems odd that a transport who was to be landed in New England should be put on board a vessel bound for Philadelphia. No doubt this vessel's homeward voyage was by way of New England.[4]

The present article is by no means so complete as the writer hoped to make it. His sources of information have been limited

[1] XXIV. 338. [2] LXXXIII., part 2, 337. [3] *Notes and Queries*, 7th Series, V. 457.

[4] From a descendant of the Treat family I learn that according to the record in an old family Bible, Elizabeth Canning, born in London, was daughter of Joseph and Elizabeth, and was married in 1756 to John Treat, and died at Wethersfield, Conn., on July 22, 1773.

as well as his ability to make full proof of them. His gleanings, picked from the wormholes of long-vanished days, may be material to serve future inquirers. The fragments he has gathered may lead to the discovery of complete reports. His research has filled him with surprise that our colonial convict element was so large. He is inclined to confess that English views on this matter have been more correct than those prevalent in America. He cannot wonder that Johnson, who, as one employed in editing the *Gentleman's Magazine*, had hundreds of times chronicled the reprieve of gallows-birds that they might be made American colonists, should hold in low esteem the regions they pervaded and peopled. It now seems more natural that he should speak as he did, and declare he could love everybody except an American, than the writer could at first believe. Nor can it do us any harm to see ourselves as others see us, looking to the hole of the pit whence we were digged as well as into the rock whence we were hewn. A new point of view must reveal new phases of truth.

We may reasonably come back from the byway of history we have been tracing, with optimistic feelings. How much of good has been evolved from evil! How many a lily, the perfection of purity and fragrance, has sprung up out of the mud of a marsh! "Saplings," says a Chinese proverb, "are crooked, but they will straighten as they grow up, — and the higher the straighter." That our country has become what it is, notwithstanding so much of baser matter was mixed with its pilgrims and martyrs, gives reason not only for thankfulness and astonishment that we behold such a survival of the fittest. It countenances a better opinion of human nature than has often been rife. Its testimony is in keeping with that of Siberia and Australia, but vastly more conclusive. It proclaims that many who have fallen will rise again if they have a chance, and more frequently and surely the more encouraging and stimulating their new environment.

> "And like bright metal on a sullen ground,
> Their reformation, glittering o'er their fault,
> Shall show more goodly and attract more eyes,
> Than that which hath no foil to set it off."

JAMES DAVIE BUTLER.

A PLEA FOR THE STUDY OF THE HISTORY OF NORTHERN EUROPE

THE earlier history of northern, or more especially of north-eastern, Europe has as yet attracted but small attention from western scholars. In England and America the ignorance about it is most profound, and the students who have contributed anything of value in this field could be counted on one's fingers. To be sure, the Germans have been too near the scene of action to neglect it entirely, while the French have at one time or another illuminated the history of the north with works ranging all the way from the most brilliant literature to the best fruits of modern scholarship. Thus it is hardly too much to say that the reputation of Charles XII. in the west is due rather to the famous biography by Voltaire than to his own character and actions, and most of the best foreign authorities on Russia to-day are to be found in France. Still, little enough is generally known about such subjects. The educated public has a vague idea that Gustavus Adolphus suddenly appeared from a hitherto unknown country, like a *deus ex machina*, to save the cause of Protestantism, and that Peter the Great forcibly converted a nation of barbarians, with no past worth troubling about, into a state with at least the superficial semblance of a civilized power. Even historians seldom realize that the interference of Gustavus in Germany may have been, from a Swedish point of view, "a serious blunder."[1] Indeed, his previous campaigns in Poland, though accidentally connected with the Thirty Years' War, and serving as a preparation for his part in it, were due to entirely independent circumstances, and would have taken place if the rest of the world had been at peace. Peter the Great likewise had predecessors who paved the way for his reforms, and the Russia which he turned into new channels can only be understood by a careful review of her previous history.

There are plainly three reasons which may make the study of northern Europe of value to us. On the first of these — the importance of Russia in the world to-day — we need not dwell, for

[1] *Charles XII.*, by Nisbet Bain.

everything connected with the development and conditions of such a mighty empire is obviously worth our attention. Its inhabitants, too, are a gifted people, destined to play more and more a leading part in the future of mankind. The truth of this, though insufficiently realized, is too evident for discussion. For her part, Scandinavia, which is holding her own well in literature and art, still has to be counted in politics. We must remember also that the great questions of the past are by no means all settled. The antagonism of the German and the Slav is as intense as ever; the dominion of the Baltic is as undetermined as that of the Mediterranean; Poland is dead, but the Polish nationality is full of life, gaining rather than losing strength in a way that makes its ultimate fate difficult to predict.

In the second place, we have to consider the influence the Scandinavians and Slavs have had on the western countries. We must begin by admitting that as regards institutions this has been slight. It is true that in Holstein the Dane has been but recently dislodged; and in the manners and life of the inhabitants of Pomerania, Brandenburg, or Austria, traces of Slav predecessors may reward the patient investigator, but, generally speaking, the interchange of ideas between the German and his more barbarous neighbors has been one-sided. On the other hand, no one can be well versed in the history of Germany without a study of the *Drang nach Osten*. For the fortunes of the Teutonic race the battle of Tannenberg was more momentous than that of Legnano, and the results of the colonization of the land beyond the Elbe and of the conquest of Prussia outweigh the brilliant but transitory glories of the struggle between the Empire and the Papacy. Even a survey of German civic institutions is incomplete without a knowledge of their workings in Stockholm, Riga, and Cracow. If we pass to Rome and the Church, we perceive that in the plans of the Jesuits and other leaders of the Catholic reaction, Poland and even Sweden at one time held a foremost place, while the dreams and enterprises of the Holy See, in her dealings with Russia, since the council of Florence, form a curious yet unfinished chapter of history. It was a pope that suggested and brought about the marriage between a tsar of Moscow and the heir of the last emperor of Constantinople. In fact, the Catholic Church has always looked to the east as well as to the west, more than once making concessions in the former quarter that she has sternly refused in the latter. On its side, the north, after the beginning of the seventeenth century, on several occasions interfered actively in the general affairs of Europe, in which

it took a more and more active part. Gustavus II. of Sweden arrested the progress of German Catholicism after Christian IV. of Denmark had failed in the attempt to do so. The ministers of the boy king Charles XI. joined the Triple Alliance, which checked the policy of Louis XIV.; while the Pole Sobieski dealt him a serious blow by saving Vienna from the Turks. The intervention of Charles XII., at one time not improbable, might have turned the balance either way in the war of the Spanish succession; Elizabeth of Russia was the most successful adversary of Frederick the Great, and Alexander I. triumphed over Napoleon.

When we turn to the history of Scandinavia, Poland, and Russia, for those peculiar features, or workings of great principles, that make a third reason for study and comparison, we have, in view of the endless variety of detail, to be on our guard against hasty generalization. All I shall attempt to point out here is a few salient features that call for attention.

One of the most important of these is the fact that we do not meet with the unity that so long prevailed in western Europe; no pope or emperor was recognized, however imperfectly, as the head of the community of Christendom. On the contrary, from the first we have the bitterest conflict of race and religion, hence the feeling of nationality seems always to have been intense, except for a time in the upper classes under the cosmopolitanism of the eighteenth century. The Russian, the Pole, the Dane, and the Swede were actively hostile to one another, as such, if not at an earlier date chronologically, at least at an earlier stage in their development than was often the case in the lands to the west of them. Each is, even now, hardly reconciled to his rivals. The fusion of conquering and conquered peoples was apt to be exceedingly slow; for instance, nearly seven hundred years of German predominance over inferior races have left the German and the Germanized with hardly more than eight per cent of the population of the Baltic provinces. True, there were instances of peaceful absorption of Slavs by Germans, as in Pomerania and Silesia, but this process was checked in Poland by a distinct national reaction in the beginning of the fourteenth century; nay, long before this, when their country was first converted to Christianity, the Poles, unable as yet to furnish their own clergy, called in foreigners from France and Italy rather than from their near neighbor the Empire. Even Panslavism was preached by the Servian monk Kryzhanich two hundred and fifty years ago. It would be easy to multiply such examples of national consciousness. In Moscow it reached a degree of Oriental isolation unsurpassed by

the Chinese, and yet, like the Chinese, the Muscovites have shown a remarkable capacity for assimilating foreign elements. The reasons for these phenomena are complicated enough; indeed, to the student of the difficult and fascinating question as to why one race, or language, tends to prevail over another, the history of northern Europe is full of problems of the deepest interest.

This applies equally when we come to matters of religion. Russia is the one mighty empire converted to the Greek Orthodox form of faith. She offers us the best chance to examine the effect of the ideas and the belief of Constantinople, imparted to a fresh, uncivilized people.

After the fall of the Rome on the Bosphorus, Moscow was hailed as the third Rome that was to rule the world, and its prince as the one monarch who maintained the true belief undefiled by Latin heresies. Here we find no conflict between the state and a clergy which was kept in a Byzantine subservience to its sovereigns, yet the hold which the Church had on the people was tremendous. In the time of trial they clung to it with unwavering steadfastness. Thus western Protestantism never had an influence upon Holy Russia itself until recent years, though it made a few converts among the Russian nobles of Lithuania. Against the many open or insidious attacks of its ancient foe, Roman Catholicism, Orthodoxy also held its own. Ivan III., with all his people, rejected scornfully the reconciliation effected by the council of Florence, and the dreams of so many popes of winning over the northern power have always been chimerical. We see, too, in the north of Europe, even more than elsewhere, the close, if subtle, connection between religion and nationality. To the uneducated Russian to-day the Protestant is a German, and the Catholic a Pole, as naturally and inevitably as the Mussulman is a Turk or Tartar.

Poland for her part has been the greatest battle-ground of the Greek and Latin faiths. Her eastern division, Lithuania, was chiefly inhabited by Orthodox Russians; in fact, it appeared at one time as if the pagan Lithuanians themselves would soon accept the same creed, had not a marriage for political reasons, the first step in the persevering policy of the Polish aristocracy, changed the natural course of affairs. By the conversion of Jagello of Lithuania and his marriage to Hedwiga of Poland in 1386 the two states were drawn together by a bond that was continually tightened till they were merged into one by the union of Lublin in 1569. White and Little Russia were long separated from Great Russia, to become part of a country in communion with the west,

their nobility in time adopting more and more the Polish language and belief. For a space, indeed, Poland herself seemed likely to be untrue to Rome, for Protestantism spread rapidly and superficially among her nobles, greedy for church wealth, and took deeper root in the German portion of the population; but when the day of reaction came, when the Jesuits who had been brought into the land set to work with marvellous skill and activity, Protestantism, except among the Germans, vanished after a feeble resistance. Against Greek Orthodoxy, however, the ability and learning of the Jesuits, supported by all the intolerance of king and noble, had a far more serious conflict. The Catholic Church only triumphed by a compromise such as was refused to the reformers of Germany. The United Greeks were not only allowed to have married priests, but kept their Slav liturgy; yet even the attempt to impose this compromise was perhaps the chief cause of the desperate insurrection of the Cossacks, ending in the loss of Kiev and the Ukraine, which marks the beginning of the fall of Poland.

The rôle of Sweden in the religious history of Europe needs no comment; we shall but note that the Reformation, complete as was its success, was not in answer to any popular demand, but was peaceably brought about by an able ruler for worldly reasons.

Turning now to questions of government and constitutional development, here also we find much to interest us, including examples of many kinds, with striking cases both of similarity and contrast. Take, for instance, Poland and Russia. In the tenth century we behold them settled by tribes of the same race, at the same primitive stage of development, with the same general political organization and institutions. The lands inhabited by the two peoples were similar, with hardly a pretence of natural geographical divisions where one should end and the other begin. Compare this with the situation of the two nations six hundred years later, when not only was one ardently Catholic and the other the sole great Orthodox power, but Russia had become an eastern despotism, where the proudest boiar called himself the slave of the tsar; while in Poland the authority of the king had sunk to a shadow, and the nobility, under the name of "golden liberties," had gradually elaborated the most impracticable constitution ever found in a civilized country. Among other distinctive features in Russia, we have also the brief but instructive history of States-Generals that at one time had a very real authority; in Poland, the tale of the long conflict between the Magnates and the Szlachta, or democratic gentry; in Denmark we find the aris-

tocracy, by its privileges and unpatriotic selfishness, crippling the state at the most critical moments, in a way that was only less fatal than was the case in Poland; in Sweden the contest between the nobles and the crown had more vicissitudes than anywhere else, even if they were not always marked by great bitterness of feeling. During the three centuries from Gustavus I. to Gustavus III., the balance of power changed from one side to the other eight times, with the varying fortunes of Sweden, and the ability of her sovereigns, which for a long time was far above the average.

It is true that in the domain of local government we meet with less variety; the cities of Poland had mostly Magdeburg or Culm rights, and German influence was equally strong in Scandinavia. In Russia, on the other hand, we find a totally different development. The Veche or popular assembly, of which we must remember that there is no trace in Poland, existed from early times in most, if not in all, of the towns. Especially the history and character of Novgorod the Great, and of her younger sisters, Pskov and Viatka, are well worth the attention of students of civic institutions.

Finally, to those who are interested in the influence of physical geography on character and history; to the investigators of the life, conditions, and progress of all classes of society, at different ages; to the lover of folklore, dramatic incident, picturesque biography, and military strategy, as well as to the student of political economy, commerce, or literature, the history of northern Europe offers a field that will richly repay the labor devoted to it.

ARCHIBALD CARY COOLIDGE.

THE VATICAN ARCHIVES[1]

Of all the great repositories of historical documents, the archives of the Papacy possess the widest interest. Other collections may contain more for the history of the particular country in which they have been formed, but the papal archives are unique in being international and universal as well as local. During a period of seven hundred years the collections of the Vatican reflect every phase of the many-sided activity of the Roman church; of the first importance for Rome and Italy, they at the same time contain material for the history of every part of Catholic Christendom, however obscure or remote. "The keys of Peter are still the keys of the Middle Ages," wrote Pertz after his brief visit to the Vatican in 1823, and recent explorations under more favorable conditions have served to confirm the statement as essentially true of the later Middle Ages and to extend it to certain parts of the modern period as well.[2] It is the purpose of this article to indicate briefly the nature and contents of the Vatican collections and to show the directions in which research and publication have been most active since the archives became accessible to students.

It should be remarked in the first place that the present papal archives, extensive as they are, represent but a relatively small portion of the immense mass of documentary material which has at one time and another been the property of the Holy See. Besides the enormous number of documents which were sent out from Rome in the ordinary course of business and which one would naturally expect to find elsewhere, the papal archives themselves have suffered from carelessness, plunder, and the accidents of numerous transfers, so that the greater part of their contents

[1] My acknowledgments are due to Father Ehrle, prefect of the Vatican library, and to the sub-archivist, Monsignor Wenzel, for their kindness on the occasion of my visits to the Vatican; I am also indebted to Hofrath von Sickel, director of the Austrian Institute in Rome, and Dr. von Ambros, its librarian, to M. Coulon, of the École Française de Rome, to Señor Altamira of Madrid, and to Dr. Koser, director of the Prussian archives.

[2] *Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, V. 24. Compare Munch, *Aufschlüsse über das päpstliche Archiv*, Berlin, 1880, and Pastor, *Geschichte der Päpste*, preface to Vol. I.

has passed into other hands or disappeared. While a place for the deposit of archives is known to have existed at least as early as the time of Damasus I. (366–384),[1] the present collection contains no originals of the early Middle Ages and no continuous series before the pontificate of Innocent III., and in the subsequent period the gaps are numerous and important. Serious losses undoubtedly took place in the course of the wanderings of the archives from place to place during the Middle Ages and again on the occasion of their transportation to Paris by order of Napoleon I., but it must be remembered that the documents were preserved primarily, not as historical sources, but as evidences of papal rights or as aids in the transaction of business, so that much which would have the greatest interest at the present time was doubtless destroyed by the officials themselves as of no permanent value. Then, too, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when no clear distinction was made between public and private papers, the archives suffered from spoliation at the hands of the great Roman families, in whose private libraries many important series must now be sought. The Archivio di Stato at Rome also possesses documents and copies from the papal archives, acquired by the suppression of the Roman monasteries, and other pieces are still more widely dispersed.

The various groups of documents which at present constitute the archives of the Holy See do not form a single collection under one administration. Just as in the various European states there exist separate archives of war, of marine, of foreign affairs, etc., so the various departments of the papal administration have their own repositories of records and papers, separately preserved for the recent period at least, when, as in some cases, the earlier series have been united with the central collection. It thus happens that besides the principal collection there exist the separate archives of the Consistory, the Dataria Apostolica, the Tribunal of the Rota, the Secretaria Brevium, the Signatura Gratiæ, the Penitentiary, and the Master of Ceremonies, as well as those of the congregations of the Index, the Holy Office, and the Propaganda, and the special repositories belonging to the Sistine Chapel and St. Peter's.[2] The only one of these that is regularly open to

[1] Bresslau, *Handbuch der Urkundenlehre*, I. 120 ff., where the history of the papal archives is briefly traced.

[2] See particularly Hinojosa, *Los Despachos de la Diplomacia pontificia en España*, I. xlvi.–lv. The archives of the Master of Ceremonies, containing the greater part of the papal diaries, are described by Ehrle in the *Archiv für Litteratur- und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*, V. 587–602.

scholars is the more ancient part of the archives of the Consistory, whose historical importance was first brought to general notice by Pastor. Here are preserved the acts of the Consistory and many of the reports and documents upon which these acts are based, extending from the beginning of the fifteenth century and containing material of much value for ecclesiastical history.[1] The archives of the Propaganda, for some years open to the public, are now closed, as their constant use by investigators was found to interfere with the current business of the congregation. The series, which is unusually complete, is of capital importance for the missionary labors of the Roman church; it has been explored particularly with reference to the religious history of Bohemia and the southern Slavs.[2] Leaving these lesser archives aside, we shall concern ourselves chiefly with the great central collection, the Archivio Segreto Vaticano, the Vatican archives *par éminence*.

Long kept rigorously secret and utilized only by the officials and by certain exceptionally favored historians,[3] the Archivio Segreto has become freely accessible to students through the liberality of the present Pope. The signs of the new policy were manifested in 1879, when Professor Hergenröther of the University of Würzburg, one of the foremost Catholic scholars of his day, was promoted to the rank of Cardinal and placed in charge of the archives, which were thus put on an equality with the library. After the necessary preparation had been completed, the archives were formally thrown open in January, 1881.[4] Since that date the

[1] See Pastor, *Geschichte der Päpste*, I². 689–693, and the detailed account, with extracts, in Korzeniowski, *Excerpta ex libris manu scriptis Archivi Consistorialis Romani*, Cracow, 1890.

[2] On the archives of the Propaganda in general and the various publications from them before 1887, see Pieper in the *Römische Quartalschrift*, I. 80–99, 259–265.

[3] Pertz, Palacky, and some others succeeded in seeing certain pieces; the Norwegian scholar, P. A. Munch, seems to have been the only outsider admitted within the precincts of the archives, and this by a stretch of authority on the part of Theiner, who was then archivist. Cardinal Antonelli is said to have remarked that only three persons were allowed to enter the archives, namely, the Pope, the archivist, and himself; whoever else entered without a special dispensation of the Pope was ipso facto excommunicated. *Archivalische Zeitschrift*, V. 78.

The earlier publications from the archives lie beyond the scope of this article; that they were by no means inconsiderable may be seen by reference to the various Bullaria, Raynaldi's continuation of the *Annales Ecclesiastici* of Baronius, and the numerous collections edited by Theiner.

[4] Of the numerous articles called forth by the opening of the archives see in particular Gottlob in the *Historisches Jahrbuch*, VI. 271 ff., and Löwenfeld in the *Historisches Taschenbuch*, 1887, 281 ff. The attitude of Leo XIII. toward historical studies is set forth in an interesting letter to Cardinals Luca, Pitra, and Hergenröther, August 15,

archives have been enriched by the purchase of the Borghese collections and by the transfer of valuable series from the Lateran, a larger consultation room has been provided, and an excellent reference library, the Bibliotheca Leonina, has been formed for the use of workers in the archives and manuscripts of the Vatican.[1] Leo XIII. has in other ways shown his interest in historical studies, notably by the establishment of the Historical Commission of the College of Cardinals, for the encouragement of the study of history among the Italian clergy, and by the institution in the Vatican of courses of systematic instruction in paleography and diplomatics, designed particularly for the training of archivists for the pontifical and other ecclesiastical archives.[2]

Access to the archives is now granted by the prefect to every investigator, without distinction of faith, upon the receipt of a written application accompanied by an official recommendation or a personal letter to one of the archivists. The archives are open every morning from half-past eight until twelve, with the exception of Sundays, Thursdays, and festivals and during the short vacations which occur at Christmas, Carnival time, and Easter. They are also closed from June 28 to September 30 inclusive, so that the actual number of working days averages scarcely more than three a week throughout the year. The well-lighted consultation room, situated on the ground floor, under the library and opposite the papal gardens, has seats for about sixty readers; although larger than the room formerly in use, it is frequently crowded, so that regular attendance is necessary to insure a place. Visitors are struck at once by the air of quiet activity which pervades the room, and the evident determination of every one to make the most of the short time at his disposal. In general, documents anterior to 1815 are freely communicated, although the archivists may reserve pieces of a private nature (*carattere riservato*) "which cannot be given publicity for reasons of public interest, religious and social." Notes and copies must be submitted to examination before being taken away.[3] Where the exact indica-

1883, to be found in Vering's *Archiv für katholisches Kirchenrecht*, L. 428 ff., and in a French translation in the *Revue des Questions Historiques*, XXXIV. 353 ff.

[1] Opened in 1893. See *Historisches Jahrbuch*, XIV. 477–483.

[2] The exercises of the school, which was established by Motu Proprio of May 1, 1884 (*Studi e Documenti di Storia e Diritto*, VI. 106–108), are by permission open to others besides members of the clergy. During the past year they have been attended with profit by students of the American School of Classical Studies.

[3] Regulations established by Motu Proprio of May 1, 1884. They are published, as of 1894, in the *Revue Internationale des Archives, des Bibliothèques, et des Musées*, series *Archives*, I. 97.

tion is known, documents are brought promptly, but every extended investigation is likely to involve numerous delays and difficulties, for while there are excellent inventories and indexes prepared in the last century, these are not freely accessible nor are their indications always sufficiently sure or precise. "It is true of the Vatican archives more than of others," says Sickel,[1] "that only a part of the material for a given subject lies on the surface; merely to get track of the rest requires, not only tedious search, but the active assistance of the officials, who alone are familiar with the contents and disposition of the archives and able to follow up what is scattered and misplaced." It should be added that the archivists freely and cheerfully give such assistance, so far as their time permits, and their helpfulness is warmly appreciated.

A description of the contents of the Vatican archives is a matter of some difficulty, as no general inventory has been published, and the system of classification is in many cases the result of historical accidents rather than of the application of any logical principle. In the following brief account emphasis has been laid upon the historical interest of the various groups of documents rather than upon the details of their arrangement.[2]

Probably the most important section of the Vatican archives is the great series of *regesta*, consisting of copies of papal letters, which extends with few breaks from the time of Innocent III. The order of the letters in the volumes is roughly chronological; in course of time they were divided into various classes (*litteræ curiales, communes, camerales*), according to subject matter or form. Beginning with the papacy of Boniface IX., two series were kept, one at the Vatican and one at the Lateran, and we later find still other registers for the less formal types of letters — breves, signatures, etc. — which came into existence in the course of the fifteenth century.[3] To the historical student these volumes of registers are invaluable. They preserve the contents of a vast number of bulls and breves otherwise unknown, and even where

[1] *Mittheilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, XIII. 371.

[2] According to Ehrenberg (*Italienische Beiträge zur Geschichte der Provinz Ostpreussen*, X.) the number of volumes in the Vatican archives is estimated at 2,450,000. Detailed descriptions exist for many parts of the collection; it would be a great convenience if some one would bring them together into a manual which should indicate, so far as is at present known, the character, number of volumes, and chronological limits of each series. At present the best summary account is that given by Langlois and Stein in their *Archives de l'Histoire de France*, 743–757.

[3] See Palmieri, *Ad Vaticani archivi Romanorum pontificum Regesta Manuductio*, Rome, 1884, a useful inventory of the registers with some account of the history of the collection.

the originals have been preserved, comparison with the registers yields important results for the science of diplomatics. As may be seen from any of the published volumes, the subject matter of the registers is of the widest possible variety, and relates to all parts of Christendom; nowhere else does one gain so vivid an idea of the widespread activity of the Papacy and its intimate relations to every phase of contemporary life. Besides constituting an official and unimpeachable source for papal history, the registers are of much importance for the local, and particularly the ecclesiastical, history of the various countries of Europe, and they yield valuable information for economic history and for the history of literature and the arts. Since 1881 the attention of scholars has been busily devoted to the registers, so that they may now be considered the best known portion of the archives. The registers of Innocent III. were printed by Baluze in the seventeenth century; those of Honorius III. have recently appeared as an official publication from the Vatican, while the registers of the other popes of the thirteenth century and of Benedict XI. have been undertaken by members of the French school at Rome, and those of Clement V. by the Benedictines of Monte Cassino. After the beginning of the pontificate of John XXII. the amount of material contained in the registers becomes so vast that scholars have given up the idea of publishing it in full, and have contented themselves with excerpting that which relates to each country or locality. The only general publication for the later period is the registers of Leo X., begun by Cardinal Hergenröther and discontinued since his death.[1]

[1] Pressutti, *Regesta Honorii papæ III.*, Rome, 1888–1895. *Regestum Clementis papæ V.*, Rome, 1885–1888; a concluding volume of indexes is in preparation. Hergenröther, *Leonis X. pontificis maximi Regesta*, Freiburg i. B., 1884–1888. Of the series published under the auspices of the École Française the only publication as yet complete is the registers of Honorius IV., edited by Prou. The others are appearing with varying degrees of rapidity — Gregory IX. by Auvray; Innocent IV. by E. Berger; Alexander IV. by Bourel de la Roncière, de Loye, and Coulon; Urban IV. by Dorez and Guiraud; Clement IV. by Jordan; Gregory X. and John XXI. by Guiraud and Cadier; Nicholas III. by Gay; Martin IV. by Soehnée; Nicholas IV. by E. Langlois; Boniface VIII. by Digard, Faucon, and Thomas; and Benedict XI. by Grandjean. A number of letters from the registers of the thirteenth century, copied by Pertz for the *Monumenta Germaniæ Historica* in 1823, have recently been published under the editorship of Rodenberg: *Epistolæ sæculi XIII e Regestis pontificum Romanorum selectæ*, Berlin, 1883–1894. See also the beautiful volume of facsimiles published by Denifle, *Specimina palæographica Regestorum Romanorum pontificum ab Innocentio III ad Urbanum V*, Rome, 1888.

The more important of the local publications will be mentioned below under the countries concerned. For the numerous discussions of the diplomatic questions arising in connection with the study of the regesta, reference must be made to special works on

A valuable supplement to the registers is formed by the *libri supplicationum*, or records of the petitions in answer to which the papal bulls were issued, which often contain interesting matter omitted in the bulls. The series begins with Clement VI., but is by no means complete; it has been utilized particularly by Denifle, and after him by others who have concerned themselves with the history of universities.[1]

Scarcely inferior to the registers in interest, are the documents relating to the financial administration of the Holy See, which first become abundant toward the close of the thirteenth century, when the increased need of money and the decline of the income from the patrimony of St. Peter began to lead to the development of new sources of revenue and a more complete system of financial administration. Besides the financial material contained in the registers, of which a special series of *regesta cameralia*[2] was formed under Urban IV., we have, for the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, six hundred volumes of *collectoriæ* and nearly four hundred of *introitus et exitus cameræ apostolicæ*. The *collectoriæ*, together with the related series *libri obligationum* and *libri solutionum*, contain reports of the collectors sent out from Rome into the various parts of Europe, records of payments made directly to the papal treasury, and minutes of the financial obligations of bishops, abbots, and other high ecclesiastics. In addition to their direct value to the student of papal finance, the reports of the collectors are of considerable importance for ecclesiastical geography and local history, and constitute a source of the first rank for the monetary history and general economic conditions of the period.[3] The *introitus et exitus* comprise two sorts of records, the

papal diplomatics. An idea of the activity with which research has been carried on in the registers may be gained from Schmitz, *Uebersicht über die Publikationen aus den päpstlichen Registerbänden des XIII.–XV. Jahrhunderts vornehmlich seit dem Jahre 1881*, in the *Römische Quartalschrift* for 1893 (VII. 209–223, 486–491).

[1] See in general Kehr, in *Mittheilungen des Instituts*, VIII. 84 ff., and Erler in *Historisches Jahrbuch*, VIII. 487 ff.; and with special reference to the history of universities, Denifle, *Die Universitäten des Mittelalters*, I. xx., the cartularies of Paris and Montpellier, and Fournier, *Les Statuts et Privilèges des Universités Françaises*, with Denifle's additions.

[2] On which see Ottenthal, in *Mittheilungen des Instituts*, VI. 615–626.

[3] Besides the earlier publications of Theiner and Munch, see especially Kirsch, *Die päpstlichen Kollektorien in Deutschland während des XIV. Jahrhunderts*, Paderborn, 1894, and the first volume of the *Monumenta Vaticana Hungariæ*. The *libri obligationum* have been of much assistance to Father Eubel, who is engaged in the preparation of a more correct *Series Episcoporum*. The value of the financial records of the Papacy as a source for local history is exemplified by Glaser, *Die Diözese Speier in den päpstlichen Rechnungsbüchern, 1317 bis 1560*, published as Vol. XVII. of the *Mittheilungen des historischen Vereines der Pfalz* (1893).

books in which the various officials noted their receipts and expenditures, and the general accounts in which the items of the year were entered. Expenditures are given in minute detail, payments for oil and tapers, oats and fodder, the wages of the cook and other domestics appearing along with those for larger matters, so that an excellent idea is afforded of the daily life of the papal household.[1] Taken with the *regesta cameralia*, these accounts indicate very exactly the different directions of papal activity; they have been utilized by Ehrle and Faucon for the history of the papal library, and by Müntz and Faucon for the history of art, and are capable of furnishing information on many other subjects.[2]

Recent researches in the archives have thrown light upon several of the sources of papal revenue, notably the *census*[3] and the annates,[4] the taxes for the Crusades,[5] the taxes of the chancery[6] and the penitentiary,[7] and the expenses attendant upon letters of provision[8] and upon ordinations and consecrations at Rome;[9] but many questions still remain obscure. Indeed, the whole matter of papal finance is one of the least understood subjects in the history

[1] See, for examples, the first volume of appendices to the *Regestum Clementis papæ V.* Interesting items of household expenditure were published by Gregorovius in the *Historische Zeitschrift*, XXXVI. 157–173, from volumes in the Archivio di Stato at Rome; Gregorovius was surprised at the simple and economical style of living they indicate among the Popes of the fifteenth century. On the abundant material for papal finance in the Archivio di Stato see Gottlob, *Aus der Camera Apostolica des 15. Jahrhunderts*, Innsbruck, 1889, and Meister, *Auszüge aus den Rechnungsbüchern der Camera Apostolica zur Geschichte der Kirchen des Bisthums Strassburg*, in *Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberrheins*, VII. 104–151. Papal accounts from the library at Prato are given in the *Archivio Storico Italiano* for 1884.

[2] See the works cited by Langlois and Stein, 753. Hayn, *Das Almosenwesen unter Johannes XXII.* (*Römische Quartalschrift*, VI. 209–219), publishes the first installment of a study of papal charities on the basis of the *introitus et exitus* of the Avignonese period.

[3] Fabre, *Étude sur le Liber Censuum de l'Église Romaine*, Paris, 1892; see also his edition of the Liber Censuum and various briefer articles on the same subject.

[4] Kirsch, *Die Annaten und ihre Verwaltung in der zweiten Hälfte des 15. Jahrhunderts*, *Historisches Jahrbuch*, IX. 300–312.

[5] Gottlob, *Die päpstlichen Kreuzzugssteuern des 13. Jahrhunderts*, Heiligenstadt, 1892.

[6] Tangl, *Das Taxwesen der päpstlichen Kanzlei vom 13. bis zur Mitte des 15. Jahrhunderts*, *Mittheilungen des Instituts*, XIII. 1–106; and compare Bacha in the *Compte-rendu des séances de la Commission royale d'Histoire de Belgique*, 1894, 107 ff.

[7] Denifle, *Die älteste Taxrolle des apostolischen Pönitentiarie*, *Archiv für Litteratur- und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*, IV. 201 ff.; Lea, *The Taxes of the Papal Penitentiary*, *English Historical Review*, July, 1893.

[8] Mayr-Adlwang, *Ueber Expensrechnungen für päpstliche Provisionsbullen des 15. Jahrhunderts*, *Mittheilungen des Instituts*, XVII. 71–108.

[9] Schmitz, *Die Libri Formatarum der Camera Apostolica*, *Römische Quartalschrift*, VIII. 451–472.

of the Middle Ages, and this in spite of its great importance. The administration of the Roman Camera appears to have been exceptionally systematic and complete, as regards both division of functions and control, and its development and possible influence upon other systems possess special interest for the student of economic and institutional history. How far, if at all, the financial measures of the Popes contributed to produce discontent with the ecclesiastical system, is another problem whose solution can come only from a careful examination of the nature of the various sources of papal income, and the amounts actually collected in the various parts of Europe. Such questions have of late years begun to attract attention from scholars, and it is to be hoped that special studies in the archives will be continued until it will be possible to write, with impartiality and a full knowledge of the sources, an adequate history of papal finance.[1]

A source of great value for the history of modern Europe is found in the papers of the papal secretariat,[2] of which the most important are the instructions and reports of the nuncii, collected into six thousand volumes and classified into twenty-one groups according to the places where the nuncii were stationed. The various series of reports begin at different dates in the sixteenth century, and are far from complete, although the collections of the Vatican may frequently be supplemented by those of the private libraries of Rome. The reports of the nuncii have been examined for the history of several countries of Europe, — notably for that of Germany in the epoch of the Counter-reformation, — but their study is attended with various difficulties, and the amount so far published is relatively small. The origin and development of the system of permanent nuncii is itself a chapter of diplomatic history as yet little understood.[3] The collections of

[1] "Der Mangel einer vorurtheilsfreien, documentarisch gut belegten Finanz- und Verwaltungsgeschichte der römischen Curie während des Mittelalters gehört zu den empfindlichsten Lücken unserer historischen Litteratur." Tangl, in *Mittheilungen des Instituts*, XIII. 1. Some phases of the financial history of the Papacy are treated by Gottlob, *Aus der Camera Apostolica des 15. Jahrhunderts*, cited above; König, *Die päpstliche Kammer unter Clemens V. und Johannes XXII.*, Vienna, 1894; Miltenberger, *Versuch einer Neuordnung der päpstlichen Kammer in den ersten Regierungsjahren Martins V.*, *Römische Quartalschrift*, VII. 393–450; Kirsch, *Die Finanzverwaltung des Kardinalcollegiums im 13. and 14. Jahrhundert*, Münster, 1895.

[2] Friedensburg, in the *Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland*, first series, I. xvi. ff.; Hinojosa, I. 1–24; Langlois and Stein, 751, 754.

[3] See Friedensburg's introduction, and Pieper, *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte der ständigen Nuntiaturen*, Freiburg i. B., 1894, intended as an introduction to an edition of the instructions of the nuncii from the pontificate of Julius III. to the Thirty Years' War. Also various articles of Meister, especially *Die Nuntiatur von Neapel im 16. Jahr-*

the secretariat also contain a great number of letters from eminent personages in all parts of Europe (*lettere di principi, cardinali, vescovi e prelati, particolari, soldati, lettere diverse*), belonging to the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, and useful for supplementing the correspondence of the nuncii, and as an independent source.

The archives of the Vatican possess several collections of a miscellaneous nature, many of them ill-arranged and as yet but little explored, comprised mainly in the series "Armaria," "Instrumenta miscellanea," and "Instrumenta castelli Sant' Angelo." Their contents are of the most varied character, including numerous originals of imperial charters and papal bulls, letters of kings and princes, papal diaries, reports of visitations and proceedings before legates, and considerable material on purely Italian affairs. Important sections relate to the Great Schism and the Council of Trent.[1]

From the very opening of the Vatican archives, scholars have been busily occupied in exploring and publishing their contents and in studying the numerous problems to which exploration and publication have given rise, so that the books and articles which have grown directly or indirectly out of labors at the Vatican represent a very considerable proportion of the historical output of the last fifteen years. An enumeration of everything of this nature that has appeared would prove of little interest to the readers of this Review, even were the material at hand for a bibliographical task of such magnitude; it has, however, seemed worth while to indicate the principal lines along which research at the Vatican has been active, and, in particular, to give some idea of the work there carried on by organized effort on the part of the various European countries. Some mention of recent publications has been inevitable in dealing with the contents of the archives; repetition of works already cited will, as far as possible, be avoided.[2]

hundert, Historisches Jahrbuch, XIV. 70–82. A good illustration of the historical value of the reports of the nuncii is found in Philippson's article, *Die römische Curie und die Bartholomäusnacht, Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, VII. 108–137.

[1] Langlois and Stein, 754–756; *Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland*, first series, I. xix.–xxiii.; Kehr, *Die Kaiserurkunden des vatikanischen Archivs, Neues Archiv*, XIV. 343–376; Fabre, *Note sur les Archives du Château Saint-Ange, Mélanges de l'École française de Rome*, 1893, 3–19; Sickel, *Römische Berichte*, reprinted from the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Vienna Academy, 1895.

[2] I know of no attempt at a complete bibliography of publications from the Vatican archives. The list of Schmitz, already cited, is useful for the registers; many titles are given in the bibliography of the publications between 1885 and 1891 relative to the

The oldest of the institutions engaged in the exploration of the Vatican archives is the École Française de Rome, which began as an offshoot from the school at Athens in 1873 and attained a distinct organization in 1875. The school is supported by the French government and is under the direction of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, subject to the control of the minister of instruction. The director, at present the Abbé Duchesne, is chosen for a period of six years. Six members are appointed each year by the minister from among the candidates submitted by the École Normale Supérieure, the École des Chartes, and the École des Hautes Études. The appointments are renewable for a second or third year; usually there are also a few associate members. The work of the school includes archæological and philological, as well as historical, studies, but research in the archives always occupies the attention of some of the members, — notably of those who have profited by the admirable training of the École des Chartes. The principal undertaking of the school — the publication of the registers of the Popes of the thirteenth century — was begun as early as 1879, and has not yet been completed; the volumes already issued form the most important series of publications that has been made from the Vatican archives, and reflect great credit upon the school. In recent years, the historical investigations of the school have centred about the registers of the Avignonese Popes, where, as complete publication is out of the question, owing to the immense amount of material, they have been confined to the entries relating to French affairs and to the special diplomatic problems involved. One member has also studied the *regesta cameralia* of this period. The resources of the Vatican have also been utilized in many other publications of the French school, notably in Fabre's studies of papal administration and in the important works of Müntz and Faucon upon the history of art.[1]

history of mediæval Italy, which appeared as the twelfth number of the *Bulletino dell' Istituto Storico Italiano*, Rome, 1892.

In the following account emphasis is laid on the results of the organized and systematic explorations conducted by the various missions and institutes. In addition to the publications of individuals noted under particular countries, certain works which rest largely upon researches in Roman archives deserve special mention. Such are: Pastor, *Geschichte der Päpste seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters*, Freiburg i. B., 1891 ff.; Valois, *La France et le Grand Schisme d'Occident*, Paris, 1896; Schottmüller, *Der Untergang des Templer-Ordens*, Berlin, 1887; Albanès, *Gallia Christiana Novissima . . .* I. (Province of Aix), Montbéliard, 1895.

[1] Reports upon the work of the Ecole Française appear in the *Compte-rendu des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-lettres;* the latest is in the January-February number, 1896, 92–100. A list of the members since 1873 is printed in the

The materials for German history in the Vatican archives are very abundant, and their exploration has been undertaken from many different quarters. Among the first in the field were the representatives of the Munich Historical Commission, who collected and published important acts for the history of the Empire under Louis the Bavarian.[1] Soon the historical commissions of Württemberg and Baden and the directors of the series of sources published in Westphalia, Mecklenburg, and the province of Saxony had their agents at work in the Vatican, as did also the provincial authorities of Brandenburg, Posen, and East and West Prussia.[2] Documents have also been collected for the ecclesiastical provinces of Cologne, Trier, and Hamburg-Bremen, as well as for a number of dioceses within and without their limits. Such investigations, carried on independently with reference to the history of each state or locality, naturally involve great waste of effort, since the ground must be gone over anew in each case, and the results are sometimes exceedingly meagre. To obviate this difficulty, the two leading German representatives of historical studies in Rome, the Prussian Institute and the Görresgesellschaft, have undertaken, first, to prepare a "Repertorium Germanicum," or calendar of all the entries relating to German affairs in the registers of the later Middle Ages, and second, to publish the reports of the German nuncii of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The work has been so apportioned that the Prussian Institute takes the registers from 1378 to 1448; the Görresgesellschaft, those from 1448 to

periodical organ of the school, *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire*, XVI. 3–12. Together with the school at Athens, the school at Rome publishes the *Bibliothèque des Écoles d'Athènes et de Rome*, an octavo series for monographs and a quarto series for the regesta, etc., where the more extended contributions of its members appear. An examination of the reports of the nuncii in France was planned not long ago, but I am not aware that it has as yet led to definite results.

[1] Riezler, *Vatikanische Akten zur deutschen Geschichte in der Zeit Kaiser Ludwigs des Bayern*, Innsbruck, 1891; compare the earlier publications of Reinkens and von Löher in the same field. The Vatican archives have also been examined for the edition of the acts of the imperial diets, and the commission originally planned to publish the reports of the nuncii of the Reformation period as a supplement to this series.

[2] Schneider and Kaiser, *Württembergisches aus römischen Archiven*, Stuttgart, 1895 (*Württembergs Geschichtsquellen*, II. 355–566); Schmidt and Kehr, *Päbstliche Urkunden und Regesten aus den Jahren* [1295–1378], *die Gebiete der heutigen Provinz Sachsen und deren Umlande betreffend*, Halle, 1886–1889 (*Geschichtsquellen der Provinz Sachsen*, XXI., XXII.); Finke, *Die Papsturkunden Westfalens bis zum Jahre 1378*, I. Münster, 1888 (*Westfälisches Urkundenbuch*, V.); Ehrenberg, *Urkunden und Aktenstücke zur Geschichte der in der heutigen Provinz Posen vereinigten ehemals polnischen Landestheile*. . . . Leipzig, 1892; Ehrenberg, *Italienische Beiträge zur Geschichte der Provinz Ostpreussen*, Königsberg, 1895. Other local researches and publications are mentioned in the *Römische Quartalschrift*, VII. 216 ff., 487, and in the *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, VIII. 176.

1517 and the earlier volumes of Martin V. With reference to the nuncii, the agreement finally reached by the various investigators that had already begun work in this field assigns to Prussia the reports before 1560 and after 1605 as well as those for the period 1572–1585; the Görresgesellschaft has those between 1585 and 1605, while the important years 1560–1572 are reserved for the Austrian Institute.

The Prussian Institute, founded in 1888, is under the general supervision of the Berlin Academy of Sciences, and the immediate control of a commission of three, consisting at present of Professors Wattenbach and Lenz and the director of the Prussian archives, Dr. Koser. In Rome the institute is represented by a secretary, Dr. Friedensburg, two regular assistants, and a varying number of other workers; the expenses of publication are borne jointly by the Prussian archives and the ministry of education. Thus far eight volumes of the reports of the nuncii have appeared;[1] work for the *Repertorium Germanicum*, which receives a special subsidy from the emperor's private funds, has been carried on in the registers of Eugene IV., and the first volume is now in press.

The historical section of the Görresgesellschaft, instituted "for the encouragement of the sciences in Catholic Germany," has its regular representatives at Rome, under the direction of Dr. Ehses, and is one of the most active agencies in the scientific utilization of the Vatican archives. Besides two volumes of reports of German nuncii, the society has published an important body of documents relating to the divorce of Henry VIII. of England, and has begun a series of valuable contributions to the history of papal finance.[2] · Work has also been carried on in the registers of Mar-

[1] *Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland nebst ergänzenden Aktenstücken*, Gotha and Berlin, 1892 ff. First period edited by Friedensburg: I. *Nuntiaturen des Vergerio, 1533–1536;* II. *Nuntiatur des Morone, 1536–1538;* III. and IV. *Legation Aleanders, 1538–1539.* Third period, edited by Hansen and Schellhass: I. *Der Kampf um Köln, 1576–1584;* II. *Der Reichstag zu Regensburg, Der Pacificationstag zu Köln, Der Reichstag zu Augsburg* (1576–1582); III. *Die süddeutsche Nuntiatur des Grafen Bartholomäus von Portia*, 1573–1574. Fourth period, edited by Kiewning: I. *Nuntiatur des Paleotto, 1628;* a second volume in press.

Reports on the work of the institute appear in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Academy; see also Sybel's preface to the first volume of the *Nuntiaturberichte* (first period).

[2] *Quellen und Forschungen aus dem Gebiete der Geschichte. In Verbindung mit ihrem Historischen Institut in Rom herausgegeben von der Görresgesellschaft.* Paderborn, 1892, ff. I. 1, Dittrich, *Nuntiaturberichte Giovanni Morones vom deutschen Königshofe, 1539–1540.* II. Ehses, *Römische Dokumente zur Geschichte der Ehescheidung Heinrichs VIII. von England, 1527–1534.* III. Kirsch, *Die päpstlichen Kollektorien in Deutschland während des XIV. Jahrhunderts.* IV. Ehses and Meister, *Die kölnische Nuntiatur, 1585–1587.* (Inventories of the *collectoriæ* and the *introitus et exitus* have been pre-

tin V. and Hadrian VI., and a complete edition of the acts of the Council of Trent is in preparation, and is to be accompanied by the various private diaries and minutes of the council's proceedings. Studies from Rome also appear in the society's review, the *Historisches Jahrbuch*.

The researches of Austrian scholars in the papal archives, begun in accordance with imperial decree in 1881, have been conducted almost entirely under the auspices of the Austrian Institute of Historical Studies directed by Theodor von Sickel. The institute, whose present organization dates from 1890, is supported by the Austrian government; its regular members, who receive an annual stipend, are appointed each year by the minister of education on the recommendation of the director in Rome and the director of the Institut für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung in Vienna.[1] In the choice of subjects for investigation members of the institute enjoy considerable freedom, while at the same time emphasis is laid upon the careful and thorough methods which characterize the Austrian school of diplomatics. Of their publications the greater number relate to German history in the century following the interregnum and to the organization and procedure of the papal chancery.[2] Mention should also be made of the important studies of the director in regard to the documents of the German emperors,[3] the

pared and are to be published. The last report of the work of the society in Rome will be found in the *Historisches Jahrbuch*, XVII. 224–226.)

[1] *Statut für das Istituto Austriaco di Studi Storici*, Vienna, 1893; director's reports in *Mittheilungen des Instituts*, VI. 203–223; XIII. 367–376, 663–667. The publications of the institute down to the close of 1893 are described by Starzer in the *Oesterreichisches Litteraturblatt*, II. Nos. 21–24.

[2] On the history of the empire: Fanta, Kaltenbrunner, and Ottenthal, *Actenstücke zur Geschichte des deutschen Reiches unter den Königen Rudolf I. und Albrecht I.*, Vienna, 1889 (Vol. I. of the *Mittheilungen aus dem vatikanischen Archive*, published by the Vienna Academy); Starzer and Redlich, *Eine Wiener Briefsammlung zur Geschichte des deutschen Reiches und der österreichischen Länder in der zweiten Hälfte des XIII. Jahrhunderts* (Vol. II. of the same collection); Werunsky, *Auszüge aus den Registern der Päpste Clemens VI. und Innocent VI. zur Geschichte des Kaiserreichs unter Karl IV.*, Innsbruck, 1885; id., *Geschichte Kaiser Karls IV. und seiner Zeit*, Innsbruck, 1880–1892.

On the chancery: Sickel, *Liber Diurnus Romanorum Pontificum*, Vienna, 1889; Tangl, *Die päpstlichen Kanzleiordnungen von 1200–1500*, Innsbruck, 1894; Ottenthal, *Die päpstlichen Kanzleiregeln von Johannes XXII. bis Nicolaus V.*, Innsbruck, 1888; Kaltenbrunner, *Römische Studien*, Innsbruck, 1884–1886; and numerous briefer studies of the same authors in the *Mittheilungen des Instituts*.

[3] Sickel, *Das Privilegium Otto's I. für die römische Kirche vom Jahre 962*, Innsbruck, 1883; Sickel and Bresslau, *Die kaiserliche Abfertigung des Wormser Concordats*, *Mittheilungen des Instituts*, VI. 105–139; and Italian documents contributed to the *Studi e Documenti di Storia e Diritto*, VI., and to the *Notizie e Trascrizioni dei Diplomi imperiali e reali delle Cancellerie d'Italia*, 1892.

monographs of Wahrmund on modern papal elections,[1] and the numerous contributions of Starzer to Austrian local history. The institute has pushed forward its preparations for the publication of the reports of the German nuncii in the period of the Council of Trent, and the first volume of the series is promised before the close of 1896.

Active investigations at Rome have also been carried on by other parts of the Austrian Empire. For Hungary the fine series of the *Monumenta Vaticana Hungariæ*, edited by Monsignor Fraknói and published under the auspices of the higher clergy of the kingdom, well illustrates the resources of the various sections of the Vatican archives and forms a contribution of the highest importance to Hungarian history.[2] Bohemia has been represented in Rome since 1887 by two *Landesstipendisten*, who receive a regular subvention from the diet and are ranked as extraordinary members of the Austrian Institute. They have been engaged in a careful examination of the papal registers with reference to Bohemian ecclesiastical history and have also collected important material for the history of the Counter-reformation in Bohemia.[3] In the South Slavonic lands the Academy of Sciences at Agram has directed explorations at the Vatican; the documents published come chiefly from the Propaganda and relate to Bulgarian affairs.[4]

Researches in regard to the material for Polish history in the Vatican archives were begun in 1885 at the instance of members of the aristocracy and higher clergy of Austrian Poland. Since 1886 the work has been directed by Professor Smolka of the University of Cracow, under the auspices of the Cracow Academy of Sciences and with the aid of subsidies furnished by the Galician diet and the Austrian minister of education. More than forty

[1] *Das Ausschliessungsrecht der katholischen Staaten . . . bei den Papstwahlen*, Vienna, 1888; *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Exclusionsrechts bei den römischen Papstwahlen*, Vienna, 1890; also in the *Historisches Jahrbuch*, XII. 784–791, and the *Archiv für katholisches Kirchenrecht*, LXVII., LXVIII., LXXII.

[2] *Monumenta Vaticana Historiam regni Hungariæ illustrantia*, Budapest, 1884–1891. First Series: I. *Rationes Collectorum pontificiorum in Hungaria, 1281–1375;* II. *Acta legationis Cardinalis Gentilis, 1307–1311;* III., IV. *Bullæ Bonifacii IX.;* V. *Liber Confraternitatis Sancti Spiritus de Urbe, 1446–1523;* VI. contains the correspondence of Matthias Corvinus with the Popes. Second Series: I. *Relationes Oratorum pontificiorum, 1524–1526;* II. *Relationes Cardinalis Buonvisi, 1686.*

[3] Compare *Mittheilungen des Instituts*, XIII. 376. Dudik's volume on Moravia, *Auszüge für Mährens allgemeine Geschichte aus den Regesten der Päpste Benedict XII. und Clemens VI.* (Brünn, 1885), I have not seen.

[4] Fermendžin, *Acta Bulgariæ ecclesiastica*, Agram, 1888, forming Vol. XVIII. of the *Monumenta spectantia Historiam Slavorum Meridionalium*

volumes of copies, analyses, and inventories of documents relating to the history of Poland have been sent to Cracow for preservation in the library of the Academy, which has published a summary of their contents and some of the material which they contain for the history of the sixteenth century.[1] Important pieces for the history of Prussian Poland have been collected in Rome under the direction of the provincial authorities of East Prussia and Posen, while from the Russian side noteworthy studies have been made by Professor Wierzbowski of the University of Warsaw.[2]

The investigations conducted on the part of the other nations of Europe can be described more briefly. The English Public Record Office has for several years had an agent at Rome preparing a "calendar of all entries in the Papal Regesta of the Middle Ages which illustrate the history of Great Britain and Ireland;" two volumes have recently appeared,[3] covering the period from 1198 to 1342. Norway, Sweden, and Denmark have each a representative in the Vatican archives, and by a coöperative exploration of all the material relating to Scandinavia avoid the waste of time inseparable from a separate examination for each country. Materials for Swiss history have been gathered both from the registers and from the reports of the nuncii, at the instance, in the one case, of the historical society in Basel, and, in the other, of the Allgemeine Geschichtsforschende Gesellschaft.[4] The Belgian government has twice sent Professor Cauchie of the University of Louvain upon a mission to Italian archives; at Rome he has explored various parts of the registers, of the records of the Camera, and of the reports of the Flemish nuncii.[5] I know of no publications for

[1] Korzeniowski, *Catalogus Actorum et Documentorum res gestas Poloniæ illustrantium quæ . . . expeditionis Romanæ cura 1886–1888 deprompta sunt*, Cracow, 1889; id., *Excerpta ex libris manu scriptis Archivi Consistorialis Romani, 1409–1590*, Cracow, 1890. These have since been combined with other matter to form *Analecta Romana quæ historiam Poloniæ sæc. XVI. illustrant* (*Scriptores Rerum Polonicarum*, XV.), Cracow, 1894. References to publications in Polish are given in the introduction. See also Lewicki, *Codex Epistolaris saeculi decimi quinti*, Cracow, 1891–1894. Reports on the work of the mission in Rome appear in the *Anzeiger* of the Cracow Academy.

[2] Wierzbowski, *Vincent Laureo, nonce apostolique en Pologne*, Warsaw, 1887; *Uchansciana*, Warsaw, 1884–1895.

[3] Bliss, *Papal Letters*, London, 1893–1895. A brief note on the materials at the Vatican concerning English history appeared in the *English Historical Review*, 1889, 810, where it is stated that the English agent is instructed to carry his investigations to 1688.

[4] Bernouilli, *Acta pontificum Helvetica*, I. 1198–1268, Basel, 1891. Wirz, *Akten über die diplomatischen Beziehungen der römischen Curie zu der Schweiz*, 1512–1552 (*Quellen zur Schweizer Geschichte*, XVI.), Basel, 1895.

[5] See his *Mission aux Archives Vaticanes, Compte-rendu des séances de la Commis-*

Holland except the collection of bulls concerning the diocese of Utrecht, edited by Brom.[1] With reference to the materials for Spanish history preserved at the Vatican a preliminary examination has been made, under official direction, by Ricardo de Hinojosa, who has just published some of the results in a volume on the despatches of the Spanish nuncii.[2] Nothing similar has yet been done for Portugal. The papal archives naturally contain less for the history of Russia than for that of Catholic Europe; the amount of material is, however, by no means inconsiderable, as is shown by the various writings of Pierling on the relations of Russia to the Holy See,[3] and by the report of his investigations at Rome recently published by Professor Šmourlo of the University of Dorpat.[4] The Russian government has recently determined to establish an institute at Rome, part of whose time shall be given to historical studies.

Within the Vatican itself the officials have naturally had small leisure to devote to special research, yet the scholars connected with the papal court have not left entirely to outsiders the work of utilizing the archives. We owe to them, and others working under their direction, the publication of three important sets of registers and a considerable amount of scattered material, relating particularly to Italian history,[5] while mention should also be made of the publications of Pitra and Palmieri on the registers, and of the documents bearing on the German Reformation, brought together by the former archivist Balan.[6] Material from the archives appears from time to time in the *Studi e Documenti di Storia e Diritto* and in other publications of the Accademia Romana di Conferenze Storico-giuridiche, founded and maintained under papal

sion royale d'Histoire de Belgique, 1892, 185–192, 313–483; and compare the reports of the commission for 1894, 3, 195, and for 1895, 259.

[1] *Bullarium Trajectense . . .*, The Hague, 1891 ff.

[2] *Los Despachos de la Diplomacia pontificia en España. Memoria de una Misión oficial en el Archivo Secreto de la Santa Sede*, I., Madrid, 1896.

[3] *Documents inédits sur les rapports du Saint-Siège avec les Slaves*, Paris, 1887; *Papes et Tsars (1547–1597) d'après des documents nouveaux*, 1890; *La Russie et le Saint-Siège*, 1896.

[4] *Revue Internationale des Archives*, etc., series *Archives*, I. 135. For Livonia see *Hildebrand, Livonica, vornehmlich aus dem 13. Jahrhundert im vatikanischen Archiv*, Riga, 1887.

[5] Registers of Honorius III., Clement V., and Leo X., cited above. *Spicilegio Vaticano di Documenti inediti e vari estratti degli Archivi e dalla Biblioteca della Sede Apostolica*, Rome, 1890–1891. *Il Muratori*, Rome, 1892.

[6] Pitra, *Analecta novissima Spicilegii Solesmensis, altera continuatio*, I., Paris, 1885. Balan, *Monumenta Reformationis Lutherianæ ex tabulariis secretioribus S. Sedis, 1521–1525*, Ratisbon, New York, and Cincinnati, 1884; and *Monumenta sæculi XVI. Historiam illustrantia*, Innsbruck, 1885.

sanction. At present the most active investigators who hold official positions at the Vatican are Father Denifle, custodian of the archives, and Father Ehrle, prefect of the library, both widely known for their valuable contributions to the ecclesiastical, literary, and educational history of the Middle Ages, in connection with which they have drawn freely upon the resources of the papal collections.[1]

Of researches at the Vatican with reference to American history there is unfortunately very little to record. Some years ago a Peruvian Jesuit, Father Hernaez, had access to the archives and made some use of them for his collection of documents relating to American ecclesiastical history.[2] Visitors to the Chicago Exposition will perhaps remember the handsome set of phototype facsimiles from the papal archives which was exhibited in the Convent of La Rabida among the objects relating to the discovery of America. This volume, of which but twenty-five copies were published, *ut illustrioribus tantum bibliothecis distribuerentur*, contains facsimiles and transcriptions of twenty-three letters from the papal registers, relating to the bishopric of Garda in Greenland, — the first American see,[3] — the demarcation line between the Spanish and Portuguese colonies, and the sending out of the first missionaries and bishops after the voyages of Columbus.[4] As most of

[1] See particularly Ehrle, *Historia Bibliothecæ Romanorum Pontificum tum Bonifatianæ tum Avenionensis*, I., Rome, 1890; and Denifle, *Die Universitäten des Mittelalters*, Berlin, 1885, and *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, Paris, 1889–1894; and the various volumes of their joint publication, *Archiv für Litteratur- und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*.

[2] *Coleccion de Bulas, Breves y otros Documentos relativos á la Iglesia de America y Filipinas, dispuesta, anotada e ilustrada por el Padre Francisco Javier Hernaez, de la Compañia de Jesus.* Brussels, 1879. The work, which was brought out by Fathers Garrastazu and de Uriarte after the author's death and does not seem to be widely known, was undertaken at the instance of the Second Council of Quito. A large part of its contents was drawn from the various Bullaria, with some use of South American archives.

[3] In regard to which several pieces have been published by a Dalmatian scholar, Jelič, under the title *L'Évangélisation de l'Amérique avant Christophe Colomb, Compte-rendu du Congrès Scientifique International des Catholiques tenu à Paris, du 1er au 6 avril, 1891*, fifth section, 170–184; *Compte-rendu du troisième Congrès . . . tenu à Bruxelles . . .* 1894, fifth section, 391–395.

[4] Also a letter of Julius II. commending Bartholomew and Diego Columbus to Ferdinand. The volume bears the title: *Documenta selecta e Tabulario secreto Vaticano, quæ Romanorum pontificum erga Americæ populos curam ac studia tum ante tum paullo post insulas a Christophoro Columbo repertas testantur, phototypis descripta*, Rome, 1893. Compare Ehrle, *Der historische Gehalt der päpstlichen Abtheilung auf der Weltausstellung von Chicago, Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, XLVI. 367–394. On the establishment of bishoprics in America see also Ehses, *Aus den Consistorialakten der Jahre 1530–1534, Römische Quartalschrift*, VI. 220–236. I am told that some researches have been made for the history of certain North American dioceses, but have no exact information on this point.

these documents were previously known, their publication was of more importance for purposes of exhibition than as an addition to historical knowledge; it will prove of further value if it serve to stimulate among us an interest in the archives and a desire to explore them.

The value and extent of the Roman sources for American history would appear only after a prolonged examination. Unquestionably, the general history of the western world, even of those parts which have always been predominantly Catholic, stands in no such close relation to the papal system as does the history of Europe, and it were vain to expect the same assistance from Roman archives in the one field as in the other. Nevertheless, there is every reason to believe that the Vatican collections contain much of special interest to American students, particularly in regard to the age of exploration and colonization, and the history of Latin America, — in which directions the material is doubtless most abundant, while our opportunity is at the same time the wider, owing to the backwardness of Spain and Portugal in undertaking researches at the Vatican. A systematic and thorough investigation of the American material at the Vatican ought certainly to be made, — either by a specially qualified agent or, better still, by an American School of Historical Studies at Rome. It is not the place here to insist upon the utility of such a school, established upon the general plan of the classical schools at Rome and Athens, and working in friendly coöperation with them and with the historical institutes already founded by European countries. If it were properly organized and directed, I believe a school at Rome would prove of the greatest value, not only by its actual contributions to historical knowledge, but also by its stimulating effect upon the serious study of history among us. Its activities should not be confined to American subjects, but should also include some of the numerous other problems of general interest whose solution lies in the archives and libraries of Rome and other parts of Italy, so that the idea of such an institution ought to appeal to all who are concerned in the progress of historical science in America, regardless of the directions in which their own special studies may lie.

CHARLES H. HASKINS.

REV. THOMAS BRAY AND HIS AMERICAN LIBRARIES

We are accustomed to think of the New England States as peculiarly the seat of learning in colonial days, and of the South as inhabited by men who cared little for reading and had little opportunity to read, even if they wished to do so. We all know of the early libraries attached to the New England colleges, and of the remarkable development of literary tastes produced by the diffusion of printed material in the northern colonies. To most men, also, the influence of Franklin and his Philadelphia Library is familiar; but it seldom occurs to us that in the provincial period there were libraries of any importance south of Mason and Dixon's line. Yet when we consider the fact that the southern gentry frequently received the best education that England could give, and that, when the Revolutionary period came, they showed themselves remarkably well versed in history and politics, we should be put upon inquiry to ascertain whether we have not overlooked the southern libraries in our survey of the social life of colonial days. We would not maintain that the love of reading pervaded the various classes of society as extensively in the South as in the North; but there is no doubt that the southern gentry possessed excellent private libraries, and that the first public library movement in North America found its chief field in the southern group of colonies.

The Virginia planters had books of their own, beside those furnished by the library of William and Mary College at the colonial capital. As is shown by the interesting lists from old inventories, which President L. G. Tyler is publishing in the *William and Mary College Quarterly*, many of the colonial mansions along the banks of the James and the Rappahannock possessed considerable and varied collections of books. In the other southern states we have not such published data to go upon, but in Maryland and South Carolina, at least, a similar condition of affairs must have existed. In all the southern colonies, however, save Georgia, which was settled after the period of his activity, the first great impulse towards forming public libraries was given by Rev. Thomas Bray. Had his efforts been made on

a broader basis, and had they met with stronger support, Massachusetts would have been much over a century behind Maryland in the success of her libraries, as she is chronologically in the enactment of a state library law.

Edwards writes, in his *Memoirs of Libraries*, that "the early history of Libraries in America derives a special interest for Englishmen, from the fact that it is pre-eminently a record of reciprocal good offices between some of the best men of both countries. There is not a library in the United States, of the age of a century and upwards, which does not treasure on its roll of benefactors the name of many a liberal-minded Englishman who saw that, in lending what furtherance he could to the cause of learning in the rising commonwealth, he was at once discharging a plain duty and sowing the seeds of an abundant harvest, of which his own posterity would surely gather a portion, though they might never behold the fields in which it was to grow." This statement is worthy of quotation, because it emphasizes the fact, which we are apt to forget, that the active interest of the mother country had much to do with the supply of books for the colonial libraries.

The first library in British North America which belonged to any public institution was the gift of an Englishman. This was the library attached to the college projected at Henrico, Va., but given up after the Indian massacre of 1623. To this institution was left, by the will of Mr. Thomas Burgrave, late minister in Virginia, a library valued at 100 marks. An unknown giver in England sent over for this library, in 1620, St. Augustine's *De Civitate Dei*, "Master Perkins his works, and an exact map of America," and in 1621 added to his gift "a small Bible with a cover richly wrought, a great church Bible, the Booke of Common Prayer, and other bookes." The two donations were valued at £10. That this was the first public library in the British colonies is a moral certainty.

Thomas Bray was born at Marton, in Shropshire, in 1656, and, after a long and useful life, died in London in 1730. A recent writer speaks of him as "a striking instance of what a man can effect, without any extraordinary genius and without any special influence. It would be difficult to point to any one who has done more real and enduring service to the church of England. He cannot be reckoned among our great divines, but his writings produced more immediate practical results than those of greater divines have done."

Bray took his bachelor's degree from All Souls' College, Oxford,

in 1678, and, having entered the ministry, was successful in several pastorates. As an able clergyman, he attracted the notice of Bishop Compton of London, who selected him as commissary of Maryland in 1696. Four years previously, Maryland, which had recently become a royal province, was divided into parishes by the governor and assembly, and the Anglican Church was established in the province. A maintenance for the clergy was provided from a tax on tobacco, and the Bishop of London was asked to send over a commissary to supervise the religious establishment of the province. This office Bray accepted, but was obliged to remain in England for the present, as the king had vetoed the Maryland law. It therefore seemed wise to await the passage of another act framed to meet the royal objections. While waiting in England he was engaged in seeking out clergymen to be sent over as soon as the new act should be passed. He found he could only get poor men who were not able to buy books for their libraries, and this determined him to inaugurate a system of parochial libraries in Maryland.

He had gained prominence at this time by the publication of a volume of *Lectures upon the Church Catechism*, and quickly found supporters in his scheme. He insisted that, if he served as commissary, the bishops must assist him in this plan, telling them that such libraries would be the best encouragement to studious and sober men to undertake the service. About this time, though little able to bear the expense, he took the degrees of B.D. and D.D. at Oxford, that he might be better fitted to sustain the dignity of commissary. He also issued printed "Proposals for the Incouragement and Promoting of Religion and Learning in the Foreign Plantations," in which he sets forth a scheme for a parochial library in every parish in America.[1] His idea is that

[1] In the preface to his anonymous *Brief Account of the Life of the Reverend Mr. John Rawlet*, London, 1728, Bray tells how such designs came to his mind. Rawlet, he says, left his library to his native town of Tamworth, with provision that any clergyman of Tamworth or the neighborhood might borrow books from it. "The Experience of its Benefit gave a Hint in forming the Design of Parochial and Lending Libraries, as well at Home, as . . . in the Plantations Abroad. . . . The first Hint indeed given of the Usefulness, indeed of the plain Necessity of such a Design, was upon another Occasion, viz. On being desired by the Relations of a Neighbouring Clergyman then lately Deceas'd, to look over his Books in Order to their Sale, it was surprising to find him so poorly furnished therewith. . . . I found, that whilst Living, he enjoy'd the Use of Two very Considerable Libraries in his Parish. . . . It was but Natural on such Occasion to Reflect, as on the one Hand, on the Impossibility of many Thousand Vicars and Curates, their enjoying such an Advantage . . . ; So on the other, the utter Impossibility they should be able to furnish themselves therewith. . . . Upon this Observation and Reflection indeed, was form'd something of a Plan of making such Provision both of *Parochial* and *Lending Libraries*, before I became acquainted with Mr. *Rawlett's*, and

each parochial library shall be strictly for reference and "shall be Affixed in a decent and large Room of the Parsonage-House of such Parish, there to remain to the sole Use of the Minister thereof for the time being, unto all future Generations, and to be as *unalienable* as any other Rights and Dues of the Church." It is directed that "in every Book, on the one side of the Cover, shall be letter'd these words, *Sub Auspiciis Willielmi III.* on the other side the Name of the Parish to which these Books do belong: ex. gr. *E. Bibliotheca de Mary-Town: E. Bibliotheca de James-Town*, &c." This was done "for further Security, to preserve them from Loss or Imbezelment and that they may be known where-ever they are found," and, by these signs, the writer has known many of them, reposing in distant corners of libraries. The minister is to be responsible for any books "Imbezelled or Lost by his fault," and must account for them annually to the churchwardens, and triennially to the commissary. To obtain books for these libraries, requests are to be made to the "learned authors" now living, to give copies of their books, and to others, especially "merchants to the foreign plantations," to give money, of all of which there shall be a full account published.

This tract was approved in a letter, signed by both archbishops and five (afterward twelve) bishops, which stated that they looked "upon the design, as what will tend very much to propagate Christian knowledge in the Indies, as it will, in all likelihood, invite some of the more studious and virtuous persons out of the universities to undertake the ministry in those parts and will be a means of rendering them useful, when they are there." Therefore, they promise to help "cheerfully towards promoting these Parochial Libraries," and "hope that many pious persons will be found, who out of love to religion and learning, will also contribute thereto."

Armed with this endorsement, Bray was very successful in collecting money and books. As he worked on, the idea grew greatly upon him, and in 1697 he published *An Essay towards promoting all Necessary and Useful Knowledge, both divine and*

the same was Communicated to such of our Neighbouring Brethren, as were sensible of the Value of Books, who approv'd the Design, and wish'd it a good Success; but it remain'd as a mere Project in Speculation only, till several of the Clergy by Experience tasted of the Benefit of Mr. *Rawlett's* Library, out of which they could now and then Borrow the Book we wanted to peruse. And indeed it was usual for some of us to Ride even Ten Miles to Borrow out of it the Book we had Occasion for. It was this Experience which encourag'd, which invigorated the Publishing an *Essay*, Printed about Thirty Years since; and which, Blessed be God, has had such Success; That, together with those, the *Missionary Clergy* in our Plantations Abroad have been provided with, there are at this Day in all, at least Hundred *Parochial* and *Lending Libraries* Rais'd and Fix'd upon that Plan."

human, in all the Parts of His Majesty's Dominions, both at home and abroad. In this work he puts forth "Proposals to the Gentry and Clergy of this Kingdom for purchasing lending Libraries in all the Deanaries of England, and Parochial Libraries for Maryland, Virginia, and other of the Foreign Plantations." He gives a catalogue of titles of books proper for such libraries, which fills six pages of the book, and includes a selection of books in all branches of literature; though, of course, theology receives the greatest attention. The first apostle of the free circulating library tells us that he no longer limits the usefulness of his libraries to the clergy; but hopes also to provide for the gentry of the country, and to allow them to carry the books to their homes. "Standing libraries," he writes, "will signifie little in the Country, where Persons must ride some miles to look into a Book; such Journeys being too expensive of Time and Money: But *Lending Libraries*, which come home to 'em without Charge, may tolerably well supply the Vacancies in their own Studies, till such time as these *Lending* may be improv'd into *Parochial Libraries*." In this plan, the parochial library was to be mainly a "standing" one, the decanal or the colonial library being the "lending" one, as a substitute for and supplement to the former. "And, whereas it may be objected, that the Books will be so often Borrow'd, that it will be hard for any one to have the Book he wants, I am so far from being much concern'd to answer it, that I heartily wish the great Use and frequent Borrowing of Books out of these Libraries, may make it a real Objection." These are words exactly in the spirit of the modern library, and, like a modern librarian, he suggests, "there being several Authors specify'd in such a Library as I design, upon most of the Subjects, if one be not to be had, Satisfaction may be sought in the mean time from another."

His argument, often quaint but always sensible, is worthy of further quotation.

> Knowledge is the fairest Ornament of the Soul of Man; and whosoever is Endow'd therewith, let it be of any kind, which is not mischievous, fails not of Esteem amongst all sorts of Persons. This is certain, that Knowledge does more to distinguish the Possessors of it, than Titles, Riches, or great Places: For, tho' these Men may command the Cap and the Knee, and extort some outward kind of Reverence from Inferiors; yet the Man of Understanding is he, who is inwardly and truly respected, whilst the Gaudy, but Empty Beau, is no other than the Scorn and Derision of all who Converse with him. But especially a Man is then Esteemed for his Knowledge, if his Understanding is Eminent in things laudable, and of great Weight and Moment, for whatever is greatly useful is highly valu-

able. And such is the Knowledge which I am endeavoring to provide for. . . . I hope, though this Design seems more immediately directed to the Service of the Clergy, yet Gentlemen, Physicians and Lawyers will perceive they are not neglected in it. . . . And indeed those Persons of Quality, whose Eldest Sons being commonly brought up to no Employment, have a great deal of Time lying upon their Hands, seem to me to be as nearly concern'd as any to favour it. For many of these young Gentlemen, when removed from the Universities . . . residing all their Life-time in Countries, where they can meet with no Books to employ themselves in reading, and whereby they may be able to improve the Talent they have there gain'd; they do thereupon too commonly become not so conspicuous for their Excellent Knowledge, and Morals, as will be ever expected from Men of Rank and Station in their Country. And when they happen into one another's Company, for want of Good Sense, are forc'd too often to fill up their Discourse, and maintain a Conversation, in the Porterly Language of Swearing and Obscenity.

We obtain further particulars of the plans from an unpublished tract of Dr. Bray in the library of Sion College, London, entitled, *Bibliothecæ Americanæ Quadripartitæ viz: I. Generales, Sive Bibliotheca Regia Annopolitana; II. Provinciales; III. Decanales; IV. Parochiales, or Catalogues of the Libraries sent into the Severall Provinces of America.*

In this tract, of which the Lenox Library has a copy, and which apparently is the initial part of an unfinished work, we are told that

> The Design of Writing and Reading Bookes is to Improve Knowledge. And the Tendency of good Books is to Advance necessary and usefull Knowledge. And Libraries, being a Collection of many Books written upon various Subjects, the End of them is to give Requisite Helps to Considerable Attainments in All the Parts of necessary and Usefull Knowledge.
>
> Now the Persons whose Chief Business it is to be men of Knowledge are the Clergy, because they are to instruct others; And it is impossible they should be Able to Communicate to others, what they are not themselves first become Masters of.

It seems best to quote his own words; for they show clearly what his idea was, how far in advance of anything hitherto conceived of, and how limited in some directions, especially in the aristocratic nature of the constituency for which he labored. Yet when ignorance was so general among the common people as it was in England, why should he think that they would be apt to take advantage of the privileges of public libraries?

In the work from which we have just quoted, he goes on to

give the first American library classification, the predecessor of those devised by later librarians for the arrangement of their collections of books. His "Compleat Scheme of the severall Sciences or Parts of necessary and Usefull Knowledge" is strange enough in many ways. It runs as follows: Knowledge is either divine or humane. In the former he includes theology, which deals with divine things and our well-being in a future state, and its appendages, metaphysics and pneumatology. The second main division, humanity, is concerned with our well-being in this life. "Most Humane Sciences" (he cautiously avoids saying *all*) "may be Reduced to such as are conversant, First, about Things, Secondly, Words." The sciences dealing with things are: "Ethicks," about ourselves, to study our well-being and the best improvement of all our faculties, especially of the rational. Appendant to this is "Œconomicks." Next come politics and law, as they deal with "ourselves as members of Humane Society." Then follows history with its appendages, geography, voyages, and travels, dealing with "the world and it's various and great occurences." From these we naturally pass to physiology, natural philosophy, or natural history, dealing with the "Frame of Nature." This again leads us to medicine, chemistry, and pharmacopy, with their appendages, anatomy and chirurgery, all of which reduce "the Knowledge of Nature to the Chiefest Use and Service of Human Life." We now make what seems a wide leap to mathematics, which treat of the "Number, Measures, and Proportion of Things." Last of the sciences of things, and seemingly far out of place, are trade and commerce, which apply the fore-mentioned to the greatest advantage of the public, especially travellers.

We now turn to the sciences concerned with words and find that grammar is the first, busying itself with the "Elements, Regulation, and Property of Language." It is followed by rhetoric, instructing "to speak Elegantly and Persuasively"; poetry, teaching "to speak Movingly and Delightfully"; and logic, giving rules "to Reason Conclusively." This ends the general classification; but we are told that there are many "particular Sciences of great name, conteyned under some of these General Heads, as Arithmetick, Geometry, Astronomy &c., under the Genus of Mathesis; but these will come under Consideration, when each General Head is drawn out into all it's Particulars."

From this work we further learn that in Maryland Dr. Bray hoped to group each five parishes together, as a deanery, with a decanal library, and we obtain a new statement of the relative spheres of parochial and provincial libraries. In the former he

hopes to place the Holy Scriptures, with some good commentaries upon the same, and a few good authors, both upon the general doctrine and the particular articles of the covenant of grace. As to books not theological, we must be contented to have them, except a very few, only in our provincial libraries, which indeed ought to be more than ordinarily furnished with books of law, mathematics, natural history, and medicine, for the use and improvement, not only of the clergy, but of the whole country. The catalogues of nineteen or twenty libraries already sent out are given in the manuscript.

This courageous man, who had no financial provision assigned for his support, and who had to dispose of his own small effects to raise money for his plans, had the most boundless confidence in the success of his endeavors. So he writes, "Instead of libraries for Maryland, the bounds of my first design, I shall not only extend my endeavors for the supply of all the English colonies in America therewith; but can most willingly be a missionary into every one of those provinces, to fix and settle them therein, when they are obtained, being so fully persuaded of the great benefit of these kind of libraries that I should not think 'em too dear a purchase even at the hazard of my life, being to both church and clergy a most devoted and humble servant."

In 1697 Dr. Bray published *Bibliotheca Parochialis: or, a Scheme of such Theological Heads both General and Particular, as are more peculiarly Requisite to be well Studied by every Pastor of a Parish, together with a Catalogue of Books which may be Read upon each of these points.* A second and much enlarged edition appeared in 1707, with the title: *Bibliotheca Parochialis, &c., or a Scheme of such Theological and Other Heads, as seem requisite to be perus'd, or Occasionally consulted, by the Reverend Clergy, together with the Books which may be profitably Read on each of those Points, In Order to promote the Forming and Erecting Libraries of three Degrees, viz. General, Decanal or Lending, and Parochial, throughout Her Majesty's Dominions, both at Home and Abroad.* In this a second volume was promised, to contain an account which should show "how far the design has been hitherto advanced and how practicable it may be to perfect the same." This, unfortunately, never appeared. News of the plan which Dr. Bray was advocating soon reached Maryland, and the governor, Francis Nicholson, who was ever a stanch friend of education, proposed to the assembly that "some part of the revenue given toward furnishing arms and ammunition for the use of the province be laid out for the purchase of books to be

added to the books, which had been presented by the King, to form a library in the port of Annapolis and that a portion of the public revenue be applied to the enlargement thereof and that the library should be placed in the office and under the care of the commissary of the province, permitting all persons, desirous to study or read the books, to have access thereto under proper restrictions." This, as far as I can learn, is the first recommendation by any public official, that a part of the public funds be applied to the support of a free public library.

Governor Nicholson did not succeed in obtaining an appropriation, but on June 11, 1697, the assembly passed resolutions of thanks to Dr. Bray for the libraries, which they "understand you are taking Care to Collect for us," and which they "are sensible will be the best Inducement to Pious and Sober Ministers to come, and live amongst us; And will be the Cause of such Education to be given, both to our own People, and Native Indians, as will best promote the Interest of Religion and Morality in this Province."

This gratitude of the Marylanders found a parallel in South Carolina, whose legislature, on November 25, 1698, adopted resolutions, in which they stated, "We can not but now think it our Duty, to make it our Endeavours to encourage Religion and Learning amongst us, according to the best of our Ability, seeing that your self (though a Stranger) have been so kind and generous, as to set the first example towards the promotion of so Good and Necessary a Work."

In 1699 Bray formed a voluntary society whose objects included the libraries, charity schools, and missions, both to the colonists and the heathen. This was the beginning of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, now so venerable and well known. Bray's success in getting contributions for his libraries had been marked and, in 1699, just before he sailed for Maryland, he wrote that his four years of labor had resulted in the sending of £2400 worth of books into the plantations, "whereby Thirty Libraries have been already advanc'd, and some of them to a considerable Perfection, . . . and a Foundation is also laid by some few Books, of 70 Libraries more." According to a table which he gives, there were libraries then established: one each in Boston, in New York City, East Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Charleston, S. C., while there were sixteen in Maryland. Besides these libraries of Dr. Bray, the only public ones then in the British colonies, as far as is known, were those at Boston, at Harvard College, and at William and Mary College.

When all things were ready, Dr. Bray embarked for Maryland

on December 16, 1699, and, with characteristic zeal, was able to found three libraries at three ports where the vessel touched in England. Arriving in Maryland, he made himself acquainted with the state of things there; but soon felt he could do more for the establishing of the Anglican Church in Maryland, if he returned home, and left the colony, never to return. The crown had twice rejected the bill to establish the Church of England in Maryland. A third bill to that effect was approved, largely owing to a printed memorial of Dr. Bray's composition.

In 1700 there was a new development in the library movement. Layman's libraries were sent out, whose books were "to be Lent or Given at the Discretion of the Minister." The books contained in these collections were exclusively religious, and many tracts were included. Of some of the titles on the list, a hundred copies were sent to a single parish. Dr. Bray sums up the classes of books in these libraries as follows: the Scriptures; works for the instruction of catechumens; works for the use of adults, "including discourses to be read on Sundays in Large families and such especially as are remote from churches"; works to "promote the reformation of manners"; works to "prepare adults for the worthy receiving of both the sacraments"; and works adapted to "recover to the unity of the Church all such as have gone astray into Heresy and Schism, *i.e.* Quakers, Papists, and Dissenters."

For such purposes, books were also to be placed in Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Annapolis, and Williamsburg for the use of George Keith, to be placed in public houses, and to be given to the "chief governors" and the "best disposed magistrates." Dr. Bray and his associates never lost sight of the religious side of his plan, and nowhere does it appear more plainly than here.

On Bray's return to England he found the work of his society had so increased that it seemed better to constitute one of its departments into a separate society; and thus the Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts was established in 1701. Apparently he now felt that he could do more good in his benevolent enterprises by remaining in England, and so he accepted the living of St. Botolph Without, Aldgate, in 1706, and remained in charge of it until his death. He devoted himself to the labors of his parish, but did not forget his libraries. In 1709 he had the pleasure of seeing an act of parliament passed "for the better preservation of parochial Libraries in England." After his return he published several works in behalf of his favorite scheme. In 1702 *Bibliotheca Catechetica or the Country Curates Library* appeared, and in 1700 he issued *Several Circular Letters to the*

Clergy of Maryland, with "A Course of Catechising to be observed in the Plantations, consisting of Books more particularly fitted for the Use of the Three several Classes of Catechumens there, in order to Season the growing Generation with the Principles of Piety and Virtue." Near the end of his life, in 1726, his interest in libraries being still unflagging, he published *Primordia Bibliothecaria*, in which he gives "several schemes of parochial libraries and a method laid down to proceed by a gradual progression from strength to strength, from a collection not much exceeding in value £1 to £100." Three years before this last book appeared he had been attacked with a dangerous illness, and, feeling that his life was uncertain in its duration, he nominated several persons to aid him and succeed him in his work. Thus arose "Dr. Bray's Associates for founding clerical libraries and supporting negro schools." This association still exists and yearly publishes reports of its activity.

We cannot sum up the result of Dr. Bray's labors better than by a quotation from his biography, published in 1746 and entitled, *Publick Spirit illustrated in the Life and Designs of the Reverend Thomas Bray, D.D.* We are there told that "His only Comfort was, that the Libraries he had begun and advanc'd more or less in all the Provinces on the Continent, and in most of the Islands of America, as also in the Factories in Africa, did not only serve the then Ministers with whom they were first sent out, but by the Care of some of the Governments, and by Acts of Assembly, settling the Rules he had prescribed for their Use and Preservation, they might be also of Advantage to many succeeding Generations."

We have paid little attention to Dr. Bray's other good deeds, as we are mainly dealing with his influence on the American colonies. Let us now see how extensive were his services to the colonies in the way of furnishing them with libraries. As we might expect, the absence of the Anglican Church from New England caused Dr. Bray to pay little attention to that part of the country, and only three libraries were sent there.

An account of that in Boston, which numbered 221 volumes, was written by Rev. H. W. Foote of King's Chapel for the Massachusetts Historical Society, and was printed in its *Proceedings*. From this we learn that the vestry of that church, on October 2, 1698, ordered twelve boxes for these books. The books had been received some time before, and their receipt acknowledged on July 25 in a letter to Henry Compton, Bishop of London. They were placed in the rector's study and kept by his successors until the

Revolution. During that period some of the books were lost, but those remaining were deposited in the Theological Library in 1807. In July, 1823, they were deposited in the Boston Athenæum and distributed according to their subjects. Thus they remained until 1881, when they were gathered together and placed in a separate case. The original library, which Dr. Foote[1] pronounces "an admirable collection of the best books for the use of a scholarly theologian of the Church of England," contained sixty-six works in folio in ninety-six volumes, twenty-one in quarto in twenty-six volumes, fifty-seven in octavo in eighty-three volumes, and six in duodecimo in six volumes. Valuable works were added from time to time, so that, in spite of losses, there were 251 volumes in 1807. The Athenæum received 214, six of which have since been lost. Of the present number 110 still bear the royal stamp and the words "De Bibliotheca de Boston."

Another New England library was sent in care of Rev. Dr. Bethune on October 19, 1700, to Rhode Island. This parochial library contained twenty-three folios, twelve quartos, and forty-two octavos. All were on theological subjects save a geography, two dictionaries, a Greek grammar, and a book on gardening. With these, forty-two theological books and one hundred pastoral letters were sent as a "Layman's Library." A year later three folios, five quartos, and four octavos were added — all on theological subjects. New York colony received two libraries: a large one of 211 volumes for the city of that name, and a small one of ten volumes for Albany. Perth Amboy, in New Jersey, received thirty volumes, while to Philadelphia were sent 327. To the several parishes of Virginia 136 books were sent, and £50 worth to the College there. South Carolina received 225 volumes, and the receipt of these books led to the first American library law which I have been able to find.

This act, passed in 1700, shows clearly that the colonial libraries were intended as lending libraries for the public at large. The books of the library, which Dr. Bray has sent over for the public use, are to be put in the custody of the Charleston minister for the time being, who shall pay double the value of any book "embezeled." In case of his death or resignation, the churchwardens are to keep the library, until a successor be chosen; take stock of the books, and give notice within twenty days if any books are "wanting or damnified." To manage the affairs of the library, the General Assembly is to appoint nine commissioners,

[1] He wrongly thinks Bray got his library idea from the gift of these books by the king to Rev. Samuel Miles of King's Chapel.

whose places may be filled by the governor, in case vacancies occur when the assembly is not in session. These commissioners are to appraise the books and to examine them yearly on November 5. To prepare for this examination, all books must be on the shelves of the library by the 26th of October.

Seven catalogues are to be made of the books in the library, and to be bestowed as follows: one to the Lords Proprietors in England, one to the Lord Bishop of London, one to Dr. Bray, one to be recorded in the provincial secretary's office, one to be in the custody of the commissioners, one to be in the custody of the churchwardens (on both of which last the incumbent of the church shall sign a receipt for the books when he enters upon his office), and one "to be fairly entered" in a book kept for that purpose, and to be kept by the incumbent in the said library for any person to read.

The use of the library was absolutely unrestricted. "Any Inhabitant" of the Colony "may borrow any Book out of the Library, giving a note under his Hand, acknowledging the Receipt and promising to return it: if a folio in 4 months, Quartoes in 2 Months, Octavoes or under in one month, upon the penalty of paying 3 times the value, in case of a failure, or damnifying the book." The incumbent shall enter these receipts in a book kept for that purpose, and shall enter the word "returned" when books are brought back, being careful not to cross or blot the book.

People in South Carolina were not always as careful to preserve the books from injury as they should have been, and so we find a supplemental act passed in 1712. From this we learn positively that the books were actually circulated among the people, and that the "unrestrained liberty hath already proved very prejudicial to the said Library, several of the books being lost and others damnified." To prevent this for the future and preserve the library, "it will be necessary to lodge a discretional power in the Person, that doth keep the same, to deny any Person the loan of any book, that he shall think will not take care of the same." It is, therefore, enacted "that in a case any Person shall desire to borrow any book out of the said Provincial Library, which the keeper of the said Library hath just reason to think will not take care of the said book and return the same in time, that, in such case, the said Library Keeper may refuse such person the Loan of any book."

Several details respecting the organization of the Board of Commissioners are included in the provisions of the act. They are

now ordered to meet at least twice yearly, to inspect the books. They have the further power conferred upon them of supervising the several parochial libraries which have been given by the Society for Propagating the Gospel, Sir Francis Nicholson, and other charitable persons. In fact, they were made an early American state library commission, and were given larger powers than any subsequent one has had, being authorized to appoint persons to catalogue the parochial libraries, to put the catalogues in the same places as those of the provincial library, and appoint trustees for them.

In North Carolina there was a library sent over by Dr. Bray to Bathtown, St. Thomas's Parish, in Pamlico. This library was sent on December 2, 1700, and numbered thirty-eight folios, nineteen quartos, and 109 octavos. Its contents were much more varied than those of the average library. There were eleven works of history and travel, two geographies, five dictionaries, three works each on mathematics, natural history, heraldry, biography, and law, four ancient classics, the same number of works on grammar and language, three books of essays, two books on sports, and one each on medicine, mythology, and poetry. This last was *Hudibras*. With the parochial library was sent a layman's library numbering 870 volumes and pamphlets. Albemarle Parish, in the same colony, received a layman's library about the same time, but apparently no parochial library.

The colonial legislature passed in 1715 an act for securing St. Thomas's Library. This also was a free circulating library, out of which "the inhabitants of Beaufort Precinct shall have liberty to borrow any book." Receipts must be given, and the time allowed to retain a book is the same as in South Carolina. A "fairly written" catalogue of the books shall be made, one copy of which shall be kept in the secretary's office in the province, a second by the library commissioners, in which the librarian shall sign a receipt for the books, and a third in the library, "that so any Person may know what Books are contained therein." The library keeper was appointed by a Board of Commissioners, and this is the first legal provision, as far as I know, for the appointment of any person especially as librarian of any library in the United States. All previous to this time were librarians because they held other offices, as clergymen or college presidents; this library keeper was the first selected primarily for that office, and even he was to hold office only when there was no incumbent in the parish. In case of his death, the churchwardens of Beaufort Precinct are to take the books and be answerable for them to the

commissioners. Only fire or unavoidable accident should excuse the keeper from accountability when books were lost or damaged. On Easter Monday of each year the commissioners should meet and take stock of the books. The dignity of their office is shown by the character of the persons appointed as commissioners. They were the governor, councillors, chief justice, secretary, speaker, and attorney-general of the province, the members of the precinct court, and ten other citizens mentioned by name, whose places should be filled by co-optation.

We have reserved Maryland for the last in our survey of the libraries founded by Dr. Bray. It received the largest share of his bounty. The provincial library at Annapolis numbered 1095 volumes and was then the most considerable public collection of books in British America. It was kept in the State House until that building was burnt in 1704, and was then removed to King William School. When St. John's College was founded after the Revolution and King William School was merged in it, the books passed to St. John's College Library. In 1876 there were still to be found 188 folios and 210 quartos in the collection, and the number preserved there to-day is about the same. As this library was certainly sent over before any other provincial one, we have in it probably the first free circulating library in the United States.[1]

The province passed no special act concerning the Annapolis library, but in 1704 established the first library system in the British North American possessions, by the passage of an "act for securing the Parochial Libraries of this Province." By this act, the governor was empowered to appoint one or more library visitors "to report the true estate" of the libraries to the "Governor and Council, that they may make orders to cause every one concerned about the said libraries to do their duties to the effectual preserving of them." This was the second state library commission in the colonies. Each library should be in the custody of the minister of the parish, who should give duplicate receipt for the books, one to the governor and council and one to his vestry, who were to visit the library twice a year, sue the minister if he "embezels" a book, and be responsible for the library during a vacancy in the parish.

There were thirty parishes in Maryland, and Dr. Bray gave nearly every parish a library, ranging in size from the great one

[1] Proof that the books were circulated and, also, not always returned, is found in the fact that Governor Hart, on taking inventory in 1714, discovered that several books were missing. The Assembly, on learning of this, ordered the several sheriffs to publish notices commanding all persons, having books from "the public Library," to return them.

at Annapolis to small ones of ten books, which were allotted to nine small parishes.[1] Only five received over one hundred books and only two others over fifty. The catalogue of the library presented to St. James Herring Creek Parish, in Anne Arundel County, has been preserved and printed by a former pastor, Rev. T. C. Gambrall, in his *Church Life in Colonial Maryland.* This library numbered 150 volumes and was fourth in size of those in the province. In 1698, the first part of it was received and consisted of twenty works in folio, eighteen in quarto, and eighty-seven in octavo. By classes, it was thus divided: religious works 111, history and geography twelve, language two, natural science one, ancient classics one, law one, mathematics one. Probably this is a fair sample of the variety of books found in the parochial libraries; it shows how predominant the religious aspect was in them. In 1703 the parish received a second invoice, chiefly composed of a layman's library. In 1709 James Rigbie, one of the parishioners, left by will £20 sterling to the parish "to be laid out in good and godly books."

Nanjemoy Parish, in Charles County, had the only other library of which a catalogue is preserved. It contained twenty-five folios, five quartos, and twenty-nine octavos and duodecimos, which were sent over May 6, 1701, and apparently ten more of unknown size, sent over at an earlier date. In the later invoice were five historical works, two each on mathematical and philosophical subjects, and one each on politics, education, language, and gardening. The rest were religious. A layman's library of 982 numbers was also sent to Nanjemoy. We have no record to show us whether such layman's libraries were sent to every parish in the province, but lists are found in *Bibliothecæ Americanæ Quadripartitæ* of the works in twelve such libraries, including those of Herring Creek and Nanjemoy. A book-plate was used for the parochial libraries. The inscription on a book from the St. Paul's Parish Library, Prince George's County, Maryland, is of interest as showing a broadening of Bray's original plan. The book-plate has an engraving of an angel standing on an open book and handing another open book to a half-draped figure above. From the angel's mouth proceeds a scroll with the legend: "Apoc. X. 9. Accipe librum et devora illum." Below the picture is this inscription (the words here italicized are in ink): "This book belongs to the Parochial Library of *St. Paul's* in the county of *Prince George's, Md.*

[1] The clergy of Maryland, in answer to certain queries propounded to them by Governor Hart in June, 1714, stated that most parishes had been furnished with parochial libraries through Bray's efforts, but that some had never received one.

Towards rendering it a more general or lending library for the neighboring clergy to borrow the book, if they shall want it."

After Bray's death, the interest in the libraries he had founded died out in England, and from that time to the Revolution but four new libraries were founded in the thirteen colonies. The four new libraries numbered about fifty books each, and were situated in Virginia, North Carolina, and New Jersey. The reports of the trustees would indicate that no books had been added to the libraries already established. But the library of St. Paul's Parish, Baltimore County, Maryland, now deposited in the Whittingham Memorial Library, contains books published in 1729 and 1748, which fact shows that some additions must have been made.

The people of the colonies seem to have taken comparatively little interest in adding to the libraries by the purchase of "good and godly books," and as those already in the libraries became antiquated and worn out, the libraries lost their usefulness and mouldered away in the corners. Bray was in advance of his times, but, in spite of that fact, was the author of much good to the colonists of the South. Yet the first public library movement in America failed to endure because it was built on too narrow foundations. It was rather an exotic plant than a spontaneous growth in the provinces, and it soon withered away. In Dr. Bray's plan there were two radical defects, which were sure to deprive his system of permanence: it made no provision for addition of books from time to time to these libraries, and there was no disposition on the part of the people of the colonies to maintain and increase the libraries at their own expense.

BERNARD C. STEINER.

THE PARTITION OF POLAND

SINCE the disasters of the Seven Years' War the influence of France in European politics had declined. The French armies had been unsuccessful; the French king was plunged in vulgar dissipation and had become even more apathetic than in his youth. It was not strange, therefore, that a country which had always received special attention from French diplomats, and had been to a certain extent a protégé of that kingdom, should have been partitioned by unscrupulous neighbors, without consultation with France and without her taking any steps to interfere. It can safely be said that so important a measure as the partition of Poland could not have occurred during the reign of Louis XIV. without his approval; but France could no longer dictate terms to the other powers of Europe, as she had done a century before. Neither Russia nor Prussia was then regarded as formidable; now both those countries possessed powerful armies and were ruled by able sovereigns. While other states had become stronger, France had grown weaker. She never held the position in Europe which she occupied before the fatal war of the Spanish Succession, and the results of the alliance with Austria still further lowered her prestige and reduced her power.

The practical extinction of an ancient nationality by neighbors, whose only justification for their conduct was that they were strong and Poland was weak, has been justly denounced as an act for which no defence could be made. It was, however, a transaction wholly in keeping with the political immorality of the eighteenth century. It was charged against the French Republicans that they refused to be bound by existing treaties; that they overthrew ancient governments and disregarded long-established boundaries; that they recognized neither the contracts nor the rights of nations. For all this they could have found abundant precedent. There was indeed, under the old régime, more formality and more of diplomatic usages; but the powdered and bewigged statesmen of the eighteenth century were as regardless of any restraint, except that of superior force, as was any long-haired patriot of the Revolution. Different phrases were used; in the past they had spoken of the glory of the sovereign and the

honor of the state; after the Revolution it was in the name of the rights of man and the liberties of the people that treaties were violated and boundaries swept away, but the spirit that governed was the same.

When Louis XIV. married the Spanish Infanta, Mazarin said that France could lay claim to the Spanish succession, no matter what renunciations were given. Frederick II. preached the same doctrine in the next century. "One must not break his word without some reasons," he said, "or he will gain the reputation of a light and changeable man"; but for any breach of faith he had as his defence that it was demanded by the interests of the state. "Shall a monarch break his word or the state perish?" was the only justification he saw fit to furnish for violating his word whenever he deemed it for his interest. "In matters of state policy," wrote a publicist, "we must not be deceived by the speculative ideas that are vulgarly formed about the justice, the equity, the moderation, and the candor of nations and of their leaders. All reduces itself finally to a question of force." "As to the doctrines of Macchiavelli," wrote another, "he teaches nothing new or unheard of; he tells only what our predecessors have done and what men of to-day practise with utility."

These quotations from political writers do not by any means misstate the accepted political traditions of European courts during the eighteenth century, and such doctrines found their full expression when two of the greatest sovereigns of modern times were seated on two of the greatest thrones of Europe. Frederick and Catharine resembled each other in force of intellect, in unscrupulous ambition, and in their resolution to increase the power of the states they ruled. The success of their long careers is proof that their methods were not out of place in the age in which they lived. The war of the Austrian Succession had shown the readiness of almost every European power to join in the attack of an enfeebled state, where there seemed a prospect of gaining something from the spoils. Another nation that appeared defenceless was now attacked, and with better success. When we consider the political traditions of the age, the wonder is that the partition of Poland was so long postponed.

The condition of Poland had not improved since the election of Stanislaus gave rise to the war of the Polish Succession. Augustus III. of Saxony then obtained the throne which had been occupied by his father, but under these Saxon rulers there was no change in the government of the country; it remained in the state of administrative anarchy which had long been its lot.

Indeed, the powers of the king were so restricted that he could exercise little influence in favor of reform, even had he been so inclined, and any efforts to establish an orderly government in Poland would have met with opponents both within and without the kingdom. The nobles would not yield one whit of their lawless independence, and they were hostile to any change which would increase the efficiency of the administration at the cost of their unrestrained freedom of action; as Voltaire said, it was a government of Goths and Franks which survived in the eighteenth century. From the prince whose income of a million was insufficient to defray his splendor, to the gentleman whose only possessions consisted of a horse, a sabre, and a title of nobility, all were equally unwilling to make the sacrifices requisite to increase the strength and insure the safety of the country; to protect the fatherland they would surrender their lives, but not their license; and even if the nobles had desired any reforms, these would have been prevented by neighbors who saw their advantage in Poland's weakness.

There was, however, one powerful state which had regarded the integrity of Poland as important to its own interests, and the fear of its interference in the past would have deterred those who hoped to profit by Poland's dismemberment. For almost two centuries the relations of France with Poland had been intimate; French candidates had twice been chosen to the Polish throne, France had repeatedly promised her protection to the Poles, and the preservation of Poland as an independent state was long regarded as essential to French interests in the north of Europe. After the war of the Austrian Succession some change took place in the tone assumed by France, and French politicians began to say that it was useless to squander money in the affairs of a country so defenceless and so far removed. "What do we care for that republic and its elections?" said the secretary for foreign affairs in 1762. "A Frenchman for king, a Pole, a Russian, it is all the same to us."[1]

These views were held by some of Louis's ministers, but they were not held by the king. During the last twenty years of his life, Louis XV. occupied himself with a private diplomacy, which was kept secret from his regular advisers, and in it Poland had the most important part. This secret diplomacy was among the many curious features of his reign. Louis was not destitute of sagacity, and his views of foreign policy were usually judicious and correct; but partly from listlessness, partly from timidity, this

[1] Hennin to Tercier, February 19, 1762.

absolute sovereign was unwilling to overrule decisions of which he disapproved. Apparently as a consolation for his insignificance in his own councils, the king had a diplomatic system of his own. In many European courts there were regularly accredited representatives of France, and there was also a more obscure agent, sometimes a secretary of legation, sometimes a man with no official position, who corresponded secretly with the king, and whose instructions were often in direct opposition to those emanating from the foreign office in the king's name. Such a system naturally came to nothing; its only results were that the influence of France was frequently neutralized by conflicting instructions, and that Louis was at times plunged into the greatest anxiety lest his secret operations should come to the knowledge of his own ministers. Curiously enough, this monarch, who had the right to choose and remove his advisers according to his own caprice, and whose authority was as absolute as that of the Czar of the Russias, was in abject fear lest he should have to face his own servants with an acknowledgment of the orders he had seen fit to issue; his feelings were those of a mischievous boy who has been caught at his tricks. One of his agents was arrested and the king, in his terror lest the secret correspondence should come to the knowledge of the ministry, applied to one of the police officers to help him out of the dilemma. "I opened the whole matter and confided in him," said the trembling monarch of 25,000,000 people, "and I think this pleased him."[1]

For many years the affairs of Poland received much attention in these secret intrigues. The agents of Louis were instructed to preserve unimpaired the credit which France had so long held, that at the proper time it might be exerted to secure the elevation of the Prince of Conti to the Polish throne.[2]

The influence of France in Poland rested on long-established relations of friendship, and was considerable when reinforced by a liberal expenditure of money among an impoverished nobility. But since the beginning of the eighteenth century Russia, to a larger extent than any other power, controlled the policy of the neighboring kingdom. After Peter the Great transformed Russia from a country of barbarians into a powerful state, she more and more assumed control of the destinies of a land which was still a prey to mediæval disorder, and which furnished a promising field for the expansion of Russian power. Her influence rested not on friendship, but on force. "The hatred which they have in this

[1] *Secret du Roi*, II. 185.

[2] *Correspondance Secrète de Louis XV.* 2 vols.

country for the Russians," said Frederick, "surpasses all imagination."[1] "The Russian power is hated in Poland," wrote the Prussian minister, "from the greatest noble to the lowest peasant. They all hate everything that is Muscovite."[2]

But Poland was helpless from lack of efficient government; her territories were open to invasion with no natural defences, no mountain ranges, nor even any great system of rivers protecting her vast plains from Russia on the one hand and Prussia on the other. With the principles of statecraft which prevailed in Europe, we can be certain that the dismemberment of such a country must often have been considered. Two hundred years before any partition was attempted, it was suggested that Poland might profitably be divided between the Emperor and Russia; later plans were made for a partition in which Sweden should have a share, and early in the eighteenth century a division was suggested between Peter the Great and the Elector of Brandenburg.[3] None of these schemes took shape, but the condition of Poland became more defenceless as her neighbors became more powerful. Once the valor of her citizens might have insured the safety of their country; now it was certain that bravery, unaccompanied with regular military organization and ill-provided with money or arms, could be of no avail against the well-equipped and well-disciplined armies in the service of the great European monarchies. There was, indeed, some hope for Poland's safety, because it seemed unlikely that those who wished to despoil her could agree on the division of the plunder, and this belief was held by French statesmen down to the time that the first partition was carried into effect. The Minister of Foreign Affairs expressed his conviction that the states adjoining Poland, filled with mutual distrust and jealousy, were really her guardians and defenders.[4]

This element of safety was dispelled when the thrones of Russia and Prussia were occupied by Catharine and Frederick. From his youth Frederick had felt the importance of what was known as Prussian Poland to the development of Prussian power. When still under twenty-one he wrote a treatise, in which he argued that the acquisition of this territory was necessary in order to join together the scattered possessions of Prussia. The fancy of youth was not forgotten in maturity. When the perils of the Seven Years' War were past, Frederick, in a testament which he

[1] Frederick to Prince Henry, January 31, 1771.

[2] Benoît, February 15, 1769.

[3] These schemes of partition are given in Sorel's *Question d'Orient.*

[4] *Mémoire du Duc de Praslin.*

prepared for the use of his successor, again laid down the need which Prussia had of this portion of Poland, and he declared that Russia was the greatest obstacle to its acquisition. The instruction was not needed by his successor. Frederick found means in his own lifetime to remove Russian opposition, and to turn his dream of conquest into a reality.

He fully realized the importance of Russia as an ally. "It is a terrible power," he said to his brother, "which in half a century will make all Europe tremble." Throughout Frederick's career it was Russia that he most dreaded; for France, under her imbecile administration, he felt contempt rather than fear; the discipline of his armies, and confidence in his own military skill, made him always ready to meet Austria; but of the vast forces that his northern neighbor could put in the field, he was justly apprehensive. In the Seven Years' War it was from the Russian armies that he suffered his most serious defeats, and had Russia remained constant to the alliance, he would certainly have been ruined at last. The friendship of Peter proved the salvation of Frederick.

It was natural, therefore, when the great war was ended, that he should wish to form a permanent alliance with a state from whose hostility he had suffered so much, and such a combination met the approval of Catharine. In Poland the two powers had common interests; doubtless Catharine would have preferred to deal with that country alone, but she saw that this was impossible, while if she and Frederick united in action, no other state was in condition to hinder them.

In 1763 Augustus III., Elector of Saxony and King of Poland, died and the succession to the Polish throne was again open. In the following spring a treaty was signed between Russia and Prussia, by which they agreed to unite their influence and procure the election of Stanislaus Poniatowski, and they further agreed to prevent any change in the Polish form of government, and especially to prevent any alterations by which the elective monarchy might become hereditary, or the right of any Polish nobleman to check legislation be done away with.[1]

Poniatowski owed his selection as the future king of Poland to the favor of Catharine. He had long been known to the Empress of Russia, and he was personally agreeable to her, said Frederick, who had learned discretion as to the manner in which he referred to sister sovereigns and their favorites. Stanislaus Poniatowski was connected with some of the most ancient and powerful Polish families, and combined with an illustrious pedigree

[1] This treaty is found in Häusser.

attractions of mind and person; he was tall and handsome with an imposing bearing, his manners were pleasing, his speech was facile and at times eloquent; he spent two years in Paris, where he studied morals from the Duke of Richelieu and learned the philosophical jargon that was finding its way into polite society; he was said to excel in the three arts of a French courtier, — he could seduce women, he could conduct himself with credit in an affair of honor, and he could roll up debts which he was unable to pay.[1]

Thus equipped, he went to Russia and was made ambassador from Poland, but his chief duty was to pay court to the young princess Catharine. He played his part well; he could quote Voltaire to her and he could talk love to her, and she enjoyed both; he was young and handsome and he soon became the acknowledged lover of the future Empress. In time Poniatowski was recalled, and this romance came to an end; but though Catharine soon consoled herself, she retained a kindly feeling for the handsome Pole. She was not indeed a woman who would allow any fond recollections of the past to interfere with her political judgment, but she knew that Poniatowski would owe his election to her and that he would be forced to rely on her support. She knew also that he was a weak man and with him for a ruler it would be easy to keep Poland in that condition of anarchy which would further her own plans.[2]

Catharine's favorite did not obtain the prize without opposition; for Saxony furnished a candidate in one of the sons of Augustus III. Though Poniatowski was a Pole, yet his rule meant the rule of Russia, and Polish patriots rallied to the support of the Saxon prince. But they could do nothing without foreign help, and this they were not able to obtain. Poniatowski himself applied in secret for the aid of France; he knew that it was to Russia he would owe his election, but he cherished schemes of reform for his distracted country. Assured of the friendship of France, he might be relieved from his dependence upon Catharine, and free to consider the interests of Poland instead of those of Russia. His election was certain and a secret alliance with him would probably have been for the interests of France and Poland; some politicians would have found amusement as well as profit in allowing Catharine to elect her lover and then using him to thwart her plans. But the dauphin had married a Saxon princess, a sister of the Saxon candidate, and Louis XV. was always ready to

[1] *Secret du Roi*, I. 272.

[2] "We couldn't find a better person for our interests," she wrote Frederick, October 6, 1763.

placate his family when they asked of him anything except to dismiss a mistress. He promised therefore to support the interests of the dauphin's brother-in-law, and at the same time he allowed intrigues to proceed in favor of Poniatowski. By the king's orders one French agent in Poland advocated the claims of the Saxon candidate, while another constantly proclaimed his friendship for Poniatowski, and as a result, any influence that France might have exercised was frittered away. "Never was France in such a position," wrote a diplomat. "All the world is weary of us as allies." [1]

It was not with such weak vacillation that Catharine and Frederick carried on their plans. Ten thousand Russian soldiers advanced upon Warsaw, while Prussian armies gathered near the Polish boundaries on the west. These republicans, said Frederick, could see with whom they would have to deal if they acted contrary to the wishes of Russia and Prussia. With such election agents, the result was sure. Russian soldiers were present at the diet and entered the hall where the deputies met for consultation; the patriots were put to flight, their leaders condemned as rebels, and Stanislaus Poniatowski was elected without opposition. "In all our history there was no example of an election so tranquil and so unanimous," he wrote with complacency.[2] Tranquillity in Poland was only obtained when her independence had ceased to exist.

The new king made some efforts to throw off the Russian yoke and to effect reforms in his unhappy country; but such attempts at independence were promptly checked. Neither Catharine nor Frederick would allow any changes which might make Poland an independent nation. The agents of both these monarchies were instructed to prevent any alteration in the Polish form of government, and most of all any abolition of the *liberum veto*, "which," said a memorandum of St. Petersburg, "is of such essential importance to the neighbors of the republic." "It is for Your Majesty's interests," wrote one of Frederick's servants, "that Poland should remain in its present condition of anarchy," and it was to insure this result that he bade his representatives oppose any change in the government of the country.[3] While any plan was opposed that might be of benefit, a measure sure to involve the country in additional disorder was insisted upon, literally at

[1] Hennin to Tercier, September 20, 1763.

[2] Stanislaus to Mme. Geoffrin, September 9, 1774.

[3] Finckenstein to Frederick, October 5, 1764. Frederick to Solms, October 6, 1764; to Benoît, October 29, 1767, etc.

the point of the bayonet. Catharine demanded the extension of equal political rights to persons not members of the Catholic Church. Her efforts gained the praises which Voltaire and the philosophers had always ready for the Semiramis of the north, but toleration loses some of its charms when it is enforced by a foreign soldiery who burn peasants' huts and ravish their wives in order to teach liberal principles. The unhappy Poniatowski besought his patron to cease these efforts in behalf of dissenters, and he told her of the misery worked by the Russian soldiers who were employed to enforce the edict. He received in reply only reproaches for his ingratitude to his benefactress. "I will admit to you," Frederick wrote to his ambassador in St. Petersburg, "that on examining Hugo Grotius it is difficult to justify the edict of the Empress of Russia."[1] Catharine cared as little for the principles of Hugo Grotius as Frederick himself, and these measures for dissenters soon produced the effect that might have been anticipated, — a large party of the Catholics rose in insurrection, and to the other miseries of Poland was now added civil war.

This rising had no result except to make the condition of the country worse. The insurgents applied to France for aid and Choiseul secretly furnished them with money, and also sent an officer by the name of Dumouriez, who was to become famous in movements more important than Polish insurrections. These efforts at assistance were of no avail. Dumouriez found some sixteen or seventeen thousand men in arms, but they were almost entirely cavalry, who recognized no authority and knew no discipline; they were for the most part ill-mounted and they had not a piece of artillery nor a company of infantry.[2] Such an unruly horde could not contend against the Russian soldiers, who had acquired a certain degree of military discipline.

This insurrection broke out in 1768, and, though the insurgents had no chance of success, it continued to smoulder and led to important results; for now the question of the dismemberment of Poland began to be seriously considered. Frederick usually receives the credit of having conceived the idea of a division of the territories of Poland among the three confederates, but such a conception was so in keeping with the political principles of the age that it cannot be said to have originated with any one man; at Vienna and St. Petersburg, as well as at Berlin, suggestions of a possible division of Poland can occasionally be found in the state papers. But it was Frederick who first gave to them a definite

[1] Frederick to Solms, February 5, 1767.

[2] *Mémoires de Dumouriez*, I. 171, etc.

form, and had it not been for his consummate diplomatic skill it would have been impossible to bring three rival powers to agree upon any scheme for the dismemberment of a weaker neighbor. It was the first example, Frederick said in his memoirs, of three powers agreeing on a partition and carrying it to a peaceable execution, and he is entitled to whatever credit attaches to this result.

Russia was then engaged in war with Turkey, and by reason of her successes was in a position to demand great concessions from the Porte as a condition of peace.[1] These victories excited almost as much consternation at Vienna as at Constantinople, and the possibility that Russia would demand Moldavia and Wallachia as a condition of peace appalled the advisers of Maria Theresa. In this state of affairs Frederick found his opportunity. By his treaty with Russia he was bound to furnish a large subsidy for the Turkish war, but therein he saw no advantage for himself; his thrift was pained by the possibility of a liberal expenditure with small prospect of return; while in the complications of Polish insurrection there was an opportunity to add to his own territories without risk or expense.[2]

His first endeavor was to establish amicable relations between Austria and Prussia. He knew well that Maria Theresa would never be his friend, but her son Joseph II. was now Emperor and entertained for the great Frederick feelings very different from the invincible dislike of his mother. In 1769 the two monarchs met at Neisse and this was followed by a second conference in 1770, in which Kaunitz also took part. Meetings between kings were not common then; monarchs, like their subjects, stayed at home instead of roaming over Europe, and the conferences excited universal curiosity.

Contrary to the general belief, the partition of Poland was not then arranged, but Frederick succeeded in his purpose of dispelling the aversion and mistrust with which he had long been regarded at Vienna. Nothing could have been more harmonious than the meeting of the sovereigns. Joseph and Kaunitz assured Frederick that Silesia was now forgotten and plans for its recovery were forever abandoned. On the other hand, the old king, with his marvellous knowledge of human vanity, flattered his former adversaries. Frederick talked well and he loved to talk, and the

[1] See report of Vergennes, June, 1768, of the intrigues at Constantinople at this time.

[2] See the correspondence of Frederick and Count Solms in the valuable Russian historical collection published in the *Recueil de la Société Historique Russe*.

young Emperor was content to listen to the wisdom of so famous a man. "At supper," says one of the guests, "the king talked all the time for three hours. The Prussian princes and generals dared not open their mouths lest they should disturb their sovereign or lose one of his words, but some of our Austrian generals slept peacefully."[1] Frederick praised the Austrian army, to which the young king gave much attention. He assured Joseph that if they could act together they need have no fear of any other power; he excited the ambitions and the aspirations of the young ruler and found in him the promise of future greatness. "It is impossible for me to be the enemy of a great man," he cried, as he claimed to discover the talents that must make the young monarch famous. "As for myself," he said, "when I was young I was ambitious, but I am so no longer. . . . You think me full of bad faith, I know it; I deserved it a little; circumstances compelled it, but all that is changed." He was even more successful in flattering the vanity of Kaunitz. "Your minister," he said to Joseph, "has the wisest head in Europe." The old chancellor insisted on reading to the king a political catechism, in which he had traced the true policy to be adopted by Prussia and Austria. Frederick was filled with admiration. "Won't you give me your little catechism?" he said to Kaunitz as they parted. "I should like to have it always under my eyes, for I sincerely wish to conform my conduct to it."[2]

It was too valuable to entrust to strange hands, but even if a copy had been furnished, it is doubtful if Frederick would have spent many hours in its study. The king obtained what interested him more than Joseph's ambitious dreams or Kaunitz's political wisdom, — the assurance that Austria did not feel bound to consult France as to her future movements. In proceeding with his schemes for Polish dismemberment, he now knew that he need fear no hinderance from France. "It is fortunate," he wrote, "that the French should be in their present condition of exhaustion; deprived of their assistance, the Austrians will be more tractable and more gentle. . . . If anything could arrest them, it would be their dear allies the French, who perhaps will not look with pleasure upon the dismemberment of Poland."[3] But France under Louis XV. was in no condition to interfere, and the Aus-

[1] *Relation du Prince Albert de Saxe.*

[2] The interview at Neisse is described in Joseph's letters to Maria Theresa, August 29 and September 25; *Briefwechsel Maria Theresia's und Joseph's II.* See also instructions, etc., published by Berr; for the interview at Neustadt, see the same and the reports of Kaunitz.

[3] Frederick to Finckenstein, May, 1771.

trians, though nominally close allies, did not feel it necessary to disclose their purpose of sharing in the spoils of Poland until the agreement was ready to put in execution.

Fortified by an alliance with Austria, Frederick was in position to impress upon Catharine's mind the necessity of dealing moderately with the Turks and seeking her compensation in Poland. Already a suggestion had been made to that effect. In 1769 Count Lymar presented to Frederick the plan of a partition of Poland which bore a surprising resemblance to the scheme that was afterwards carried out. The king usually gave little heed to volunteer diplomacy, and it seems doubtful whether Lymar or Frederick should have the credit for so ingenious a device. At all events, Frederick at once sent the plan to his representative at St. Petersburg, and told him to show it to Count Panin, the Russian minister. "This plan has a certain *éclat*," the king wrote in a very casual tone. "It seems attractive."[1] It was not favorably received. Panin suggested other plans; this had its advantages, he said, but as for Russia she cared for no further conquests; her territories were sufficient.[2] It was Frederick's just boast that he knew when to wait and when the time for action had come. He saw that Russia still regarded Poland as her own, and as yet recognized no necessity for any division with her neighbors, and he patiently bided his time.

Some steps taken by the Austrians furnished an excuse for reopening the Polish question. In 1769 Austrian troops had taken possession of a small piece of land formerly belonging to Hungary, and called the Zips. It was announced that the movement was made with no thought of conquest; but Hungary had claims on this district, certainly of great antiquity, for they went back to 1412, and these it was proposed to submit to the Polish king in order to reach some amicable agreement. The validity of such claims needs no examination. "I have a very poor opinion of our titles," said Maria Theresa, who had no taste for the unscrupulous measures adopted by her son and Kaunitz. About all that could be said was that the Zips constituted a very small and unimportant strip of mountainous land, and it mattered little to whom it belonged. But in 1770 the Austrians extended the line they had established, and under similar claims took possession of a somewhat larger piece, pending the examination of the further titles which had been exhumed at Vienna.[3]

[1] Frederick to Solms, February, 1769.
[2] Solms to Frederick, March 3, 1769.
[3] Referat of August 19 and October 18, 1770.

Frederick was ready to follow so good an example, and in 1770 his troops also entered Polish soil. This was not done under any claim of title, but the pest was raging in Poland, and in his zeal to ward off pestilence from Prussia the king formed a sanitary cordon, and stationed his troops well beyond his own frontiers. Thus the matter stood in January, 1771, when Prince Henry, Frederick's brother, was visiting St. Petersburg, and Catharine for the first time responded favorably to the suggestion of a partition. "I was one evening with the Empress," he writes, "and she said jokingly that the Austrians had taken possession of two starosties, and, she added, why should not every one take some also? I replied that you had established a cordon in Poland, but you had not occupied any starosties. She said, laughingly, why not occupy them? And Count Czernichef added, why not take the bishopric of Warnia, for after all every one must have something? Although this was said as a pleasantry, I am convinced that very possibly you may profit by the suggestion."[1]

Frederick needed no one to incite him to diligence in such an endeavor; but when he took a hand in dismembering Poland, he intended that his share should be sufficient to repay the risk. "As to the duchy of Warnia," he wrote, "I have not taken possession of it, because the game is not worth the candle. This portion is so small that it would not compensate for the clamor it would excite; but Polish Prussia would be worth the while. . . . If one seizes bagatelles eagerly, it creates a character for avidity and insatiability that I should not wish to be attributed to me, more than is already done in Europe."[2]

Austria had set the example, and Frederick was now eager to follow it. "I see nothing for me to do," he wrote, "but to follow her and, like her, make use of ancient titles, which for that matter my archives will furnish me."[3] He was right in his confidence as to the contents of his archives; diligent officials were set to work ransacking them, and with surprising promptness they furnished indubitable proofs that Polish Prussia was by law a Prussian province, and in taking it the king would, as with Silesia, only be asserting his just rights.

But if Frederick was to obtain a liberal portion for himself, it was necessary that his allies should be well provided for, and he did his best to excite the greed and overcome the scruples of the Austrian court. "Rummage your archives," he said to the

[1] *Œuvres de Frédéric*, XXVI. 345.
[2] Frederick to Prince Henry, January 31, 1771.
[3] Frederick to Solms, February 20, 1771.

Austrian ambassador, "and see if you have not pretensions to advance on something more than you have already occupied, something like a palatinate that would be to your taste. Believe me, we must profit by the occasion. I will take my part and Russia will do the same."[1] He dealt with Catharine with equal liberality. "To indemnify the Empress for the expenses of the war," he wrote, "I propose that she shall take a piece of Poland to suit her taste."[2]

Frederick's allies were less eager or more scrupulous, and instead of acceding to the plan for a partition, the Austrians offered to abandon the portion of Poland of which they had taken possession.[3] Even Catharine hesitated about putting into execution the suggestions she had made. The Russians, wrote Count Solms, wanted to postpone these plans and were unable to reconcile a project for dismemberment with the repeated guarantees they had given Poland for the preservation of her territory intact.[4] Frederick had no patience with such scruples. "These guarantees are no longer in force," he wrote Solms. "I know very well Russia has given assurances of her desire to preserve intact the provinces of that country, but after the confederates have openly taken up arms against her, it does not seem to me that Poland can claim this guarantee."[5]

In due time the Russians adopted Frederick's views and either decided that their guarantees were no longer in force, or that it was not worth while to regard them if they were; but while they were ready to agree with Frederick upon the dismemberment of Poland, they refused to deal with him with the same liberality that he had shown them.[6] In addition to Polish Prussia, Frederick demanded the important city of Dantzic, situated on the Vistula, and to this Catharine would not agree. It was a free city, she said, whose liberties had been specially guaranteed by Russia and free it must remain. Frederick replied to this argument with the vivacity which often characterizes his papers. "I look upon this matter as a bagatelle," he wrote; "Strasburg was a free city and Louis XIV. took it; how many parallel cases does history furnish? . . . In return for the risks to which I shall expose myself for Russia,

[1] Arneth, VIII. 305.

[2] Frederick to Solms, April 28, 1771.

[3] Finckenstein to Frederick, May 13, 1771.

[4] Solms to Frederick, March 12, 1771; Joseph to Leopold, May, 1771.

[5] Frederick to Solms, March 24, 1771.

[6] "It is with infinite pleasure that I learn from your despatches of the 12th the favorable reception which Count Panin has given to the proposition of my aggrandizement on the side of Poland." Frederick to Solms, March 27, 1771.

I must obtain the continuity of my possessions. . . . Messieurs les Russes, you wish that I should expose myself in your quarrels, you want my troops, and that in assisting you I should run the risk of a general war ; all very well, but Polish Prussia and Dantzic is the price I put on the services I render you. . . . Have the goodness, my dear Russians, to examine and see if you have any need of me, or whether I am of no use. In a word, do you want my merchandise or can you do without it?"[1] But all his eloquence did not obtain Dantzic, and Frederick left its acquisition to the future.

After much bargaining the agreement between Russia and Prussia was made.[2] Russia was to have the territory beyond the Dnieper and the Düna ; the share of Frederick was Polish Prussia and some adjacent districts. Russia received in population and territory the larger portion, but the districts ceded to Frederick were richer and had a special importance in connecting his scattered possessions. It was provided that if Austria wished to join, she should have her share in the plunder ; but if she refused, Frederick and Catharine agreed to furnish armies and defend their new possessions against any invader.[3] Little trouble was expected from the Poles, for they were powerless against Prussia and Russia combined. "We must expect," Frederick complained, "that the Poles will make a great outcry ; that vain and intriguing nation makes an outcry over everything, but an army on the Vistula will stop their clamor.[4]

The delay in the negotiations came from Austria. Maria Theresa was sincerely opposed to this unscrupulous division of the territories of a weak and friendly power, and as the matter advanced she expressed herself in no measured terms. "We have tried to act after the Prussian fashion," she said, "and at the same time to keep the appearance of honesty. . . . I should always think our possessions bought too dear, if they were gotten at the expense of honor, of religion and good faith, and of the glory of the monarchy. When all my states were menaced, I rested on my good right and God's help ; now when right is not on my side, . . . when equity and good sense are against me, I have no rest."[5] "The measures we have taken," she declared again, "have been so contrary to honesty and uprightness that even the King of

[1] Frederick to Solms, October 30, November 13, 1771.
[2] The agreement was signed February 19, 1772.
[3] Secret article. Beer, II. 334.
[4] Frederick to Solms, November 15, 1771.
[5] Maria Theresa to Joseph II., January 20, 1772. Letter cited by Arneth.

Prussia can accuse us of falseness and duplicity." Of all the pangs which the partition of Poland caused the Empress-queen none probably were as bitter as this thought.

In their desire to participate in the gain and escape some of the infamy, the Austrians suggested that Frederick might resign to them a portion of Silesia and take the share set off to them in Poland. "What did you say?" cried Frederick to the ambassador. "I have the gout in my feet, and when it goes to my head you can make that proposition. We are partitioning Poland and not my estates."[1] As the Austrians were to share in the spoil, Frederick was resolved that they should not leave him and Catharine to bear alone the animosity of Poland.[2] Finally they consented to his proposition, and having decided to join in the partition they showed a willingness to take their full portion. "Permit me to say, you have a good appetite," said Frederick to their minister, as he stated the amount of Poland that would satisfy Austria's demands. At last all parties were content, and the final treaty was signed at St. Petersburg on August 2, 1772. It declared in the name of the Holy Trinity that the anarchy existing in Poland excited fears of the total destruction of that republic; and, in order to pacify the country, as well as to settle their own ancient and legal claims, they had decided to annex the various districts which they then proceeded to take. By this first partition of Poland about one-quarter of the territory and of the population of the country was divided among the three powers.[3] The number of Poles who became Russians, Prussians, and Austrians was about two millions. Considering the poverty of the land and the misery and degradation of the peasants, who were serfs attached to the soil in a state varying little, if at all, from that of three hundred years before, it is probable that their material condition was improved rather than injured by the change of rulers.

The news of the partition was received with little emotion in Europe; such an act was so in accord with the political morality of the time that no one was surprised, and for that reason the community was the less disturbed by it. In Poland herself the announcement that she must surrender one-quarter of her terri-

[1] Report of Swieten, April 21, 1772.

[2] Frederick to Solms, February 5, 1772.

[3] The figures are usually given much higher. I have followed the estimate made in Russia and published by Beer, "Évaluation de la valeur intrinsèque des parts des trois cours." This gives the population of the territory taken by the three powers at about two millions. It corresponds more closely with the probable population of Poland under the conditions then existing than the much-higher estimates that are usually given.

tories to her neighbors excited a feeling of despair. It was the first step towards the extinction of the Polish nationality; if it was not yet "the end of Poland," it was the beginning of the end. But nothing remained for the king and the diet but to yield what had been taken, lest the three powers should punish a refusal by demanding more. "Some money and some threats will bring these people to agree to our desires," wrote Frederick; "and if we have to resort to force, the only result will be that we shall make a new partition and take more."[1] It was the knowledge of this that made the Poles submissive, and in 1775 Poland ceded to the powers the territories which they had seized. Both at St. Petersburg and at Berlin there was great rejoicing over the auspicious result, and Catharine declared she had never signed a treaty with so much satisfaction.[2]

In the gratification which Frederick felt over the successful termination of this protracted and difficult negotiation, there was an additional pleasure in the fact that his old enemy, Maria Theresa, who had so long denounced him as a robber, a man without faith or honor, should have been associated in a transaction beside which the conquest of Silesia seemed an heroic enterprise; her feelings of remorse, combined with her desire that her neighbors should gain no greater advantages than herself, amused the great cynic. "She wept and she took," he said. Perhaps, as long as she took, it was well that she should also weep. It is certain that her partners shed no tears over the woes of Poland. "The Empress Catharine and I were brigands," said the great king; "but that pious Empress-queen, how did she arrange the matter with her confessor?"

JAMES BRECK PERKINS.

[1] Frederick to Benoît, November 4, 1772.
[2] Rapport de Lobkowitz, September 24, 1772.

DOCUMENTS

[Under this head it is proposed to print in each issue a few documents of historical importance, hitherto unprinted. It is intended that the documents shall be printed with verbal and literal exactness, and that an exact statement be made of the present place of deposit of the document and, in the case of archives and libraries, of the volume and page or catalogue number by which the document is designated. Contributions of important documents, thus authenticated, will be welcomed.]

1. Lord Burghley on the Spanish Invasion, 1588.

THE following is among the most remarkable of that mass of state papers in Lord Burghley's peculiar, cramped, and slanting hand, which bear witness to the sagacity and astounding industry of Elizabeth's great minister. It has long been a matter of keen regret that no historian has thus far been able to describe the part played by English statesmen in the Armada crisis. Here the veil is lifted for a moment upon one of the most impressive sittings of the Council during that troubled period. Burghley, cautious and wise with the experience of four storm-tossed reigns, was hoping against hope that he might steer England clear of the danger which threatened from Spain. Yet, while he was seriously considering the possibility of a sound and honorable peace with "the mightiest enemy that ever England had," we find the venerable minister reading his attentive colleagues an able state paper which showed him prepared for every contingency of vigorous, aggressive war. Surely Motley must have been mistaken in thinking Burghley was meant when the Lord Admiral cursed the peacemaking "long grey beard with a white head witless."

In emphasizing the religious element of the struggle, an aspect which the modern historian is too prone to neglect, Burghley strangely enough suggests for the queen a motto almost identical with the *Exsurge Domine et indica causam tuam* embroidered on the Armada standard. He had, it would seem, a vague notion that, as Catholics and Protestants were both defending the cause of the Almighty, it behoved the English to surpass the Spaniards in piety as well as in sailing and fighting. "We are truly certified," he wrote, soon after the Armada appeared in the Channel,

"how diligent the enemy is by prayers, fastings, pilgrimage, etc., to commend their tyrannous intents to God, and therefore there is more reason for us to commend our just cause to his mercy."[1] But while declaring that "the first and last Comforter for her Majesty to take hold on" was the Lord of Hosts, Burghley was determined to neglect no practical measure which might ensure success. He traces with great force and breadth of view England's policy in case of war, and adds a detailed and liberal estimate of the costs. Most remarkable is his plan for the naval campaign. Burghley's pen anticipates not only the strategy which Howard and Drake so successfully employed against the Armada, but even advocates a descent upon Spain similar to that which Drake himself afterwards urged, but, to his great disgust, was not allowed to execute. We thus see that the victory over Spain was not alone the work of Elizabeth's splendid sailors. While the heart of every Englishman may well beat high at the story of Drake and Gravelines, the historian must remember that it was not the audacious genius of Drake, but the far-seeing mind of the responsible minister, that took the foremost part in shaping the destiny of England.

W. F. TILTON.

(British Museum. MSS. Vespasian C. VIII, f. 12. Holograph by Lord Burghley, endorsed by him "25 Febr. 1587 [this date is of course Old Style]. Treaty for peace wt [with] Spayn. A Consultation uppon Certen Question[s] in p[re]sence of L. Chanc[ellor], L. Tres. [Burghley], L. Stuard [Steward], Mr. Secret. [Walsingham], Mr. Wolly.)

First is to be considered . . . the p[oin]t of the Ennemy. The K. of Spayn being the p[ri]ncipal and therto both provoked and ayded by the pope and his quarrell, p[ri]ncipally grounded for the popes religion and to subvert the Chri[sti]an religion p[ro]fessed by her Ma[jes]ty and her people and for th[t] [that] cause makyng this warr ageynst hir p[er]son and realm, ther is accompt to be made th[t] all the papists th[t] have any power to offend hir Ma[jes]ty or hir people will yeld ther powers to joyne wt [with] hym and so accompt is to be made of hym and his forces ageynst hir Maty. And as his will joyned wt the generall mallyce of his Confederats is known to excede in Mesure, as not to be satisfyced wtout obteyning his desyre of conquest as well for the subduyng of relligion as for enlargyng his temporall power by reason of his ambicion, so is his power by men and specially by mony larger than any other Monarch of Chr[ist]endom. For to consider the nombres of men of warr, besyde such as he hath to command of spanyards and now of portygales [Portuguese] wherof though the nombre is not so great as other Kyngs have, yet of them he hath by reason of ther long trayning in warrs these many ye[a]rs and specially in the low

[1] British Museum MSS. Add. 32092. 26, f. 102.

Contreys a gretar [greater] nombre of exercised captayns and soldiors than any other Kyng hath. Beside these he hath commodite to have great nombres of men of warr both for the land and the sea out of Italy from the pops dominions, out of Naples, Sicily and Millan of his own, out of Savoy and Florence from the 2 duks the formar being his son in law, the other a Creatur of the popes, and from Genua, Naples and Sicily help of shipps and Gallyce. In lyk manner he hath commodyte to have very great and puissant nomb. both horssmen and footemen out of Germany by favor of Themp[er]or and by confederatyng to him of the papisticall Bishopps and p[ri]nces of the emp[i]re by pensions and wag[e]s, and at this prsent also he hath at his commandment the forces of all the p[ro]vynces being 17 in the low Contreys savyng Holland, Selland [Zeeland] Utryct and pt of Geldres and Fresland, so as whosoever shall accompt what nombres of men of war and of shipps and Gallyes he may have to s[er]ve his purporss bouth by sea and land, if he may have mony to paye them, shall certenly determyn that he is the mightyest enemy that ever England had, yea mightyar than ever his father the Em[per]or Charles or any other Monarch of Chr[ist]endom was these many years. . . .

It followeth to be considered in what sort for place tyme and nombres it may be thought he will mak his warrs to offend the Q[ueen's] Maty and hir Dominions.

His most commodite shall be to invade England and Irland joyntly at on[e] instant, wc he is to do by sea, for which purporss he must have a Great Navy of shipps wherof he hath and may have plenty, to carry an army very great to land in England, and a smaller in Irland, because he p[re]sumeth ther can be no resistance, but rather an asistance of the people miscontented. He also may be probably advised to send some small nombres of skylfull captayns and soldiors into Scotland, wherto if the Kyng shall be willyng, he may wt [with] more probabilite offend England greatly by sendyng mony wt his generall, to wage both the Kyng yt [that] is poore in mony and his people to enter by mayne land into the north of England by the north, but if the scottish King shall not yeld to the spanish attempts, yet suerly consideryng so great a party of late grown of the Noble men of the land to be devoted papists and sworn ennemyes to England. . . .

Upon these considerations remembred on the pt of this great Ennemy may it well appeare not only how great and puissant he is but what commoditees he hath to furder his actions, if God by his goodness asistyng hir Maty in the exequution of hir actions shall not enhable hir to mak a good defence, for wc [which] purporss, followyng the formar mention of hir Maty as the pncipall pty th' must susteyn this warr for defence of God's cause, hirself and hir countrey, ther ar to be considered what forces hir Maty hath and may have both of hir own and other auxiliar[y] helps, and how besyde hir defence she may impeach and offend the K. of Spayn in his gretest enterp[ri]ses.

The first and last Comfortor for hir Maty to tak hold on is the Lord of

hosts, for whose cause only hir Ennemyes ar risen wt might and fury to overthrow the Gospell of christ and the professors therof so as hir Maty may saye wt David Exurge Deus, Judica causam tuam and lykwise Dominus mihi Adiutor et ego despiciam inimicos meos. And so wt a firm hope of God's assistance in his cause ther may be remembred all these thyngs followyng for th strength of hir Maty not only for hir defence, but for offence of the Ennemy, notwstanding his apparant wor[l]dly mightynes.

The Realms of England cannot from Spayn or the lǫw Contreys be assayled but by sea.

Therfor hir Matys speciall and most prop[er] defence ageynst the Ennemys Navy must be by shipps. And hir defence ageynst them wc [which] shall land must be by power on the land.

For shipps of England hir Maty is of hir own prop[er] shipps so strong as the ennemy shall not be hable to land any power, wher hir Matys Navy shall be neare to the Ennemyes Navy. The shipps of hir subjects ar also at this daye both in nombre, in strength, in hable captayns and marryners stronger than ever they war in the memory of any man. To the augmentation of this English Navy ar to be joyned the shipps of warr of Holland and Selland [Zeeland] accordyng to ther compact. . . .

If the K. of Scotts may be recovred to be a frend to hir Maty and the realm as reason ought to move hym, consideryng his expectancy, [*i.e.* of the English crown] the Navy of England might have some ayd of shipps for 2 or 3 months though they ar not of great burthen. Yet they may s[er]ve to empeach landyng.

If warr also shall follow betwixt Spayn and England reason wold [would] th[t] the french Kyng shuld wtdraw all aydes from Spayn, as of vittells into Spayn and of marrynors into Flanders.

The Navy of England may be so devyded as the on[e] pt may be here in the Narrow Seas on the est pt of England and another pt on the west towards Irland and Spayn, by which meanes the spanish Navy shall not be hable to come to the low Contreys to joyne wt the flemish Navy, for the English western shall follow them if they come to the est, and they shall be intercepted by the English Est Navy.

It shall also be to a great purporss to provyde a nombre of shipps th[t] may mak a voyadg to portyngale [Portugal], to put comfort in the portyngales when the spanish army is come to the sea and if the K[ing] Antonio [the Portuguese Pretender] might be enhabled to land in portyngale, the K. of spayn shuld hazard the Crown which he now possesseth, whylest he seketh for another yt nether he hath nor ought to have.

If also in tyme of the yere convenient shipping may be redy to pass to the Ilands to intercept some of the Indian flete, the exequution therof will be very proffitable for the mayntenance of the charges of the warrs and the report of the intention to put such a Navy in redynes in the Name of S. francise Drak may be an occasion to deminish the nombre of the K[ing]s shippyng ageynst England or percase [perchance] a divertion of his purporss ageynst England. . . .

Now followeth to be considered how hir Maty shall maynteane the charges for this warr, for though God hath gyven hir people to serve hir both on the sea and on the land yet of Necessite ther must be mony to paye the wages of hir armyes both by sea and by land wt [with] vitylls by sea and also for the hyre of shipps, repayring of hir own shipps and new byldyng of some, for powdre, Munition, and other thyngs req[ui]sit for ordonance, for sayles, masts, cordage, and all other apparrellyng for hir shipps, for munition and powder both for hir forts and for hir armyes by land, of all which charges it is hard to mak any certayn estymat, but yet to gyve occasion to consider therof these articles followyng ar to be considered.

Navy. First the charges of hir Matys shipps and pynnasses being about XXXVII [37] wherin ar to serve nere [near] hand [*i.e.* about] VI M [6000] men, the chardges wherof will by estimation arise in prest, conduct, wages and victell for 3 months to the some of XXXIIII M l. [£34,000] and for XXX [30] other shipps of M[er]chants mete for war, wherein are to serve IIII M II C [4200] men, the charges wherof to s[er]ve for 3 month will amount to XVII M l. [£17,000], in the whole LI M l. [£51,000]. And for th[t] it will be necessary to have mo[re] shipps wt II M [2000] men mo[re], the same will be for 3 months more about IX or X M l. [£9000 or £10,000], so in the whole the chardg may be LX M l. [£60,000] at the lest.

Ther is to be added to this chardg for all manner of p[ro]visions of powder and other munition wt cordage and other apparrellyng by estymation about V M l [£5000], and if the Navy shall s[er]ve 3 months more the chardg will be dob[le].

To this chardg is to be added the Q[ueens] Matys charges in the low Contreys amontyng to I C xxvi M l [£126,000] in certenty, and to be added for extraordynary by estimation yerly IIII M [£4000] in toto XXX M p. annum [he means £130,000 per annum and writes that sum on the margin].

Ther is to be added if ther shall be dowt of breach wt Scotland a chardg at the lest for III M [3000] men to ly on the borders wc for IIII months will amount to XII or XIII M l. [£12,000 or £13,000].

To this is to be added a necessary chardg at the lest of I M [1000] men to be sent into Irland to incress the army ther for defence of the same wc [which] for VI months wt charge of prest, conduct, Cote [coat] mony and transportations will amount to VII M l [£7000] besyde xxv M l [£25,000] for the ordinary ther.

The incress of soldiors in the forts in Kent and of portesmouth . . . for a year IV M l [£4000].

The charges th[t] necessary must insew if an army be levyed to repayre to the sea costs for defence ageynst landyng or to fight wt the ennemy whan he is landed cannot be less than for XM [10,000] men, which accomptyng the same at the lest, wt shott and munition cannot be less than XII M l. [£12,000] and if the landyng be in sondry places the same must be doobled, th[t] is XXIV M only for 1 month.

It is to be considered that wha[t] soever shall be uppon the seas wt appearance to land, ther must be an army in redyness to attend on the Q. pson [Queen's person] which cannot be less than of XX M men which for II months at the lest may be estemed at XL M l. [£40,000].

2. *McKean to Washington*, 1789.

For the following, from the archives of the Department of State (vol. "Applications for Office"), the readers of the REVIEW are indebted to Edward I. Renick, Esq., of that department: —

PHILADELPHIA
April 27th 1789.

Sir,

I have an ambition to take a share in Your Excellency's administration, and know of no line in which I can render so good service as in the judicial department. Having expressed this, it will, I trust not be deemed indelicate in me to give a short account of myself and my studies.

I was born in Chester county in this State, and having been instructed for seven years in the latin and greek languages, and the arts and sciences usually taught in the schools, I commenced the study of the law at the age of sixteen in Newcastle; at the age of twenty I was admitted to the bar in the courts of common pleas and also in the supreme court of Delaware, and soon after in the supreme courts of Pennsylvania and New Jersey. From that time to the present, the law has been my principal study and my only profession. It is true I have gone thro' the rotine of office, have been annually elected for seventeen years a member of Assembly for Newcastle county; was a member of Congress, first at New York in 1765, and from 1774 until the day I had assurance that the preliminaries of peace were signed: But these employments added to and enlarged my legal knowledge.

Among the learned, I early in life received the degree of Master of Arts from the College of Philadelphia, and have since been honored with the degree of Doctor of Laws by two other Colleges and one University. I am also a Trustee of three incorporated seminaries of learning, and a member of several societies for the promoting the arts and useful knowledge. My official rank may probably be known to you, I shall therefore only mention, that I have been Speaker of the Delaware Assembly both before and since the Revolution, and sometime President of Congress: In 1766 I first took a seat on the Bench at Newcastle, having before been in the commission of the peace and a Justice of the common pleas for that county, and had influence enough to have justice administered upon unstamped paper. When the Stamp-Act was repealed I returned to the Bar and there remained until 1777 when I was appointed Chief Justice of the supreme court of Pennsylvania; which station I have now held near twelve years, having been twice chosen by an unanimous ballot. These honors

and offices were confered unsollicited by me, and most of them without my previous knowledge.

My character must be left to the World. I have lived in troublesome times, in an unsettled and tumultuous government: A good Judge cannot be very popular, but I believe, that my integrity has never been called in question, and it is certain, that no judgment of the supreme court of Pennsylvania since the Revolution has been reversed or altered in a single Iotta. A book of reports by Counsellor Dallas, is now in the press here and will be abroad in about two months, from which some judgment may be formed in the other States of our decisions. I will only add, that I am by habit and inclination the man of business.

Your Excellency will be pleased to excuse this particular self-detail, when it shall be considered, that if you think fit to advance me to this station, my reputation will become in a degree your interest, and my pretensions should be known.

Having lost by depreciated Congress-money upwards of six thousand pounds of my own acquiring (for I have been the maker of my own fortune) I have a wish to recover in some honorable way at least a part of it, for the sake of eight promising children; however, tho' not affluent I am still above the fear of want, and I owe no man anything but good will.

This having been a sudden resolution, I have not dropped the least hint of it to any person whomsoever. With respect to the Senators, I am personally known to most of them, and flatter myself not to my disadvantage; but in this opinion I may be mistaken, for the politics of some of them did not co-incide with mine. However I mean not to trouble them.

For this freedom I must trust to your great goodness. It is (tho' I am not three years younger than Your Excellency) my first essay of the kind. If you shall approve of this overture, I promise you to execute the Trust with assiduity and fidelity and according to the best of my abilities; the only return that I can make, and that, I know, you wish for. There is but one thing more I have to say, and that is, if you should make a single Enemy, or loose a single friend by gratifying my desire, I most sincerely beg you will never spend a thought on the subject; for I profess myself to be, with the utmost attachment and regard,

Sir,
Your Excellency's
most obedient and most humble servt
THO M: KEAN

HIS EXCELLENCY GEORGE WASHINGTON ESQUIRE.

3. *A Committee of the Massachusetts Legislature on Additional Amendments to the Federal Constitution*, 1790.

At the same time when the twelve amendments submitted by Congress to the states, in response to the demand for a "Bill of Rights," were under consideration in the Massachusetts legisla-

ture, and when all but three had received the preliminary approval of both houses, and when a joint committee had been appointed to report a bill or resolution for the ratification of the same, a second joint committee was appointed "to consider what further amendments are necessary to be added to the Federal Constitution and report." This motion originated in the Senate on January 29, 1790, and Josiah Thacher, Benjamin Austin, jr., and Samuel Fowler were named to serve on the part of the Senate. (*Journal of the Senate of Mass.*, Vol. X., p. 192; *Journal of the House*, Vol. X., p. 209.) On the report as submitted the name of Nathan Dane appears instead of that of Samuel Fowler. The House of Representatives, February 2, 1790, "concurred, and Messrs. Hill, Sewall, Goodman, and Bacon were joined to the Committee." (*Journal of the House*, Vol. X., p. 218.)

Although the committee on the amendments submitted by Congress does not seem to have reported, and the legislature failed to take any further action upon the same, the committee on the additional amendments submitted, before the end of the month, the subjoined report. In the *Senate Journal* for February 24, 1790, the following minute may be found: "Ordered that the clerk of the Senate cause 190 copies of the report of the Committee appointed to consider what further amendments are necessary to be added to the Federal Constitution to be printed forthwith for the use of the Senate." (*Senate Journal*, Vol. X., p. 256.) On the report is the following indorsement: "Referred March, 1790." Further action does not appear to have been taken. This report is of interest for several reasons: First, because of the nature of the amendments proposed, some of which had been previously recommended by the Massachusetts Convention, but had not been included in the series sent out by Congress to the states; second, because it indicates that the series of amendments proposed by Congress did not go as far as some, in Massachusetts as well as elsewhere, thought necessary in protecting the rights of the states and the people; third, because it reveals the doubts felt as to the practical working of a federal government; and fourthly, because of its presentation of some of the leading ideas of political science prevalent at the time.

HERMAN V. AMES.

[Archives of Massachusetts, Senate Documents 1145.]

The Committee of both Houses appointed to consider further amendments in the Constitution of the United States, report that they have carefully examined and considered the subject referred to them, they are fully of opinion that further amendments in that Constitution are necessary to

secure the liberties of the people, and the blessings of a free and efficient system of Government; and that such amendments ought now to be attended to and made more particularly, as will have a tendency to preserve the forms of a federal republic and to prevent a consolidation of the States. As this important subject is now brought before the legislature, and the people have a favorable opportunity to deliberate upon it, the Committee think it is proper for the General Court, at the present time, to suggest to the members from this State in Congress several principals of amendments, to be attended to as soon as the important business now before Congress will admit. It is with diffidence the Committee express their opinion on this very interesting subject, but as it is made their duty they have made it their endeavour to consider the objects referred to them with the attention they deserve — and though they think the States have been highly favoured in laying the foundations of a good Government; yet they conceive much is to be done, to define and complete the system.

The Committee in their enquiries have been influenced by those truths and principles which are held sacred in all free and enlightened Countries, and have inferred the proposed amendments from what they conceive to be the fundamental principles of a free and energetic system of Government for an extensive Community.

And they feel the fullest conviction, that the liberties and prosperity of the United States must rest on a general Government adequate to the common defense and general welfare, and on State or local Government constitutionally secured in their proper stations — and, therefore, that every good man will seasonably oppose a consolidation of the States; an event that must, probably, be attended with the loss of every thing dear to a free, virtuous, and manly people.

Your Committee believe it is a truth very generally admitted in this Country, that the greatest portion of political happiness is enjoyed in that equality which prevails in well regulated republics; that there is a constant effort in each order of men to destroy this equality to exalt itself and depress the others; to prevent the ruinous effect of which many checks must be engrafted into the Constitution; and every part of the people have its constitutional influence and proper means of defense in the Government; and to this end, not only a Senatorial branch, but a full and substantial representation of the body of the people must be effectually provided for.

That it is a fundamental principle, that such a representation and power to lay and collect taxes; to form and controul the military forces of a community ought to go together in all cases, where not evidently impracticable — and that the legislatures of the society ought to be so formed that the sense of the majority therein may correspond with the sense of the major part of the people.

That the powers of those who govern ought to be accurately limited and defined by the instruments and compacts of association; and that

where the sovereignty is divided and qualified, and lodged in a federal head for certain purposes, and in local Governments to certain other purposes the line of distinction ought to be very carefully drawn to prevent encroachments.

On attentively examining the Constitution of the United States, the Committee are of opinion that the powers of the General Government in several instances are not well defined or limited; that there is not a just line of distinction drawn between them and the powers of the local Government; and that there is no such representation as before mentioned in the legislature of the Union.

It appears to the Committee that it is agreeable to the very essence and design of a federal system, that there be a general legislature composed of a few members and that a more numerous and substantial representation of the people be assembled in the State legislatures; and, therefore it follows, that councils of the Union must have a natural biass to vigor, order, and an aristocratical system of policy; and that the State Governments must have a like biass to popular liberty and popular measures. To make the democratic temper of the latter and the different temper of the former mutual checks on each other, and thereby conducive to the happiness of the whole, is peculiar, perhaps, to a republic like our's, and a part of political science yet, in some measure, to be learnt. In a single legislature the Senatorial and popular branches prevent the extremes of each other by mutual negatives in all or particular cases, and how far this fundamental principle can, with safety and propriety, be extended to a general and State Governments in a great republic, must require much discernment and reflection, time and experience to determine. The Committee conceive, however, that some important means to lessen the abuses of democracy on the one hand, and of aristocracy on the other now present themselves — by increasing and improving the representation in the General Government, and making some of the State Governments (if necessary) less popular they will become less destructive of each other; and by giving a negative in certain cases where practicable, each will be enabled to defend itself against the other and a medium between the extreme views of both be happily produced; and by limiting and defining powers, and by a proper distinguishing line, each may be kept in its proper place. As the Constitution now stands, the Committee are of the opinion it will cherish those natural inequalities among men, from which, will in time, result constitutional distinctions, or an uneasiness in the body of the people which, by sudden commotions, may endanger or demolish the whole system.

The Committee by no means agree with those who contend that the natural tendency of a system like our's, is toward an undue increase of the powers of the State Governments, nor with those who contend that the democratic temper of the people is a sufficient check upon the extensive powers of the general Government. Certain it is that this temper must tend to destroy all governments, if not constitutionally directed. It must

have its due weight in order to prevent the making of certain laws or irregularly operate to prevent their execution.

This subject of amendments is too extensive to be treated at large or in particular detail, the Committee, therefore, have more particularly in this report made it an object to bring into view such principles as appear to them to be deserving of more immediate attention. It appears to them to be a most important object duly to examine the legislative powers of Congress respecting internal taxes, the militia, peace establishments, regulations of elections, the federal Judiciary and federal Territories, and in various ways to check and limit those powers in their exercise. It is very obvious, that the legislative powers of the general Government as to these objects, may be so exercised, as in a short period of time, materially to alter the condition of the community, and the first principles of the Government, and it is, in the opinion of the Committee, equally obvious, that the body of the people ought to have some further and more effectual control of the formation of the laws, and over those who make the laws, relative to these subjects.

If it be necessary that Congress should retain and exercise the powers vested in that body; yet many useful checks may be provided, — merely to elect the Senators and representatives of a federal head can be but imperfect security to the body of the people against a system of politics very repugnant to their general sentiments — for it is clear that in a federal republic that the aristocratical part of the community will very generally be elected to administer the general Government.

In altering the Constitution all agree, that the body of the people in their state legislatures, or in their state Conventions, ought to be consulted; because, otherwise, the public opinion could not be known and all parts of the federal system be secure; and, perhaps, this principle, under different modifications, may well be applied to some few important cases in federal legislation.

The Committee are sensible the weakness and embarassments of the confederation, and the many obstructions in the forms of Government in the United Netherlands are to be avoided; but a federal head possessing almost entire sovereignty, and noways checked by the local Governments, may be equally dangerous, and destructive of the system of which it is intended as a part. If a direct tax, a plan for forming the militia or a large peace establishment, should be proposed by the General Government, and be disapproved by a large majority of the state legislatures, ought such measures to be adopted?

Having made the foregoing observations the Committee submit the following principles of amendments for consideration, and that constitutional provision be made:

first, that Congress shall not interfere in the regulations of the election of its members, except in cases where the State Legislature shall neglect or refuse to make regulations; and that the qualification of Senators and representatives be expressly defined in the Constitution.

secondly, that Congress erect no Company with exclusive advantages of Commerce.

thirdly, that Congress have power to establish a uniform rule of inhabitancy or settlement of the poor of the different States throughout the United States.

fourthly, that republican forms of Government be established in the Districts which are or shall be ceded to the United States.

fifthly, that Congress shall by law provide for calling forth the *posse comitatus* for executing the laws of the United States.

sixthly, that the General Government exercise no power but what is expressly delegated.

seventhly, that a part of the internal resources of taxation be appropriated to the United States, and that a part thereof be exclusively reserved to the respective States, with such exceptions, however, and under such limitations as war and other extraordinary exergencies may require.

eightly, that no system for forming the militia be established, and that no establishment of troops in a time of peace beyond a limited number be made, if disapproved of by a specified number of the State legislatures, within a limited time after the bills for those purposes shall be laid before them.

ninthly, that the Judiciary power of the United States may be more explicitly defined and more accurately distinguished from those of the respective States.

tenthly, that the Senate shall not possess all the executive and Judicial power now vested in that body.

eleventhly, that it be left to the several States to make compensation to their Senators and representatives respectively for their services in Congress.

twelvthly, that the State legislatures have power to recall when they may think it expedient their federal Senators and to send others in stead; and that the Senators be chosen all at the same time and for the term of four years.

In the foregoing investigations it has been the main object of the Committee to bring into view amendments which shall secure the blessings of freedom without injuring the nerves of Government.

As to internal taxes, the Committee further observe, that [if] there shall remain in all cases concurrent power in Congress and the respective State legislatures to tax the same objects, it will be impracticable for the Union or Separate States to estimate their revenues, and, consequently, to estimate, with any degree of certainty, on performing their respective engagements.

Permanently to secure the liberties and happiness of America the Committee believe a due modification of the legislative powers before mentioned, and further checks in the Constitution, are essential; as well as a fair and honest administration of the General and local Governments.

The Committee are convinced that the people of this State, when

they adopted the Constitution of the United States, wished for and expected other and further amendments, than those which have been recommended; and that they are now anxious to have their liberties more explicitly secured to them.

After dilating on general principles, the Committee have brought into view more particular propositions, resting assured that from the principles laid down will result such amendments as will answer the just expectations of all our citizens.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

The Roman See in the Early Church and Other Studies in Church History. By WILLIAM BRIGHT, D.D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Co. 1896. Pp. viii, 490.)

IN addition to the essay mentioned in the title, Professor Bright's volume contains five briefer papers on a variety of topics: St. Ambrose and the Empire; Alexandria and Chalcedon — "a combination, with some abridgments," as the author says in his preface, "of certain articles on Alexandrian patriarchs of the fifth century, which may be found in the 'Dictionary of Christian Biography'"; The Church and the Barbarian Invaders; The Celtic Churches in the British Isles; and The English Church in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth — the last three "originally written for a 'Summer Meeting of Clergy' at Oxford."

The first and most elaborate of the essays is an enlarged reprint of two articles in the *Church Quarterly Review*, which were written in reply to the Rev. Luke Rivington's work on "The Primitive Church and the See of Rome," in which that author endeavors to carry the supremacy of the Pope back even to the days of the apostles. Professor Bright's purpose in writing these articles was purely practical. As he says at the close, "graver [than mere scholarly and literary] issues are raised by a publication which is obviously part of a new Roman campaign against the English church and the churches in communion with her. It is a mere duty to speak plainly of the most untrustworthy presentation of a great period of history which has ever come under the writer's notice. . . ." In replying to Mr. Rivington, Professor Bright undertakes not to trace and to explain the development of the power of the Bishop of Rome, but only to show from the sources the baselessness of his opponent's claims. This he does in a very complete and thorough-going way, devoting nearly 200 pages to the question, "Were the bishops of Rome the acknowledged 'Popes' of the primitive or ancient church?" the term "Pope" being employed throughout the discussion "in the sense of the Vatican council and in no other." The task as thus defined is a very easy one, and has been so often and so adequately performed that no particular scientific interest attaches to this latest discussion; but any one unfamiliar with the facts may be referred to Professor Bright's essay as a convenient and reliable summary of the extant evidence upon the subject. Had the author in republishing his articles supple-

mented them by a study of the ideals of the early Roman bishops, and of the positive influence exerted by them upon the church at large, his essay would have had greater historic interest.

Of the other papers in the volume it is not necessary to speak here. The most interesting and instructive is the one upon The Celtic Churches in the British Isles, a subject dear to Professor Bright's heart, and one upon which his special studies qualify him to speak with peculiar authority.

A. C. McGIFFERT.

A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom. By ANDREW DICKSON WHITE, LL.D., L.H.D., late President and Professor of History at Cornell University. (New York: D. Appleton and Co. 1896. Two vols., pp. xxiii, 415; xiii, 474.)

THE writer of this notice, being no student of history except that of science, including philosophy, ought to apologize for undertaking to review this book. The truth is, when he promised to do so, he supposed it would be chiefly a history of science. It turns out to be nothing of the sort; but a history of how theologians have met those discoveries of science which have been in conflict with their teachings. All this seems to be told with fulness and accuracy, evidently after mature research.

The book lies far away from the studies of the peaceful student of science. It is a controversial work. Nor does it dispute theoretical positions merely. It is one of the fruits of a hand-to-hand struggle over the studies at the Cornell University. The author tells us in his preface how it came to be written. At the establishment of that institution he had been careful to insert stringent provisions in its charter calculated to prevent its ever falling under the control of any "single religious sect." "Opposition began at once," and "as the struggle deepened, hostile resolutions were introduced into various ecclesiastical bodies." He first "fully tried" "sweet reasonableness"; but finding that of no avail, he entered upon the series of writings, of which the present volumes are the recension and completion.

Matter written in the course of a bitter struggle cannot possibly be philosophically judicial. Coming from the losing side, it must be unphilosophically abusive; coming from the winning side, the wiser it is, the more certain it will be to carry conciliation further than philosophical truth requires. Moderation and diplomacy have marked President White's course throughout. As a work of controversy, his review of the long series of events is simply pulverizing; and that is its essential character.

Upon the evolution of scientific thought and observation no light is shed. Each chapter narrates how some dogma of the Church has been fought over more and more savagely, how next the theologians have proposed modes of reconciliation, and how finally they have endeavored with great ingenuity to explain away their former dicta. Owing to this mode of

subdivision, the lively tone of controversy, and certain circumstances of the composition, the effect is somewhat that of a series of papers. Repetitions are noticeable; and the same situations are regarded a little differently in different places.

Chapter I. shows how the old doctrine of an instantaneous or speedy creation out of nothing a few thousand years ago by a man-like creator has been displaced by the conception of a very slow evolution from nebular matter many millions of years ago under mechanical forces. Chapter II. explains the Biblical geography. Chapter III. describes the infantile monkish astronomy, and gives an account of Copernicus and of the treatment of Galileo. Chapter V. relates to comets. Chapters VI. and VII. show how the high antiquity of man has come to be admitted in consequence, on the one hand, of discoveries in Egypt and Assyria, and on the other of prehistoric archæology. Chapters VIII., IX., X., show how the dogma of the Fall of Man has been refuted, first, from prehistoric remains, secondly, from the study of existing races, and thirdly, from history. Chapter XI. shows how storms were formerly attributed to evil spirits; how prayers, exorcisms, relics, processions, and the ringing of hallowed bells were the recognized defences against lightning; and how these practices have been superseded everywhere by the use of the lightning-rod. Chapter XII. gives a slight sketch of magic, of what the author calls the "theological theory of gases," and of other chemical matters; and it is shown that those ideas have been completely exploded. Chapter XIII. is devoted to the study of the percolation into theological brains of good sense and science about medicine. The topics here are a multitude; and several single paragraphs might advantageously be expanded into chapters. Chapter XIV. shows how the Church used to sanctify dirt, but how modern sanitation has triumphed. Chapters XV. and XVI. cover the extensive subject of insanity, the former treating individual lunacy, the latter endemic outbreaks. Chapter XVII. tells how the dogma of the Confusion of Tongues has been exploded by comparative philology. Chapter XVIII. treats the legends relating to the Dead Sea. Chapter XIX. sets forth the theological tergiversations about usury. Chapter XX. gives a history of the criticism of the Bible. But the author fails to use this history, as he should have done, to show that dogmatism, or what comes to much the same effect, gregariousness of thought, is not confined to theology, by explaining how the critics have often been led to carry their denials too far. It is not consistent in a prophet of candor thus to resort to suppression in order to veil the fact that science is not infallible.

The book is in effect a score of terrible pamphlets, dealing death to the dunce-spirit that endeavors to barricade the roadway of science. The author himself, in the first words of his preface, teaches us so to regard it; adding, however, that his purpose is not a purely philosophical one, but that he designs, by doing this in time, to prevent unnecessary damage to Christianity. With this intent, he often uses conciliatory phrases which, it may be feared, will exert little force in stemming the flood which he

dreads. How shall Christianity be defined? Shall we go back to the common matter of the synoptical gospels? In that, we find little else than miracles. Shall we rely upon the universal understanding, by Christians, of the essence of their own religion? If so, that religion adds to the general doctrine of love wherein it agrees with other Buddhistoidal beliefs, the distinctive doctrine of resurrection by the might of Jesus Christ. Can President White think his book favorable to that doctrine? He tells us (I. 22) that "the Bible is true." This sounds like practising upon — or exhibiting — that very *sancta simplicitas* at which he has been laughing three pages before. He informs us that in consequence of the revolution whose history he narrates, "our great body of sacred literature is only made more and more valuable" (II. 208). He speaks of "the exact teaching of the Holy Ghost." He quotes, with seeming approval, the formula of Le Clerc, "Our Lord and his apostles did not come into this world to teach criticism to the Jews, and *hence* spoke according to the common opinion." But his own history affords instances enough to suggest that this conciliatory "hence" comes too late, now, to be accepted.

Many a cultured reader of this *History* will assume that he reads here something of the true history of science. That is because the heart of the scientific man is not comprehended by men of affairs. The one consuming passion of that heart is to *learn;* and to desire to learn implies a desire to change one's mind. The impulse to communicate what he has learned, strong as that naturally is, together with all those desires whose aggregate makes up the love of life, are not, in the true man of science, comparable in intensity with his paramount passion. This is by no means an ideal representation; it is a faithful portraiture of that man, as he lives and has lived in all ages; and his life proves it. For that reason, the history of the troubles of scientific men in their collisions with outsiders is no part of the life of science, and hardly touches it. It would, therefore, be a misuse of this book to consult it for the history of science; it is of no moment that President White regards science altogether from an exterior standpoint, and is not of much consequence that his assertions here and there involve misjudgments of scientific history. Such misjudgments are neither frequent nor serious.

It seems to have been no part of President White's purpose to trace the causes, nor even to analyze the essence, of what he calls the theological position. Yet these things come properly within the scope and power of history; and the history of the great revolution of belief will not have been philosophically expounded until such questions have received their answer.

One essential difference between the scientific and theological attitudes is plain. The scientific man is animated by a passion to *learn*, — to learn the truth, which is for him that which "will out," that to whose overwhelming power all minds must bow, at last; while the rage of the theologian is to *teach*, — to teach men to behave as he feels they ought to behave. To be thoroughly zealous in this last pursuit implies perfect

confidence that one knows already all that need be known concerning the matter of the teaching. The priests are wont to call to their aid every innocent passion which can serve their purpose, — men's fears, hopes, love of ease, shame, etc. But their experience in all climes and ages shows that, for the majority of men, no motive is stronger than the spirit of fidelity to sentiments inculcated in childhood. Thus, to continue to believe what he has believed becomes, for the religious man, the first of virtues. The scientific man, on the other hand, holds every opinion lightly and provisionally, ready at every moment to dump his whole stock of beliefs, should the evidence prove decidedly against them.

Men who only know science in its results, not in its formative life, are apt to picture the typical scientific man as a sort of nominalist, pooh-poohing every proposition not plain, intelligible, definite, as simple as possible, and free from mysticism. But history will not bear this out. Indeed, a thinker can win no ground in any department if he be afraid of harboring ideas which, as they first come to him, are vague and shadowy. As a method, scientific men do indeed object to mysticism; but they have no rooted dislike to any theory because of any character of its substance. They will not even refuse to entertain a grossly improbable hypothesis, so long as it possesses the one merit of being the theory which is at the moment most conveniently and economically compared with observation. A successful investigator occupies the larger part of his time with theories of all degrees of improbability; for he expects to reject the larger proportion of those which he cordially receives on trial. The science which he is helping to develop has the ages to come at its disposition; and an orderly line of examination must be pursued, no matter how slow it may be. The only positions which are in his eyes in themselves anti-scientific are such as would tend to cut off inquiry. The theologian, on the other hand, is in the situation of any other practical man. The time to act has come, and he must select, as well as he can and for good, the theory upon which he will act. That one must be embraced and its denial spurned. He cannot stop to dally with improbabilities.

These are the most important respects in which history shows the scientific and the religious mind to be at variance, and much follows from this variance. President White manifests a disposition to concede that theologians have as sincere a love of truth as scientific men. This may be a judicious diplomatic concession, but it is not the verdict of history. The religious mind wants the very feeling of truth that lies at the bottom of the inquirer's heart; namely, of truth as an awful and stupendous power listening to no prayers and not to be withstood. For, had they this conception, the devout would never dream that one doctrine could be put down and another set up by any machinery or organization whatsoever. Deficient love of truth appears in every department, in every book, throughout the period of faith which intervened between Greek and modern science. President White gives facts enough to illustrate this; such as St. Augustine's averring (II. 23) that peacock's flesh will not

decay, that he has tested it and knows it to be a fact. Let exaggeration, falsification, forgery, be pardoned and excused, if President White inclines to such leniency; but they remain evidences of deficient love of truth. So are those suppressions which have given rise to the English Church proverb that "he may hold anything who will hold his tongue" (II. 334); and so is avoidance of crucial tests, such as the clergy betrayed upon Tyndall's honest proposal of a prayer-test. The story of Elijah and the priests of Baal illustrates how honest love of truth would have met such a proposal. The very rating of "fidelity" to a belief as a virtue, the holy horror of doubt, the anger at or fear of contradiction, are so many unmistakable signs of a want of desire to find out the truth. And these are not so much faults of the theologian as they are essential characters of the religious mind.

If we look into the origins of opposition to science, history will show us that it has, in different cases, at least four different sources. The first is simply conservatism, the unreasoning dislike and dread of new ways. No sensible man will deny that this feeling, in moderation, is wholesome; and in proportion as people are ignorant a larger measure of conservatism is advantageous. Morality is even more dependent on conservatism than religion itself. We certainly ought not to blame the Church for being conservative, since that is one of its chief utilities. Unfortunately, conservatism is essentially unintelligent; for were it intelligent it would cease to be genuine conservatism, which is just the needed counterpoise to activity of thought. Naturally, then, when anything new is proposed in a community in which conservatism has not unhappily been swept away, the blessed stupids will raise a great outcry. They cast about for some effective weapon, and, as a matter of course, look to religion, the great conservative power, to protect the people. Texts of the Bible are brought forward, and every effort is made by the dullards to enlist their friends, the clergy, on their side. Such, for example, were the phenomena at the discovery of anesthetics, as the writer of this himself well remembers; and such, doubtless, they have been in many conjunctures. It is hardly just to say that *theology* is at fault for such opposition to science as this. A principle of human nature is at the bottom of it, and a right wholesome principle too. "A radical, myself, from top to toe," said somebody, "I am very glad there is some conservatism among my fellow-citizens, and only wish there were more." Some recent examples, Huxley and others, have made men associate science with radicalism; but, as a general rule, scientific men have been cautious, if not conservative, about far-reaching measures, until all the circumstances had been studied.

The second source of opposition to scientific discoveries lies in certain beliefs which, though not perhaps themselves implanted in human nature, are intimately associated with natural sentiments, or, at least, are inheritances or traditions from primeval man. Such, for instance, is the hostility to the idea that we are descended from apes. Many such prejudices have no further connection with theology than this, that they are likely to be

reflected in any collection of ancient literature as extensive as the Bible. Others, such as the belief in Heaven and Hell, seem to have a special affinity to the religious mind. But even they are rather data than fruits of theology.

The third source of opposition to scientific discoveries lies in opinions formerly drawn by scientific reasoning, with more or less logic, from such data as were available at the time those opinions were formed. Such, for instance, was Claude Bernard's dictum that a disease is not an entity, but only an aggregate of symptoms, which, having become ingrained in the minds of physicians, retarded for several years the general acceptance by the medical profession of Pasteur's bacteriological conclusions, after these views ought logically to have been accepted. This is simply dogmatism founded on old science, the hard wood obstructing the movement of sap, the skull preventing the growth of the brain. Dogmatism is usually stronger the older it is. Those same Chaldeans who made the beginnings of that astronomical theory which, having undergone certain modifications, is admired to-day as the most perfect of sciences, also busied themselves about the evolution of the universe. Two of their tentative theories, somewhat simplified, were incorporated into the first chapters of Genesis. The dogmatism that resulted from that dead science in course of time acted as an obstruction to living science, just as Claude Bernard's science, hardened into prejudice, obstructed bacteriological medicine. Certainly theology was guilty in this case; but it was only guilty of having dogmatized obsolete science. Theology dogmatizes because religion demands party fealty, which it apotheosizes under the name of Faith. Religion itself is the prime cause of the difficulty; but this is no more an argument against religion than the first kind of opposition to science is an argument against conservatism.

The fourth source of opposition to scientific discoveries is distrust of "circumstantial evidence" as opposed to "direct evidence." There can be no doubt that this has been quite as much fostered by law as by theology. Historians and philologists have, down to within very recent times, preferred extremely imperfect documentary evidence to any monumental evidence which was at all indirect or "inferential." Flinders Petrie, for example, wrote a book entitled *Inductive Metrology*, in which he investigated the ancient weights and measures after the method (much improved) of Isaac Newton. Now the only documentary evidence there is upon the subject comes from writers of whom (with trifling exceptions) Eusebius is far the best and earliest, and it bears strong internal evidence of having been adjusted to a system which was an afterthought. Yet one might hunt long to find a reference by a historian or philologist to Petrie's book as a surer guide than the compendium of Hultsch, founded on the documents. What wonder, then, that theologians should be found to prefer the direct testimony of the sacred historians to the inferences of science!

The Church claims infallibility. In the eyes of science, which nowadays doubts the very axioms of geometry, such a claim is monstrous. Yet

did it rightly understand itself, it were no more than every man claims when he says, for example, that it is wicked to marry one's sister; for he will listen to no argument on the subject. He will, indeed, permit the student of ethics to discuss the precept; and is willing, in advance of the practical emergency, to be influenced by his studies; but he will not listen to argument on the occasion of the question taking a practical shape. At that moment his conscience claims momentary infallibility, and will entertain no new doctrine. The Church claims infallibility in what respect? In respect to the conduct of the faithful, including their mental conduct. Infallibility being limited to that, and no more being claimed, merely means that the faithful ought not to do or believe what the Church forbids, if they can help it. It does not follow from this that the injunction can never on another occasion be reversed. Limited, as it is, to the conduct, bodily and mental, of the faithful, it is only *practical* infallibility. Let it recognize itself to be of that nature; let it, in an age that measures the distances of the fixed stars, not claim to be immeasurably certain; let it be wisely exercised and not attempt to stretch itself beyond the bound which the nature of the human mind forbids it to transgress, under pain of futility and everlasting ridicule; let it promise not to interfere with the free work of science, and it may even yet recover the respect of mankind.

A History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church. By HENRY CHARLES LEA, LL.D. (Philadelphia: Lea Brothers and Co. 1896. Three vols., pp. xii, 523; viii, 514; viii, 629.)

EVERY work from the pen of Dr. Lea is awaited by students of church history with eager and confident expectation. Not only is he the first American scholar in this field, but for command of material and thoroughness of investigation he has there no living superior. The volumes now before us will not disappoint this expectation. They separate naturally into two parts, the first two being devoted to the former of the subjects named in the title, the auricular confession, while the third contains the treatment of indulgences. Considering first the subject of confession, we find that the central point of Dr. Lea's interest in these two volumes is the nature of the Roman ethical theory. His treatment of the institution of the confessional is really only a basis and an illustration of this larger idea. He is not primarily concerned with the obvious dangers of an institution through which a class of highly trained human guides undertakes to govern the conduct of all the rest of mankind, though he is plainly interested in this aspect of the case as well. Rather he desires to examine the principles according to which this class of professionals try to determine in specific cases what a human being may properly do and leave undone.

Obviously we are not here concerned with exact science. The data of

ethics are themselves precisely the most difficult part of the subject, and whatever appearance of precision a system of ethics may have, there always remains the possibility — nay, the certainty — that the underlying data will be questioned, and that, in so far as the questioning takes place, the system itself will go to pieces. Evident as all this is, the history of confession shows that the Roman Church, both officially and unofficially, — through its judicial organs, that is, and through its scholars, — has steadily aimed at making precise what it has all along felt could never lend itself to precision. It has been bound to appear infallible, as courts of law must always be; but it has also felt that the human will was a feeble and uncertain agency, and so to be tenderly handled. A system it must have, but the bases of the system must not be too rigidly built. It is this continual interplay of human passion with the stern requirements of a code claiming to be divine and an administrative machinery which can only cover its frailty by the same claim of divinity, that lends to all study of the church law its peculiar fascination.

The character and the value of Dr. Lea's work cannot better be shown than by following the line of thought just indicated. He aims first of all to lay broad and firm the historical foundation of the confessional. He of course rejects all idea of a specific divine ordination, which would simply remove the whole subject from the field of historical inquiry, and examines the earliest indications of the idea that the Christian Church was a disciplinary institution. He finds here no indication that the control of the Church over its members had any reference to the forgiveness or remission of sins. What the Church originally aimed at was rather reconciliation than absolution. It laid down, as every association of men must do, the terms of its own membership, and, when these were violated, it declared the terms upon which the offender might be received again into its common life. Now one of the conditions of this reception was — and this almost as a matter of course — some more or less formal acknowledgment of wrong and of intention to conform to rules in the future. Here is the germ of the later confession. Assuming what we may now fairly describe as the historical conception of the early Church, the author goes on to show that the Church — *i.e.* the body of Christians — was the organ of this primitive "confession." The person disciplined acknowledged his fault to the community, publicly. There was no intermediation of the priest, excepting, indeed, as the presiding officer of the assembly; with increased organization, and especially with the development of "heresy," all this question of purity in membership became more acute, but it never involved the idea of privacy or of personal relation between penitent and priest until long after the early trial of the Church was over, and the triumph of the priestly idea had begun. In the long period down to the thirteenth century two parallel currents of ideas on this point are discernible. On the one hand we find a growing priestly class claiming for itself an ever larger and larger function as a mediator between sinful man and a forgiving God; on the other hand we find a steady resistance to this notion,

and a continued repetition by the best minds of the principle that the individual soul must seek its reconciliation with God alone.

It is in the course of this conflict that the practice of auricular confession is developed. Its early motive is curiously expressed in a letter of Leo I., in 452. He forbids the reading of public confessions, not, as the later idea would have it, because of any specific absolving power of the priest, but because fear of exposure was keeping many from acknowledging their sins. It is enough if a man confess first to God and then to the priest. Even then its growth was gradual. Dr. Lea's argument here is from the frequency of repetition of the requirement for stated confession, a negative argument always to be used with caution. He fortifies it, however, with some convincing illustrations, as, *e.g.*, the persistency of public confession in the monastic orders until the increase of the sacramental idea in connection with penance made it doubtful whether such public confessions were sacramental enough in character to make them "good." The substitution of private for public confession in the orders brought in a new set of troubles, and was at least coincident with the weakening of discipline which marked their decline. The triumph of the confessional as a necessary step in deliverance from sin is as late as the twelfth century. It came with the formulation of the great mediæval sacramental system, in popular form, and its elaboration by the schoolmen. Until then it had been taken too seriously to become popular. Now it was seen that it might be adapted to human frailty, and its popularity was secure.

Dr. Lea reaches this point at about the middle of the first volume, the rest of which is occupied by a very careful examination of the growth of detail in connection with the act of private confession. He discusses here questions of jurisdiction, especially the rivalry of the regular and the secular clergy, and of "reserved cases," whereby the power of the parish priest was prevented from reaching so great a height as it at first threatened to do. His examination of the detail of the confessional act itself, the attempts to define it and to render it complete and effective, is very thorough and immensely suggestive; but perhaps the most generally interesting chapter in this volume will be that on the "seal," the implied contract with the penitent that his confession shall be kept with inviolable secrecy. Nowhere else is the terrible strain on human nature, implied in the whole confessional system, more evident than here. The principle may be very simply stated, but the complications arising under it are infinite, and it is not surprising that men were led to the most painful stretching of common morality in their struggle to maintain so unnatural a relation. We owe an obligation to Dr. Lea that he has resisted all temptations to ornament his pages with stories of violated confessions, of which the scandal-monger may elsewhere find enough.

The second volume deals with the vast multitude of philosophic and ethical aspects opened up by the practice of confession and the consequent attempts at defining the whole penitential process. The infinite variety of human action, and the possibility that every action might involve

a sin, drove the doctors and the clergy who resorted to them for advice to their wits' end to keep up the ever shifting balance between right and wrong. Indeed, we may well wonder with Dr. Lea whether these hair-splitting theologians had any conception of permanent moral distinctions. Given a rigid system of divine ordinances, and over against them frail human nature, and we can well understand that a church which cares for the souls in its charge would go all lengths of leniency in interpreting the law so as to meet the demand of human weakness. Dr. Lea works up his subject from the chapter on the penitential system to that on probabilism and casuistry with quite convincing force. By the time he has shown us the vast range of activity to be covered by the tribunals of the Church, the infinite refining upon human sinfulness, the distinctions between mortal sins and venial sins, between sins theological and sins philosophical, we are tempted to believe that men were simply trying to make sin as convenient and as safe as possible, and were totally without guiding principles of judgment. We believe, however, that this conclusion would be wrong. Doubtless the mechanical system of the Roman ethics led inevitably to vast and terrible evils. Its very formality seemed to take the weight of sin off the shoulders of the individual and throw it upon the institution. Yet it would be possible always to find such men as Dr. Lea enumerates in the concluding chapter of his second volume, men like Baronius, Ximenes, and Fénelon, who interpreted the awful responsibilities of the confessional with a simple directness which shames all the ethics of the schools. The error of this over-refined morality was after all only that of every moral theory which dares to trifle with the plain dictates of conscience when it comes face to face with temptation. "But surely," the casuist would reply, "the conscience needs education, and who so fit to educate it as they who through experience and training have sounded all the deeps and shoals of human motive." So that we are inevitably brought round again to the one fundamental error of the whole confessional theory — the notion that there can be a body of men suited to so delicate a function. That the confessional has succeeded only under the most favorable conditions of an ignorant, simple, and well-meaning people on the one hand, and a pure, direct, and self-distrustful clergy on the other, is not strange. The only wonder is that it could succeed at all. When these conditions are changed, and we have on the one hand a world enlightened, complicated, and self-seeking, and on the other a clergy corrupt, trained in scholastic sophistry, and bound to maintain its own interest at all hazards, the strain is more than can be borne. Dr. Lea's chapter on probabilism and casuistry is a masterly presentation of the subtleties of a desperate logic, wherein an honest man could not venture without deadly peril to his honesty. Yet there is no question that much of this apparently unscrupulous twisting of plain common sense was a praiseworthy effort to work out of a moral muddle along the same road by which men had got into it. To have done otherwise, to have struck off on the straight right angle of simple honesty, would have meant revolution, and revolutions are long in the breeding.

The third volume is devoted to the subject of indulgences as flowing naturally from the theory of penance defined and illustrated in the two former ones. Dr. Lea begins, as before, by disposing of the argument that indulgences are of original, divine institution, and then directs his inquiry to ascertaining precisely by what historical process the idea which underlies them made its way into the practice of the Church. That idea is that after a due penance has been properly imposed the whole or any part of that penance may, upon a suitable consideration, be remitted by the Church, as the divinely appointed administrator of this great trust. This remission is the indulgence.

So far we have nothing new. Dr. Lea's service is not in making a definition, but in showing the process by which the thing, here so simply defined, came to mean so vastly more, that men, both within and without the Roman Church, have at times quite forgotten the simplicity of its origin. The Church, as administrator of a grace of God, was bound to have some theory of the basis for its action, and in time two such bases were evolved, — one the general principle of the keys, the binding and loosing function, which covered also the whole process of absolution; the other the theory of the "heavenly treasury." This latter idea is shown by Dr. Lea, and is indeed recognized by candid Catholics, to be a pure invention or discovery of a very late date. It proved so effective that it rapidly overgrew all other forms of sanction and took on shapes of incredible diversity as ever new cases offered themselves for its practical application.

This volume is chiefly occupied with the detail of this extension. Beginning simply enough with the liberation of an individual from the burden of a heavy penance on condition of the performance of some "work" for the advancement of religion or morality, the meaning of the "work" was extended to a money payment, always with the understanding that the money was to be applied to a religious purpose. Then, as the doctrine of purgatory was evolved, the purgation of the soul after death was easily conceived of as precisely similar to the condition of penance in the living and therefore as subject to the same theory of remittance; but, since the dead could do nothing for themselves, it was easily established that a man might anticipate his purgation and shorten it by suitable provision during his life, and then once more, since no one could be sure that his probation was all provided for, it must be that a way of relief was open to him through the action of his survivors.

In all this there was no idea which, however resisted at first, could not be made acceptable to the kind of minds to which it was addressed, and from about the twelfth century the system made very rapid strides. Dr. Lea has brought to bear upon his subject almost every possible illumination from the history of the time, but one point of view he has not developed, though it can hardly have escaped him, — the immense economic advance of Europe under the lead of Italy at precisely the time when this essentially commercial aspect of the Church's function was put most prominently forward. The substitution of a money payment for a spiritual penalty could

hardly have become popular until the European peoples were familiarized with the freer use of money in all other transactions. The great banking houses of the rising Italian cities furnished a practical working model on which men could construct their notions of the vaster banking system of the heavenly treasury.

Here, rather more than in the first part, the order of treatment is chronological. One gains an impression of unity somewhat lacking in the earlier volumes. The picture left in one's mind is that of a perfectly well-conceived purpose to take advantage of every circumstance, both in the conditions of the world and in the internal policy of the Church itself, to exploit to the utmost this unparalleled control of a single human power over the destinies of men. So complete is this impression of continuity that, as one is carried along by Dr. Lea to the very latest utterances of the Roman power, one is left to wonder what will come next. For these very latest nineteenth-century declarations of indulgence are as extravagant and as unlimited as any ever put forth. The method is more decent, as are the times, but there has been absolutely not one change of theory to meet the advancing thought of our day.

In spite of the subjects of controversy with which this special topic fairly bristles, Dr. Lea maintains to the last word the same attitude of scholarly simplicity and directness with which he began. His aim is to get all the clearness possible into a subject where every detail has been disputed, and where hardly any point has been authoritatively fixed. His definitions are drawn, so far as possible, from the accepted Roman jurists and theologians; yet he constantly emphasizes the lack of certainty upon questions which the average man would regard as the most vital. Here, for example, is a system of book-keeping in which the account is kept in terms of numbers and periods of time; and yet, between the several elements of the computation, the amount of sin in the individual, the length of his future probation, the amount of merit which may be at his disposal, his balance in the divine bank, and the price he is called upon to pay in money or in kind, — between all these elements there is not and never has been any known relation. Indeed, there has seldom been a time when the conditions of an indulgence were not subject to grievous doubts in the minds of the best friends of the Church. We are here given many illustrations of such cases, but, happily, in all of them the invalidity was easily removed by a simple declaration of the power that stands for God to the faithful soul, and no harm was done. Dr. Lea's great merit is that he has thus clearly indicated the precise causes of difficulty in his subjects. If one does not find here exact definition of the stock phrases of the indulgence system, one finds at least that exactness is here impossible and why it is so.

As to our author's method, he gives us the clue to it in his brief preface. He has consistently followed the plan of letting the highest authorities on the several topics speak for themselves. His own part has been that of selection and arrangement. He has, as he says, "been sparing of comment, preferring to present facts and to leave the reader to draw his

own conclusions." We owe him thanks that he did not say "*the* facts," for then we should have been bound to inquire "*which* facts?" As it is, he has not committed himself, but has been free to select and arrange at his own discretion. Obviously another writer on the same subject might lay down the same general principle and follow it just as consistently and yet leave an impression totally opposed to that of this book. Facts we have here and in abundance, and that is all the author has promised us. The amount of reading and note-taking that preceded the publication is prodigious. If, as we look over the volume as a whole, the note-book seems a little too much in evidence, we must remind ourselves that in polemics of this sort we have to choose between some such method as this and some form of direct and presumably violent assault. As between these two, we prefer what Dr. Lea has given us. It will satisfy all those who can accept his definition of "facts," and those also who cannot will still be at liberty to select a group of other "facts" for themselves and arrange them to suit the taste of their own circle of readers.

The most that can be said in praise of any author is that he has done well what he tried to do, and this may, almost without reserve, be said of Dr. Lea. His argument, although put in a form somewhat fragmentary, rises steadily to a climax, if only we have patience to follow it. A certain confusion is sometimes caused by a kind of repetition inevitable in any topical arrangement, where the several topics run into each other so persistently as here. For example, it requires rather careful reading to make quite clear to one's self that there was from an early date, certainly from the third century, a practice of private confession, which Dr. Lea believes, probably with reason, to have been a something exceptional, and, on the whole, not highly approved. This confusion comes from the repetition of references to the same phenomenon in many different connections and from many points of view. It suggests in these volumes a certain lack of "editing." On the other hand, one finds in individual chapters admirable little essays on distinct topics, as, for example, besides those already referred to, in the chapters on absolution, on the classification of sins, on "satisfaction," and on the development of purgatory.

The apparatus of scholarship appears in Dr. Lea's volumes in the form of abundant footnotes with references to works he has consulted, but it is to be regretted that these references were not either more or less complete. One would be grateful for at least one complete statement of the full title of each work referred to and an indication of where this statement is to be found. Still more serviceable, especially in a work dealing with a subject so little studied as this, would be some account, were it never so brief, of the sources most often referred to. On the other hand, we could well spare the repeated references to given pages of the same work, and also the repetition of much-abbreviated titles. By this exchange of space the volume of the book would hardly be increased, while its usefulness to the audience which it primarily addresses would be much greater.

E. Emerton.

Woman under Monasticism: Chapters on Saint-Lore and Convent Life between A.D. 500 and A.D. 1500. By LINA ECKENSTEIN. (Cambridge: University Press. 1896. Pp. xv, 494.)

IN view of the difficulty of compressing into a single volume the story of religious woman for a thousand years, the author has wisely limited the scope of her studies, for the most part, to Germany and England, and has called the work a series of chapters rather than a history. The historical part of the work begins in reality with the second chapter, which treats of monastic life among the Franks, since the earlier pages attempt to connect heathendom and Christianity through the tribal goddess and the woman saint by conjecture more than by evidence. Folk-lore and history both testify to the transfer of many heathen rites and conceptions into early Christianity, but it demands a painful stretch of the imagination to trace the Christian reverence of woman back to the time when tribal relations were determined by *Mutterrecht* rather than by descent through the father.

The first century of Frankish Christianity was its darkest period, for the conversion of these Germans was decidedly superficial, if we may judge by the doings of their rulers and the naïve statements of their historians. Yet a few bright lights appear. St. Radegunda of Poitiers and her poetic friend Fortunatus are familiar figures to the student of this period, but the character of the convent life of the time is not usually so well brought out as it is in the author's description of the revolt of the nuns of Poitiers, a few years after the death of Radegunda. For two years the sisters defied churchmen and laymen to place an undesired abbess over them. Independence of spirit does not seem to have been confined to men, even before the days of Brunhilda.

The history of convent life in England during the early Anglo-Saxon period is hardly more than a catalogue of foundations. Houses were established for women in abundance; but information as to the character of the life within is not easy to obtain. Whitby and Ely are seen to be centres of influence at certain times owing to the position and character of their abbesses, but it is difficult to make an account of the period interesting. One significant feature, however, should be noted in the fact that so many of the abbesses of the time were daughters of the royal families; and in this connection one may profitably compare the genealogical tables in Montalembert's chapter on Anglo-Saxon Nuns.

During the early part of the eighth century the literary powers of numerous English religious women were brought to light in their correspondence with Boniface, the missionary to Germany. To the historian's regret, these letters are so largely of an introspective, or devotional, character that they afford few glimpses of the life of the time. This friendship did lead, however, to the voluntary transfer of a number of Anglo-Saxon nuns into the German missionary field, and eventually they became prominent in ecclesiastical matters. Hence the transition is easy to an account of convents in Germany.

The Old Saxons were the last branch of the German race to accept Christianity, but seem to have developed at once a vigorous monastic life. The heads of convents here as elsewhere were usually of distinguished lineage, and the religious houses became the recognized centres of culture. Between the years 800 and 1000 this region produced numerous monuments of literature. Herford, Essen, Quedlinburg, and Gandersheim are particularly prominent as seats of learning and piety. To the latter place the author devotes considerable space, and still more to the most brilliant product of the Gandersheim convent, the Nun Hrotsvith (Roswitha, 932–1002?). Descriptions of her poems and legends are accompanied by copious extracts from her dramatic writings, which show that mediæval woman was also ready to attack the so-called social question of her day, though with loftiness of purpose and becoming modesty. Her contributions to history were considerable, but she is perhaps more interesting herself as a product of the age in which she lived.

The chapter on the monastic revival of the Middle Ages is a very compact account of the foundation of the many new orders which sprang up between the eleventh and thirteenth centuries. The details are dry, but are perhaps necessary to show the new careers opened to women, and to point out the motives which led to such a multiplication of denominations within the religious world.

A consideration of art industry in mediæval convents shows that women had many of the employments of men, even to the copying of manuscripts, but that they were particularly skilled in embroidery. The highest degree of excellence in all these branches was reached in the first half of the fourteenth century, after which there was a steady decline owing to the new industrial competition of the towns. In this connection the author gives considerable space to that remarkable character of the twelfth century, Herrad of Hohenburg, who compiled, copied, and illuminated with her own hand what may be called an encyclopædia of contemporary life. Her miniature work in this *Hortus Deliciarum* was the wonder of artists until the manuscript was destroyed in the siege of Strassburg, but one can hardly less admire her literary and educational conceptions.

The women chosen to represent the prophetic spirit in convent life are St. Hildegard of Bingen and St. Elizabeth of Schönau, both from the twelfth century. Among those conspicuous for philanthropy we see the familiar figures of Hedwig, patron saint of Silesia, and St. Elizabeth of Thuringia. A study of the contemplative side of religious life leads to a chapter on the mystic literature written particularly for women. In England attention is called to the poems of Thomas de Hales and the *Ancren Riwle* of disputed authorship. In Germany the convent of Helfta produced during the thirteenth century a body of mystic writings by women themselves, which maintained its influence for a long period. So different, however, is the spirit of that time from ours that it is difficult to take up the subject with sympathy.

Convent life in its internal and external relations is treated in interest-

ing chapters, which, though they reveal nothing new on the subject, throw needed light on other topics. The theoretical rules of conduct remained about the same for long periods, but every generation placed its own interpretation upon them. The author takes pains to refute the notion that monasteries were hotbeds of idolatry and superstition by saying that the ceremonials complained of by their critics were adopted by an earlier age for the very purpose of preserving the faith, and had that effect at the time. As educational centres convents retrograded as the occupations of the nuns became more exclusively devotional.

The decline and fall of mediæval monasticism is presented in chapters on the reforms attempted before the Reformation and on the dissolution in England. Visitations of nunneries do not begin with Henry VIII., for a critical attitude was apparent in the fourteenth century. The independence of monasteries was long fought by the bishops and was finally overruled. Evident evils were in process of correction before the violent interference of the Reformation. The author agrees with Gasquet that the dissolution in England was harshly and cruelly carried out, but does not accept the suggestion that the monastic property could have been successfully taken over by the reforming party and adapted to new uses, although in many cases this was done in Germany by converting the convent into a school or home for indigent women.

A picturesque *dénouement* is given to the book in a sketch of the Abbess Charitas Pirckheimer, sister of the humanist of the same name. She was not only an enlightened woman but of such vigorous character that she was able to keep at bay till the end the reforming party of Nuremberg. She was one of the last great "women under monasticism."

The book is a careful piece of historical work. It enters a field which has been much studied and brings forth no new results, but there is evidence of close contact with original sources, though one may differ here and there with conclusions drawn. The treatment is scientific as over against the legends of Mrs. Jameson, and cool as compared with the emotional periods of Montalembert. When woman is separated from the other religious life of the time the picture is incomplete, but the author has successfully depicted a series of characters who deserve remembrance.

J. M. Vincent.

Geschiedenis van het Nederlandsche Volk. Door P. J. Blok. (Groningen: J. B. Wolters. 1892–1896. Three vols., pp. 384, 580, 548.)

A full history of the Dutch people by a native master of materials and methods has long been a desideratum. To the matter supplied by the old annalists and folio-makers, vast stores have been added by scholars in various countries who have delved in the archives long since opened by the governments of Europe. Professor P. J. Blok, successor to the veteran Dr. R. Fruin, who was his teacher, in the chair of history at the University of

Leyden, has essayed the congenial task, and three volumes of his work, bringing the narrative down to the Great Truce of 1609, are before us. Dr. Blok divides Netherlandish history into seven eras: I. From the most ancient time to the full development of the feudal states in the fourteenth century; II. The Burgundian era; III. The eighty-years' war, ending in 1648; IV. The Republic, which fell in 1795; V. The French domination until 1815; VI. The Kingdom of the United Netherlands; VII. A history of Netherlands after the separation from Belgium.

As preparation for his grand work, he has spent much time among the archives of various countries and especially in those of his own. Besides monographs and sketches he has published two books, "Eene Hollandsche Stad in de Middeleeuwen," "Eene Hollandsche Stad onder de Bourgondisch-Oosterrijksche Heerschappij," illuminating the story of Leyden, and "Lodewijk van Nassau," brother of the Silent One. He has been tutor of Queen Wilhelmina and is a prominent figure at great historical anniversaries in the Netherlands. Being but forty-two years of age and in excellent health, there is hope that he may complete the work as planned.

The volumes are handsomely printed and bound, with an appropriate map and index in each, the first two volumes having an appendix on authorities and sources of information. The essay in Vol. I. is of great interest as showing how history was written in the cloisters. Dr. Blok is generous in his references to authorities, though foot-notes proper are few and brief. His thorough familiarity with modern historical literature enables one who wishes to do so to construct from his references a bibliography of the latest and best critical writing concerning Netherlandish history. Every page shows him at home also with the standard Dutch historians, Bor, Hooft, Van Meteren, Wagenaar, Fruin, etc. While keenly appreciating Motley and realizing how effectually our countryman stirred up the Dutch scholars to noble industry, Dr. Blok regards him as a colorist in words, a dramatist and partisan, rather than a thoroughly trustworthy writer. Indeed, in one place he intimates that into the penetralia of Dutch politics Motley did not enter, thus confirming the judgment so often given by private Dutchmen in conversation that Motley depended too much upon foreigners for his knowledge of the springs of Dutch thought and action. Dr. Blok is far from being a mere annalist. He takes for granted an ordinary knowledge of the subject among his readers and avoids needless details, except as these are absolutely necessary. His plan, finely carried out in Vols. I. and II., — we are not so sure of it in Vol. III., — is to picture life, custom, thought, dress, manners, ideas, business, and markets as well as war and politics. His style is graphic and often reaches the point of fascination. It combines the dignity of stately narration with the charm of colloquial confidence.

In Vol. I., Book 1, the author treats of the primitive dwellers during the night of unlettered Netherlands, before Cæsar, the Stanley of antiquity, found a path through the regions bordering the North Sea and let fall the light of written description upon them. How the Romans and the men,

both of the vile and the good soil, in this delta land dwelt together, is pictured with skill and rhetorical power. Book 2 reveals to us the Frankish era. Then, Franks, Saxons, and Frisians traded, fought, and struggled together, making the stock of mediæval and modern Dutchmen. Then, Charles the Great and his successors erected on the ruins of Roman authority a government which itself in turn aged, weakened, fell, and made way for feudalism. The iridescence of myth, poetry, and fairy lore, which rises on the surface of the stream of narration, shows incidentally how rich is the common inheritance of the speakers of Dutch and English. In Book 3, when he takes us amid the little feudal states, Dr. Blok is thoroughly and happily at home, leading us easily through the maze. To Motley, this period seems as early England did to Milton, — a time of kites and crows, — but under Blok, the Dutch J. R. Green, we see in the feudal strifes of Holland, Friesland, Brabant, Limburg, and Flanders the exact conditions under which the later city-republics and larger states arose. Many brilliant passages are found in his descriptions of the crusades, of the reclamation and peopling of this naturally barren country, and of the estates spiritual, noble, and imperial. In Vol. II. we study the era of the Arteveldes, and the centre of interest is in Flanders and the southern Netherlands. Book 5, which treats of the Burgundian era, sparkles with the splendors of feudalism at its best estate. Here, not only trade and commerce, rustic and urban life, cloister and church, castle and tourney, but also art, letters, and law have an exact and appreciative chronicler.

We think it a fair criticism to make that Vol. III. rather falls behind the other two in brilliancy of graphic narration, for it is almost wholly political in subject while more severely serious in cast. It may be, however, that in the next volume the author's idea of furnishing a history of the Dutch *people* will be more closely adhered to. He is doubtless fully justified in first of all narrating the events leading to and falling within the first half of the war, and leaving for another volume the story of life in city and country and of the wonderful growth of wealth and luxury in Holland even during a struggle for existence. To the reader of Dutch that which seems at first sight a defect is made up in Fruin's masterpiece "Tien Jaren uit den Tachtigjarigen Oorlog" (1588–1598), of which we have the fourth edition in 1889 and to which Dr. Blok often refers. In this Vol. III., with notable increase of dramatic power the author sets before us the determined men who stood in the forefront of the death struggle between arbitrary authority as represented by Spain, and freedom under law as embodied in brave little Holland. His limning of Philip, Alva, Requesens, and Parma on the one hand, and William, Maurice, and Oldenbarnevelt on the other, is most masterly. We have "speaking portraits." We are free to say that in judicial calmness, poise, and conviction, with fairness to both sides, the Dutch excels the American narrator. With a grasp upon the latest critical Spanish literature which explains both the economic and social as well as the political condition of Spain during the mighty struggle, the author reveals the secret of the weakness and decay of the great peninsular power.

Holland's increasing strength, which surprised contemporary spectators and later students, and the causes of it, are better known. "The days of Maurice and Oldenbarnevelt" is the prelude to one of the most terrific political duels in modern history. The "minute details" concerning the alliances of England and France, Leicester, whose character is a puzzle, and the splendid conquests of navigation, are probably not too voluminous. Literary proportions are carefully studied and comparatively little is said of battles and campaigns. Good use has been made of the rather abundant writings of the English captains who served in the Low Countries. Throughout Dr. Blok combines happily, we think, the functions of a cool critic and impartial judge with those of an interesting story-teller. We shall look for future volumes with interest. WM. ELLIOT GRIFFIS.

Select Cases from the Coroners' Rolls, A.D. 1265–1413, with a brief Account of the History of the Office of Coroner. Edited for the Selden Society, by CHARLES GROSS, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of History, Harvard University. (London: Bernard Quaritch. 1896. Pp. xliv, dbl. pp. 159.)

FOR the student of English institutional history none of the eight preceding volumes published by the Selden Society is perhaps so valuable as Professor Gross's *Coroners' Rolls*. In a narrower field he has here accomplished what he did for scholarship in his epoch-making book on the *Merchant Gild*. It is hardly too much to say that he has fairly rescued the office of mediæval coroner from the obscurity in which even the ablest of our constitutional writers have left it. For the first time we are able to see somewhat clearly how really important was the office of the elective magistrate as compared with that of the king's sheriff, by which hitherto it has been quite overshadowed.

The historical account is a fine piece of special research. The leading writers, including Mr. Maitland and Bishop Stubbs, have sought the origin of the coroner's office in the articles of the eyre of 1194, requiring that in every county three knights and a clerk shall be chosen as *custodes* or keepers of the crown pleas. But Dr. Gross finds in the municipal charters, Pipe Rolls, Curia Regis Rolls, and other documents, evidence which seems to show that both borough and county coroner existed before this date, at any rate as early as the reign of Henry I. The office was thus developed side by side with that of the itinerant justices, both becoming "firmly established under Henry II." These early coroners not only kept but also held pleas of the crown; and it is strongly argued against Professor Maitland that they continued to exercise both functions until 1215, when by c. 24 of the Great Charter the coroner, like "other bailiffs," was forbidden to hold *placita coronæ*. Even later than 1215, he could "pass judgment on felons caught in the act," and conduct "jury trials in ordinary civil pleas, either taking the place of the sheriff or, more commonly, associated with him."

The functions of the coroner were manifold. Aside from the inquests in cases of violent or accidental death, he heard the "appeals," or "criminal accusations, brought by one person against another, the final trial being reserved for the eyre"; made a record of exigents and outlawry; and received the confession of criminals who turned "approvers" or informers. Thus (p. 128) in February, 1292, Richard of Scot Willoughby "came before the coroner and sheriffs of London . . . and confessed that he was a thief, and he appeals William Bishop and Richard Fewyth who live at Titchmarsh near Thrapston in the county of Northampton, and Roger Leney of Warden in the county of Bedford, of having participated in robbing two merchants of forty marks near Bath, and in killing them, as they were coming from the Winchester fair." So also when a felon fled to sanctuary his confession and abjuration of the realm were received by the coroner. For example (p. 68) on March 10, 1324, "Richard Lubbe of the castle of Eye in the county of Suffock took refuge in the chapel of St. Thomas the Martyr in Oundle . . . and confessed before Henry of Titchmarsh and four neighboring townships . . . that he was a thief, and had stolen a mare at Toseland in Huntingdonshire . . .; and he abjured the realm of England on the following Wednesday," the port of Bristol being "assigned to him."

Other functions show that the coroner was the complement of the sheriff, taking about as important a part as the latter in the judicial and administrative business of the shire. In civil pleas, as we have seen, he took the place of the sheriff, or acted with him; and in the county court his "position and activity were not much inferior." The coroner alone or with the sheriff "sometimes convened the hundred for judicial business, and even held the sheriff's tourn"; and the two magistrates were associated in other duties, such as the attachment of persons "breaking the assizes of bread and beer and measures." In default of a sheriff, or if the latter were a party to a suit, the coroner took his place. In short, Professor Gross has established more clearly than ever before that the coroners were intended to act as a check upon the sheriff. "In criminal matters their rolls had more authority than his," and as the power of the latter decreased, that of the former grew in importance. The coroner was at once the agent of the crown and the representative of the people. His dual position was the result of sound policy. By giving him power at the expense of the sheriff, and placing his "election in the hands of the people, the king diminished their grievances and at the same time made them responsible for the proper exercise of this office."

By far the greatest space in these rolls is taken up by the ordinary inquests on the bodies of the dead. Incidentally much light is thrown by them on social, legal, and constitutional questions. One is impressed, for instance, by the number of inquests in cases of death in prison from hunger, cold, and thirst, or on the bodies of those drowned by accident in wells and ditches, or slain while defending their houses against house-breakers, sometimes in open day. At the inquests deodands were appraised

and Englishry was presented. It is noteworthy that this custom appears in the rolls, even in the case of death by accident, as late as 1332 (p. 82). The purpose of its retention was probably the murder-fine which the hundred had to pay to the king if Englishry were not proved. Bishop Stubbs is scarcely exact, therefore, when he declares (*Const. Hist.*, I. 589) that, in the period between Stephen and Magna Charta, presentment of Englishry "loses what significance it ever had."

But it is for the history of trial by jury that the inquests are most instructive. The coroner's jury was not always constituted in the same way, and its procedure in finding a verdict varied. Usually it was composed of twelve *juratores*, drawn probably from the whole hundred, and of the "reeve and four men" from each of the four neighboring vills or townships, including the one in which the death occurred or the body was found. In the normal case, therefore, the entire jury comprehended thirty-two men. But the "four vills and the twelve men seem often to be regarded as two distinct bodies; their verdicts may be given separately. Then, again, each vill may make its own statement; or the vills may find a verdict, collectively and severally." But sometimes the four vills alone or the twelve *juratores* alone formed the jury. Now, in those cases where two distinct bodies gave separate verdicts a relation is established between them which may well have suggested that existing between the jury of presentment and the petty jury which made its appearance sometime after the abolition of the ordeal *ca.* 1219. It is possible, in fact, that in the four vills of the coroner's inquest, we have the model for the later petty jury. For at the eyre in the days of Henry III., notably in trying appeals of felony, the verdict of the twelve *juratores* of the hundred, who had both presented and tried the accused, was submitted to the four neighboring vills. "If they agree with the hundredors, sentence is passed." By the time of Edward I., according to Pollock and Maitland, "the practice of swearing in these villagers seems to be abandoned as the accused acquires his right to a second jury of free and lawful men." Moreover, the theory that the action of the vills at the eyre is the prototype of the petty jury becomes more plausible when it is considered that these may often have been the same four townships which, in a manner, had traversed the verdict of the twelve men of the hundred at the coroner's inquest. Another point is of interest. The four neighborhoods are sometimes found at the eyre aiding the presenting *juratores* by their testimony, "seemingly when the latter were in doubt or when the court deemed it expedient that they should be afforced." Is it rash to suggest that this procedure may have been one of the influences which led to the separation of the witnesses from the judges of evidence, an event of so great importance in the evolution of trial by jury?

The coroner's office, it is strongly urged, was the link which bound together the central and local governments; and it had a decisive influence on the principle of representation. Many boroughs had coroners of their own, from one to four being elected for each town by the "civil com-

munity." Rarely were the lords of manors allowed to appoint them. In each shire from two to four coroners were elected for life in full county court, and in the thirteenth century these were "knights." Here is discovered the "mould" or "prototype" of parliamentary representation; "the exact counterpart of the knights of the shire, who in the reign of Henry III. were two or four in number, and were chosen in the county court."

The editorial work is thorough and helpful at every point; and Dr. Gross's book will be heartily welcomed by every student of the English law and constitution.

GEORGE E. HOWARD.

Introduction à l'Histoire de l'Asie. Turcs et Mongols, des Origines à 1405. Par LÉON CAHUN. (Paris: Armand Colin et Cie. 1896. Pp. xii, 519.)

THOUGH we have long been in possession of voluminous and learned histories of the Turks and Mongols, — translations of works of Oriental writers or compilations by various European scholars, among whom I will only mention De Guignes, I. J. Schmidt, Baron d'Ohsson, Sir Henry Howorth, and, quite recently, Dr. H. Huth and E. H. Parker,[1] — the present volume of Mr. Léon Cahun will be read with great pleasure, not only by those interested in the special subject of which it treats, but also by all philosophical readers who seek in the narrations of history the solution of the great laws governing the growth and decay of nations.

The scope and purpose of Mr. Cahun's work are best shown in his own words in the preface of his book (p. ix): —

"Until science and method," he says, "supplanted faith and brute force, the Turks and Mongols dominated Asia and eastern Europe; religious enthusiasm played hardly any part in their wonderful fortune. At the time of their greatest power, their typical empire, that of the Mongols, had no well-defined religion. But all that could be done with the sword the Turks and Mongols accomplished. In them is incarnated the military spirit; their virtues are those of true warriors, courage, obedience, straightforwardness, good sense; they have been careful governors, firm administrators; far from scorning art and science, they have done homage to intellectual processes; they have endeavored to adopt them, to make them natural to themselves. But the mould of their original thought was too narrow and misshapen to contain and transform the civilization of Persia or China; confined to such a mould, it burst it asunder and lost every trace of the form which the natural correctness and clearness of view that characterized the Turk had sought to impart

[1] It is to be regretted that Mr. Cahun has not been able to avail himself of the *Tarikh-i-Rashidi* of Mirza Haidar, a work of great value on this subject, especially in the recent translation of E. D. Ross, and that he has also overlooked a most valuable study by E. E. Oliver, entitled "The Chaghatai Mughals," published in the *Journ. Roy. Asiat. Soc.*, n. s., XX. 72–128.

to it. These conquerors were, notwithstanding their innate intelligence, incapable of developing and applying to their own lives what they had learned from the Persians and Chinese; they remained shackled to their dead bodies. . . .

"The Turkish peoples are agents, elements of action, whose material rôle is preponderating, decisive, but whose moral rôle is limited. They have availed themselves of Arab thought, Chinese thought, Iranian thought. Without them, throughout the broad expanse of Asia, neither Iranian nor Chinese nor Arabic thought would ever have passed their own political frontiers, beyond which the brutal genius of action, the warlike impetuosity of the Turks, have carried and combined them. . . ."

On the early history of the Turks, the Hsiung-nu and T'u-kueh of the Chinese, Mr. Cahun quotes from the Chinese annals and the recently deciphered monuments in ancient Turkish script. By their help he draws a most vivid picture of these peoples at the opening of the historical period of their existence, and of the regular, and, on the whole, successfully followed Chinese policy which, by the way, China has adhered to down to the present day with equal success, in regard to these dangerous hordes; driving away the most unruly from the Empire, subsidizing or assimilating others, and planting Chinese colonies along the most exposed borders. Under the impulsion given by the Chinese, the Western T'u-kueh pushed westward, and from the first to the seventh centuries of our era, under various names, they carried their victorious arms through Asia and Europe, finally holding in their hands, in the sixth century, the balance of power between the Roman and Chinese empires.

Passing to the question of the religion of the Turkish peoples, Mr. Cahun describes with great detail their primitive faith and also shows, conclusively to my mind, that the only religion which has perfectly suited their phlegmatic natures has been Buddhism, in which they have found a freedom and comfort entirely lacking in all the other forms of religious belief they have at various periods adopted. Our author also notes that the Buddhist spirit pervades pure Turkish literature of all periods.

In the second chapter of his work Mr. Cahun treats of the Turks from the seventh to the twelfth century, of the empires of western Asia destroyed or founded by them, and of the profound modifications which the introduction among them, by the Arabs, of Islamism, has had on the subsequent history of Asia. "The Mussulman revolution," he tells us, "decided the fate of Asia, without, however, the will of the people who ruled Asia through their geographical position and by the force of their arms having counted for anything in this result. The Turks became the Mohammedan representative of Asia against Christian Europe without even noticing it. These men, proud of their race, pre-eminently brave and stubborn, wasted their energy and their liberty at haphazard, recklessly, in the service of foreigners. When the great Mongols of the thirteenth century wanted them for themselves, it was too late; their destiny was fixed" (p. 120).

The third section of this volume is devoted to the Mongols proper and

to their wonderful and sudden assumption of the leading rôle among the nations of the world.

While most of the details of the story of the founding of the Mongol empire and of its founder, Temudjin or Chingis Khan, as given in this work are familiar to students of the subject, I cannot forbear quoting the following passage, which discloses the veritable reason of the seemingly incomprehensibly rapid extension of Mongol power over Asia and most of Europe in the brief space of a quarter of a century, a reason to which I have not heretofore seen sufficient prominence given by previous writers. "It was to the perfection of their strategic and tactical methods at a period when the art of warfare among the other nations of the world had become quite rudimentary, that they owed their wonderful success. . . . That the Mongols of the thirteenth century, three-fourths of whom were Turks more or less Iranianized or Chinesified, were inferior in respect to intellectual culture to the Chinese and the Irano-Turks, is possible; that they carried on warfare brutally and with extreme rigor, is certain; but that in war or as administrators they have been the inferiors of the peoples whom they always were able to conquer and whom they governed regularly with a steady hand, is not true. In the thirteenth century, in military art, the Mongols were the civilized people, and the barbarians were those whom they vanquished according to rules and forms, through the genius of their generals, the experience of their captains, the discipline of their troops, and in no wise through their numbers. Their campaign of 1219 was as regular, as well planned as our classical campaign of 1805" (p. 279).

In the fourth part of his work, Mr. Cahun reviews the history of Asia under the successors of Chingis and shows us the general loosening of the bonds which held its various parts together, the constant and ever increasing power of Islamism in widening the breach. "To the middle of the fourteenth century, however, the federal bond which held the Gengis-khanites of Russia, Persia, and the Transoxiana to their suzerain the emperor reigning at Peking, was not totally severed. From the Black Sea to the Persian Gulf, the Indian Ocean, and the Sea of Japan, the Chinese Kaan, 'Power of Heaven,' remained truly the Emperor. But he was a Buddhist, and his vassals, mediatized kings, had become Mussulmen. There was no pope; but let a religious force spring up between the Mongol of the East and the Turk of the West, and the bond which holds them together will snap; the Mongol empire will completely dissolve and there will not be a common feature in its scattered remains. This religious force was not created by the great Timur; he found it organized and availed himself of it" (p. 440).

Timur, of whose romantic history the last chapter of this work treats, was the ideal knight-errant, the perfect gentleman, according to the Turkish standard of the fourteenth century,—half adventurer, half artist, trusting to his luck and to the protection of the saints. He is also for us the perfect picture of the Islamized Turk. With this perfect Turkish gentleman the decadence of Asia began; the Turk Timur smothered Turkish genius.

With the death of Timur in 1405 and the final and perfect subjection of the Turk to Islamism and of the Mongol to Buddhism, with which began the fall of these peoples from among the great powers of the world, this interesting study of Mr. Cahun's comes to an end.

While nearly all the sources of information of Mr. Cahun have for many years been familiar to Oriental scholars, it cannot but be admitted that his comprehensive arrangement of the materials at his command, and the general conclusions he has been able to draw from them, will be appreciated as positive and valuable contributions towards a better knowledge of the intricate problems of Asiatic history with which he deals, and as such should be welcomed by all students of history.

W. W. ROCKHILL.

Joan of Arc. By FRANCIS C. LOWELL. (Boston, New York, and Chicago: Houghton, Mifflin and Co. 1896. Pp. iv, 382.)

As a piece of critical biography, the *Joan of Arc* is a noble success. From the effort of the author on the one hand to be severely critical, and on the other to avoid obtruding his own theories, the book may be said to lack color somewhat. And yet it is just the presence of these elements which will give the work a charm for the scholar and make it a valuable contribution upon the subject of the mysterious maid of Domremy. Mr. Lowell has, in fact, sifted a vast mass of contemporary legends and other sources, to say nothing of modern authorities, and out of it drawn what we may regard as the real Joan of Arc, — altogether a very sweet and lovable woman, who, with all the devotion of a singularly pure and unselfish nature, gave herself to the noble work of vindicating her king, unworthy though he was, and of freeing her country from the scourge of one of the cruelest wars of all history.

By way of introduction the author presents in outline a sketch of the stirring events of early fifteenth-century French history, barely sufficient to furnish a background for his main subject. Domremy, its relation to the king of France and its position in the feudal scheme, the childhood of Joan, and the influence of her surroundings upon the development of mind and character, occupy another chapter. The subject of *the Voices* ushers the reader at once into the public career of Joan. From her first appearance at Vaucouleurs the author proceeds straight forward through the relief of Orleans, the progress to Rheims and the coronation, the betrayal and capture, the trial, judgment, and execution, to the rehabilitation.

The subject of *the Voices* Mr. Lowell does not attempt to discuss, nor does he try to solve the question of inspiration. For his own peace of mind this is perhaps wise. He simply tells the story of what Joan herself saw and heard during these years, chiefly as gathered from her own testimony at the several trials. Of her sincerity there can be no doubt. An enthusiast may profoundly believe in the cause which he has espoused as a whole, and be sincere enough, and yet find himself in special instances

consciously drifting across the line that divides truth and simulation. But in Joan there was nothing of the charlatan. Although constantly tempted by the ready credulity of her admirers, she never descended to acting a part. Whatever the present rationalistic age may think of her visions and her voices, there can be no question that to her they were grave realities. She saw and heard. Was she insane then? Mr. Lowell does not attempt to answer the question. He contents himself with stating the problem (Appendix B) and leaves the matter to be settled by the pathological specialist. As to the men of the fifteenth century, the possibility of such possession was a matter of daily belief. The supernatural was continually breaking through into the natural and mixing up in most ordinary affairs. There could be but one question,—the character of the possession. Was it of God or of the devil? And men generally ranged themselves on the one side or the other as selfish interest dictated. If there was predisposition, it was more likely to favor the devil. For whatever they might think of God, for body and soul, they feared the devil.

It is in this active belief in the supernatural, whether in the powers of good or evil, that Mr. Lowell finds the explanation of much of the remarkable success of Joan, as well as of her failure and her cruel fate. The counselors of the king, hardened men, who had little faith in goodness of any kind, probably at the first did not put much faith in Joan. But the case of Charles was desperate, and a chance was offered by the appearance of Joan which was not to be neglected (p. 68). With the men who composed the armies of Charles, however, the case was far different. Simple hearts, they believed in Joan and in her commission, as they believed in God. One old captain who served with her before Orleans, afterwards looking back across twenty-five years of almost constant service, declared that in all her deeds he believed there was more of the divine than of the human (p. 138). The effect upon the morale of the army was immediate and profound. The French had been beaten by the English so often that they had come to regard their foes as irresistible. But when Joan began to lead the troops, all was changed. "Two hundred English," wrote a chronicler of the day, "used to chase five hundred Frenchmen; but after her coming, two hundred Frenchmen used to chase four hundred Englishmen" (p. 137).

Joan herself was not a general. Of strategy she knew nothing. Her one idea of war was to seek out the enemy and fly at him furiously wherever he appeared, confident always in the justice of her cause and the support of God. It was her favorite retort to those who were inclined to cavil, or to question the wisdom of her counsels, "the men at arms will fight and God will give the victory." Such headlong impetuosity, such furious energy, would in all probability have led her army into inextricable trouble if not irretrievable ruin, had she been given the full command. But under the control of such sober-headed old veterans as La Hire and Dunois, the army was kept under control, while the soldiers suddenly developed an energy and fighting power such as Frenchmen had not known before in the entire

course of the war. The English, on the other hand, lost their fighting strength as that of the French rose and owing to the same cause, — a belief in the supernatural nature of Joan's power. But to them her furious energy, the wild and unwonted zeal of her comrades in arms, were due to the support of unhallowed influences; and this belief, as it forced itself upon their superstitious minds, filled them with a mysterious dread that paralyzed the stoutest hearts. They were not afraid of Frenchmen, much less of French women, but they were afraid of the devil; and of all things terrible, the most terrible was the devil in feminine guise.

It was this belief in the divine inspiration of the maid that thrilled the disheartened and demoralized French, and enabled the king's captains to raise the siege of Orleans and bear the king in a triumphal march to Rheims, there to receive the crown of his fathers. Other elements there were also which conspired to assist the king and unnerve his foes. As the Duke of Burgundy had seen the French driven foot by foot south of the Loire, he had lost his old zeal in the cause of the English. It was not in accordance with his interest, as he saw it, to allow the English to become too strong in France by the complete overthrow of the Dauphin. The people of the conquered regions, also, who had for years been exposed to the license of the English and Burgundian soldiery, had forgotten what they had suffered at the hands of the Armagnac party, and were ready to welcome the approach of an Armagnac army as a deliverance. Hence the real resistance which Charles met from the cities in his northward march was confined for the most part to the English garrisons, who without support, or at most with only a half-hearted support from the people, easily fell into his hands. The king, however, feeble and worthless, without a mind of his own, allowed his council deliberately to throw away the splendid advantage which the coming of the peasant girl had placed in his hands, and then the end came soon. Joan, only half supported, if not betrayed outright, was suffered to be beaten. The confidence of the soldiers was shaken and their enthusiasm dampened, and when at last she fell into the hands of the enemy, the splendid morale of the army, worth thousands of fighting men, was completely dissipated.

Yet the new spirit which had breathed upon France was not to be lost. The people had come to distinguish the cause of the king as the cause of all true Frenchmen, while the English they regarded as foreigners and their French and Burgundian allies as traitors. A true patriotism was thus born in France, which was not to be allayed until the foreigner had been driven from her shores.

But for Joan there was no escape from the hard logic of her position. She had claimed to be divinely commissioned, but her *Voices* had not protected her from defeat and capture. The faith of the simple folk was shaken, while the great, never more than lukewarm in her support, abandoned her altogether. It was without doubt congenial to the self-seeking and corrupt La Trémoille, who had seen in her success a threat to his own influence with the king, to have her thus effectively removed from his path.

Witch or angel, it was all one to him. The English and their party believed that the treacherous spirits to whom she had sold herself had betrayed her into their hands, that she might meet the punishment which the age regarded as suited to such a crime. The leaders possibly regarded her condemnation as necessary to justify their own claims in opposing the heir of Charles VI. But die she must. If the charge of witchcraft failed, it was possible to catch the ignorant peasant girl in the toils of a long prosecution and condemn her as a heretic. From the moment therefore in which she fell into the enemy's hands, a condemnation upon the heinous charge of dealing with evil spirits and a cruel death were foregone conclusions.

The book, as has been stated, is not a history, but a biography. It is perhaps to be regretted that an author who has proved himself so capable and so judicious in the handling of difficult sources has not allowed himself a wider field. Good books in English upon continental subjects are rare. The epoch of French history, in which Joan of Arc is, after all, only an episode, is worthy of such an author as Mr. Lowell. In the appendix (A), he reviews the reign of Charles VII. in discussing the character of that monarch. This, with the introductory chapter, is all that he has seen fit to attempt in presenting the larger subject. As a piece of historical biography, the *Joan of Arc* is, without extravagance, one of the best books put forth by the American press for some time.

BENJAMIN S. TERRY.

Lorenzo de' Medici, and Florence in the Fifteenth Century. By E. ARMSTRONG, M.A., Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1896. Pp. xiv, 449.)

THE constant improvement in the character of our historical manuals is a source of satisfaction to every student, for it frequently happens nowadays that little books for the many are written by those who are well qualified to furnish big books for the few. Mr. Armstrong's work belongs to the best of its class. It is scholarly and judicious in its arrangement, and is written *con amore* by one familiar with the most approved historical methods. The best secondary sources have been used, controlled, we may infer, by a considerable knowledge of the chief primary authorities. Thus while the author modestly refuses all claim to original research, even the special student will find much to attract him in the compact logical presentation and the thoughtful observations of the writer.

Mr. Armstrong adheres closely to his subject, which is Florence under Lorenzo, not the Renaissance in Italy. We are thus spared all trite general reflections such as too often form the stock in trade of writers on this period. The treatment is philosophical in the best sense of the word. Definite comparisons with familiar modern conditions are substituted for the usual vague formulæ which assume to supply a single explanation for a whole civilization. Resemblances rather than differences are emphasized; but

one which the writer has missed and which will readily occur to the American reader is the analogy between the political "boss" of the fifteenth and of the nineteenth century.

The causes of the supremacy of the Medici form the logical introduction to our book. The intricate constitutional conditions, the multiform historical survivals, — for the creation of new magistracies did not imply the destruction of the old, — all these are described with remarkable clearness, considering the obscurity of the subject. Lorenzo was a party leader, and his power was maintained by methods part of which were peculiar to Florence, but some of which will appear strangely familiar to those who follow the career of the successful contemporaneous "politicians." The element of popular elections was of course practically unknown in Florence, but patronage then as now was the mainstay of the "boss." Taxation, which Cosimo "plied as other tyrants would the dagger," could be used against individual opponents in a way that is no longer possible. Of the financial measures of Lorenzo, Mr. Armstrong gives us an especially interesting account.

The permanence of tenure of the Medici as compared with the similarly unofficial English premier, the writer ascribes to several causes. "The spoils system was in Florence much more complete; a party once in power had far more means of rewarding adherents. But chiefly the reason was the entire absence of elections in the modern sense. . . . The drawing by lot, the insignificance of the individual magistrate, the rapid rotation of offices, deprived the actual election to the magistrates of all significance. There was no natural and definite moment at which discontent with the administration could make itself vocal." Thus revolution was the only means of ejecting the ruling party.

In his account of the literary and artistic tendencies of the time, Mr. Armstrong is no whit less happy than in describing constitutional and financial conditions. He confines himself to the art and literature as connected with Lorenzo, and in this way enhances the value of his work for those already familiar with the general development of Italian art. "Botticelli was the truest artistic counterpart of the literary tendencies of his day and more especially of those of his chief patron." To him Mr. Armstrong turns for the most characteristic expression of this transitional epoch in art, and his unaffected analysis of the charms of this now so popular painter are full of suggestion and good sense. The choice of less common, but historically important, illustrations forms an admirable feature of the book.

JAMES HARVEY ROBINSON.

Lectures on the Council of Trent. Delivered at Oxford, 1892–1893, by JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE, late Regius Professor of Modern History. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1896. Pp. 294.)

THIS course of lectures is really a critical history of the Reformation, considered as a movement towards the goal of a reformed and reunited

Church, which outcome was prevented by the papal policy which culminated in the Council of Trent. That Council was to have been the theatre of reform and reunion, according to the purpose of Charles V. and of the German princes. It was, in fact, the scene of the triumph of papal hostility to any and every reform.

Mr. Froude's characteristics as a historian are now well known. He seldom wrote without a purpose, without taking a brief for some character or cause, without endeavoring, with however little or great success, to right some wrong and help onward some good. This book is no exception to his general style of work. It is a history, in that it reviews the general course of events. It often indulges in minute description and in dramatic portraiture. Generally, however, upon this well-threshed theme of the Reformation, it presupposes an acquaintance with the main facts, and dismisses them with the lightest touch. After this fashion it reviews in successive chapters the rise and development of Lutheranism, the increasing demand for a general council for the settlement of the religious difficulties, the history of the Council, and its close as the close of the era of negotiation and the opening of the age of religious war. But throughout, the purpose is one, to rescue the Reformation from the misrepresentations of modern times, to answer its detractors, whether Roman Catholic, Anglican, humanistic, or philosophic, and to set forth again its fundamental and immortal service to the creation of that modern era of religious freedom in which toleration, breadth, opportunity for the human spirit, and emancipation from priestcraft are the distinguishing and the priceless characteristics. This purpose is grandly attained; and Mr. Froude, whatever criticisms any may have to pass upon the incidental features of the book, must be confessed by all the lovers of religious liberty to have performed a great service.

Froude's general conception of the Reformation is that it was at bottom the rise of the laity against the oppressions of the clergy. Martin Luther was the central figure on the stage, but what gave him popular following was not the acceptance of his peculiar opinions upon this subject and that, but the general joy to see one brave man stand up against this tyrannical system. Indeed, Froude seems peculiarly blind to what is most characteristic in Luther's career. While he describes his self-discipline in the monastery at Erfurt, and notes the change which came over him before Staupitz brought him out upon the larger stage of Wittenberg, he gives no hint of the great spiritual transformation that went on in his soul, says nothing of the fact or the meaning of the doctrine of justification by faith, and thus drops silently out of sight the very moving cause of the whole drama. This is, however, quite in accord with Froude's whole method. He cares nothing about "theology" himself, deems opinions upon abstract matters, such as are embraced in the symbols either of Augsburg or of Trent, of little or no independent value, and thinks that the whole disastrous outcome of the Council is due to the extreme dogmatism of both Protestants and Catholics. Here is exhibited a decided limitation of

Froude's mind. While dogmas have their place, and abstract opinions should not be allowed to have an influence upon common life disproportionate to their certainty and relative importance, still religion can never be dissociated from doctrine, and thought is of the essence of spiritual life. The laity in their struggle with the Roman court were indifferent to all these things, thinks Froude; and moderate men, with Charles V. at their head, were endeavoring to secure such a change as should leave matters of opinion where they belonged, and should secure high morality and purity in Church and State. Upon such a reform all parties could have been united. The significance of the Council of Trent is that it was the main instrument in frustrating this endeavor.

The picture which Froude thus draws of Charles V. is a distinctly new one. He represents the Emperor as sincerely attached, as he undoubtedly was, to the old Church, but as indifferent to its dogmatic system, and quite critical in his attitude towards the papacy as an institution. He could not only suffer his troops to sack Rome, but he could compel the Pope by various threatenings to yield point after point in reference to the Council till he had well-nigh compelled acquiescence in the demands of the Germans. But Charles seems scarcely so modern a man to the more objective student of history. He is rather the political sovereign, engaged in various enterprises, in which the help of German Protestants is indispensable, who spares them as long as he needs them, and then turns upon them with the purpose to make at last an end of their schism. That he did not succeed was no fault of his, but the natural result of the power and enthusiasm of the German people as a whole. It is in this connection that Froude presents a new theory of the Elector Maurice, which will have the credit of originality, and which may after all be a genuine product of historical insight. The strange tergiversation of Maurice, who followed the Emperor till he had wrested the electoral hat from his cousin of Wittenberg, and then turned upon the Emperor himself and almost took him prisoner at Innsbruck, has been generally ascribed to the treachery of his nature, which seems to have been the patrimony of the Albertinian Saxon line down even so late as 1866. But Froude says, No. Maurice was a clever head. He wanted a moderate settlement, in much the same way as the Emperor. At last he and the Emperor despaired together, and between them the little farce of Innsbruck was arranged and played to force the Council to yield at last to the demands of common sense. Charles knew that the fear of Maurice, if thought to be against his master, would operate powerfully upon the minds of the Council, and so he consented to the sham desertion and sham violence of Maurice. Froude's proof of this remarkable theory is simply his view of the two men as level-headed men of affairs, with the one additional piece of possible evidence that Maurice visited Ferdinand at Linz, and conferred with him about something, nobody knows what.

In his history of the Council itself Froude has done the best work of the book. The demand of the German nation, the earnestness of Charles, the unwillingness of the Pope, the shifts and evasions to which Rome

resorted, the paucity of numbers when the Council was at last assembled, the constant influence of the Roman court, the absolute unwillingness of the papal party to see any effort made at reforming the Church, — all these things are sketched with all the wit, keenness, and biting sarcasm for which Froude is deservedly famous. We think, however, that Froude, in consequence of his own indifference to theology, has failed to do justice to one part of the work of the Council, — that of defining the dogmatic system of the Roman Church. He constantly represents that doctrinal discussion was used as a means of avoiding the discussion of reform, or as a means of steering the fathers clear of dangerous demands which some of them might have been inclined to make upon Rome, and thus he fails to bring out, what seems tolerably clear upon a mere reading of the sessions and canons, that there was, as Kahnis of Leipzig used to put it, "an honest endeavor on the part of the fathers at Trent to understand and do justice to the Protestant system." We may acknowledge all that Froude has to present as to the determination not to yield the Protestants any fair position in the Council as disputants or even give them the opportunity simply to present their views. Yet it seems evident that standard presentations of the Protestant positions were carefully studied. The result proves it. You have in the decrees of Trent the careful formulation of the consistent system of Catholicism, as it had been growing up through the Middle Ages, so well stated that they have been the standard of faith in that Church ever since. The Tridentine bishops were by no means so ignorant and incapable as Froude would make out. It is to be doubted whether the addition of a very large number of Spanish, French, English, and German bishops would have added much to the real equipment of the Council for this specific dogmatic work. For accuracy in summing up the results of a long period of consistent development, the work of the Council stands unsurpassed, and only equalled by the Westminster Confession itself. The failure to accept the modifications suggested by the Protestants lies far deeper than Froude sees. It is in the polar antagonism of two systems, the one of which is founded upon the idea of merit, and the other upon the free grace of God. Froude thinks that all views are of little consequence if they only lead to good lives, and both of these he perceives to be possible, as they are, under a theory of justification by works or by faith. But you meet in this antithesis two conflicting theories of God and the universe, two different types of piety, two divergent modes of practical life. The two could not be reconciled, and between them there is no compromise. Trent saw this and was right. The Council understood itself better than does its historian.

The close of the book deserves a careful notice. It has been its purpose to vindicate the service to humanity which the Reformation rendered. It "is now said," the author remarks, "to have settled nothing. I wish you to recognize that every one of the 'hundred grievances' of Germany, every one of the abuses complained of by the English House of Commons in 1529, has been long ago swept away. . . . Popes no longer depose

princes, dispense with oaths, or absolve subjects from their allegiance. Appeals are not any more carried to Rome from the national tribunals, nor justice sold there to the highest bidder. The clergy have ceased to pass laws which bind the laity and to enforce them with spiritual censures. Felonious priests suffer for their crimes like unconsecrated mortals. Too zealous prelates cannot call poor creatures before them *ex-officio*, cross-question them on their beliefs, fine, imprison, or burn them at the stake. Excommunications are kept in bounds by the law of libel. Itinerant pardon-venders no longer hawk through Europe their unprofitable wares. Cardinals cannot now add see to see that they may have princes' revenues, or private clergy buy benefices as they would buy farms, and buy along with them dispensations to neglect their duties." He does not add, as he should, that a new spirit was infused into the Christianity of northern Europe whereby in the "freedom of the Christian man" of which Luther spoke so much, the works of Christian freedom, the free air of scientific research, the free governments of the present day, and, particularly, the intelligent and progressive spirit of the English Protestant monarchy, and of its daughter, the American Republic, were rendered possible.

We esteem the work a valuable and timely one, and a positive service to the cause of truth, defective in certain lines as we have found it to be.

FRANK HUGH FOSTER.

The History of Local Rates in England. Five Lectures by EDWIN CANNAN. [Studies in Economics and Political Science.] (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Co. 1896. Pp. 140.)

THIS book is the first fruit, in the way of publication, of the London School of Economics and Political Science recently established under the directorship of Mr. W. A. S. Hewins. It is an amplification of five lectures delivered before the school, and hence can make, as the author himself expressly states, no pretence to cover, even in outline, the yet unworked field of the history of English local taxation. Its purpose is merely to trace the historical growth of two of the most characteristic features of the existing system; namely, the exemption of personal property and the assessment of the occupier rather than the owner of real estate. Mr. Cannan would probably not make the claim that his investigation of even this limited field was exhaustive. What he has done is to make a careful and scholarly study of the more available sources of information. The facts collected and the ability with which their significance is pointed out are sufficient, however, to yield a real addition to our very limited knowledge of the subject.

As in most fields of English economic and administrative activity, general legislative enactments shed comparatively little light on the details of actual practice. It is a great merit of this book that it goes behind statutory provisions and shows that the present practice is deter-

mined not by the provisions of the poor-law of 1601, to which we are usually referred for an explanation of the existing system of rating, but by custom gradually acquiring through time and statutory and judicial sanction the force of law; the provisions of the law of 1601 having been themselves largely influenced by the then existing custom, and having been of so indefinite a character as to admit great variety in practice. The conclusions reached may be briefly summarized as follows: Local taxes, at first assessed upon the inhabitants of the locality, according to ability to pay or to benefit received from the expenditure of the tax, came gradually to be assessed on real estate in proportion to its annual value; because, practically, in an agricultural community, and even in towns of the mediæval sort, the extent and character of the real estate occupied was the best index, both of ability and benefit; and because, this standard of assessment once adopted, it was natural to assess the land of non-resident occupiers, the tax thus coming to be regarded as assessed on property rather than on persons. It was assessed upon the occupier because it was through his hands that the revenue to be assessed first passed; and the non-occupying owner was exempt because to tax him had the appearance of double taxation of a single source of revenue. As a matter of fact, the question was, in the early period, comparatively unimportant, since the modern relation between tenant and landlord did not exist. The result just described had been, for the most part, reached before the introduction of the poor-rate. The poor-rate, indeed, growing out of voluntary contributions, from which the voluntary element had been gradually eliminated, was intended as, and perhaps for a time, to some extent and in some places, actually was, a return to the principle of assessment according to ability, from whatever source derived. The act of 1601, however, provided, in accordance with the then existing usage, for the assessment of all occupiers, and hence of non-resident occupiers, of lands and other specified forms of real estate; and the practice from the beginning doubtless conformed, for the most part, to the established custom in assessing local rates, the exemption of personal property, notwithstanding its increasing importance, being continued as the result of the force of custom and the difficulties involved in its assessment. Instances of the assessment of some forms of such property were, however, not uncommon in the seventeenth century and continued to exist throughout the eighteenth. At the end of the last century stock in trade was declared ratable and remained so legally until all personal property was exempted by the act of 1840. While there seems good reason to believe from the facts at hand that this is in general a correct outline of the course of development, our knowledge of details, particularly for the earlier centuries, is still very imperfect, and it is not improbable that local rates were, for a longer time than Mr. Cannan seems to think, of the nature of a general property tax. This is the impression given by Professor Seligman in his essay on the general property tax, and Mr. Cannan certainly brings forward no facts to disprove it; but whether his conclusions be accepted or not, the book has a real value from the facts collected in it. HENRY B. GARDNER.

Histoire des Princes de Condé pendant les XVI^e^ et XVII^e^ Siècles. Par M. LE DUC D'AUMALE. Tome VII. (Paris: Calmann Lévy. 1896. Pp. 784.)

THE Duc d'Aumale has completed the five large volumes which he devotes to the life of the "Great Condé." The present volume begins with the battle of the Dunes, when the prince was still in the service of Spain, engaged in fighting against his own country; it tells of his pardon and the restoration of his estates at the Peace of the Pyrenees, and then describes the tranquil and somewhat uneventful maturity that followed a youth filled with adventure and glory.

In 1651 the Prince of Condé, having taken up arms against the French government, sought the assistance of the Spanish king, and when he was compelled to fly from France, he assumed command of the Spanish armies in the Low Countries. It is hard to see wherein Philip IV. was helped by his new ally; Condé had become famous by his victories over Spain, but he won no victories for Spain. Doubtless he was hampered by the jealousy of his associates and by the inefficiency of Spanish administration, but Condé's fame as a soldier was won when he was under thirty, and later in life either fortune deserted him or his genius had waned.

However little the Spanish profited by Condé's aid, they insisted with chivalric, one might say with quixotic, devotion that the demands of their ally should be satisfied before they would agree on terms of peace. His requests were exorbitant, when we consider that he was a rebel fighting against his government, and a rebel who had been unsuccessful. Peace could only be made, said the Spanish minister, if Condé were restored not only to all his hereditary rank and wealth, but to all the honors which the king had bestowed upon him; he must be governor of Guienne and grand master of France, and in addition to this, wrote the prince, he must not be required to appear at Louis XIV.'s court unless it suited his pleasure.

Mazarin bore Condé no love; he felt that it was dangerous to grant excessive power to a man who had shown that he was ready to abuse it; and moreover the day was past when the king of France made treaties with a subject as with an independent prince. In 1656 Lionne visited Madrid as a messenger of peace, but his mission was a failure because the Spanish stubbornly insisted that Condé's pretensions must be satisfied, no matter how unreasonable in themselves, no matter at what cost to Spain; this, they said, concerned Spanish honor, and when honor was involved considerations of advantage had no weight.

It was on this ground that negotiations were broken off, but three years later they were again renewed. Condé's stubborn pride was beginning to weaken as the years of exile went on, and the Spanish were now eager for peace. The prince yielded many of his exorbitant demands, and Philip offered to increase the territory ceded to France in order to obtain more favorable terms for his ally. The cession of Avesnes softened Mazarin's

rigor; Condé acknowledged his misdeeds and was pardoned, his estates were restored, and he was made governor of Burgundy.

All these negotiations the Duc d'Aumale has described with fulness and accuracy. He has at his command the materials, whether published or unpublished, which can throw light on Condé's career, and the story is always told with that grace and clearness of style in which the author excels. If an accurate and agreeable narration of the events of Condé's life were all that was required, no criticism could be passed upon this work. But his career is hardly worth studying in such detail, unless from it some lessons can be drawn, and in this respect, it seems to us, the Duc d'Aumale is lacking. He views his hero with the favor natural, perhaps, in a biographer, in a member of the same family, in one who himself dwells where the great Condé once held his princely court. The vices of Condé's character, his greed for power and place, his impatience of legal authority, his disregard for others, the evil example he set, the harm he did to France, his readiness to plunge the country in disorder that he might gratify a selfish ambition, — these things are little impressed upon the reader. Yet to be allured by the fame of Condé's early exploits and view his career as one deserving the admiration of posterity, seems to us to be misreading the teachings of history.

Condé lived for twenty-six years after his return to France, but he was no longer a great figure in French politics. Though he had been pardoned, some time elapsed before he was regarded by Louis XIV. with entire confidence. So far as this mistrust was based upon his former career, it was without foundation; the prince came back a tamed conspirator, a repentant rebel; amid the crowd of courtiers who followed the *grand monarque* as he walked through the gardens of the Tuileries or the park of Versailles, there was not one more entirely submissive to the least intimation of the monarch's wish than the prince who for over ten years had been in open rebellion. Implicit obedience and a chastened spirit at last brought some reward. In 1667 Condé was again given the command of an army, and he served for several years in the Low Countries. Though he acquitted himself with credit, he gained no glory; the daring, the presence of mind, the quickness of conception that had made him famous, were no longer displayed. Twenty years earlier he had been thought a greater general than Turenne; now no one disputed the latter's claim to pre-eminence, and when Turenne was killed at the head of his army, Condé admitted that he was unequal to filling the vacant place. In 1675 his career as a soldier closed; he was only fifty-four years of age, but he was weighed down by infirmities, and he retired to a life of stately repose at Chantilly. There he could find consolations for the pains of disease or the disappointments of ambition. The most famous and the most charming men of France paid their court to the hero of Rocroi, and thither almost every one of European prominence at one time or another made his pilgrimage. Foreign ambassadors regarded a visit to Chantilly as part of their regular duties; ministers of state there sought relaxation;

Louis XIV. himself sometimes honored it with his presence and took part in hunts which, either in splendor or in the amount of game, could not be surpassed in France.

The prince was interested in letters, and his taste was generally correct. Molière and Racine, Corneille and Boileau, were favored with his patronage, and they, with almost every one prominent in literature, were frequent visitors at Chantilly. Many of Molière's plays were acted there, and the struggling playwright had the steadfast protection of the prince. Condé's hospitality was freely extended to all who had any claim upon his interest. "Ancient adversaries," says the Duc d'Aumale, "met ancient friends, the Huguenot jostled against the Catholic, the Cartesian conversed with the free-thinker, every one breathed at his ease the free air of this hospitable mansion."

Condé's mind was active, and he was interested in many things; he gathered a fine collection of paintings; under him the great park of Chantilly was enlarged and beautified, and the picturesque château of Chantilly was enlarged and made hideous. Thus the prince spent his declining years, enjoying the splendor of his fortune and the incense of his fame, yet free from vulgar egotism, and extending to all the stately and somewhat condescending courtesy of a great French nobleman. In 1686 he died. He has left a great name, but his insubordination cost his country more than his genius gained for her; his career was controlled by selfishness, and lacking in patriotism, and even as a soldier his reputation pales before the pure fame of Turenne.

JAMES BRECK PERKINS.

The Union of England and Scotland: a Study of International History. By JAMES MACKINNON, Ph.D. (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Co. 1896. Pp. xviii, 594.)

THIS book is on a subject that must always be interesting to students of history. There was need of a new account of the Union. The accounts of it accessible to ordinary students are of a rather meagre and perfunctory sort. The great historians, for one reason or another, have slighted the subject. Lingard stops at the Revolution; Hallam considered his work done when he reached the reign of Anne; Macaulay died before he reached the date of the Union; to Stanhope, Burton, and Lecky the parliamentary union with Scotland was but an episode in the general narrative. The book before us is designed to fill this gap by making the Union the central theme of an adequate treatment. The result is, on the whole, satisfactory. The author has gone to the contemporary sources at every point. He has found some materials that have never before been used. He has constructed a narrative that is always clear and eminently readable. He writes as a Scot even to the extent of dropping into an occasional Scotticism, and makes the Scottish side of the case the more prominent throughout; but

this was perhaps inevitable from the nature of the subject. There is no trace of narrow prejudice in the treatment.

The opening chapters are given to a description of the relations between the two kingdoms during the seventeenth century. The author shows how Scotland learned by experience that, in giving England her king, she had parted with her independence. The union of the two crowns in the person of King James was at first supposed to have ended forever the old frictions and enmities between the two kingdoms. Bitter experience showed that it brought, instead, new occasions of heartburning and hostility. The Stuart kings were not the men to reconcile the jarring interests of their two peoples. They deliberately sacrificed the allegiance of their northern subjects in the futile effort to establish a uniform system, in Church and State, throughout the whole island. Dr. Mackinnon tells how the Scotch came to regard themselves as victims of English policy; how they found the action of their government and parliament constantly hampered and coerced for purposes that seemed purely English.

The Revolution of 1688 seemed, for a little while, to have mended matters; the strong hand of William III. was able at first to keep the two kingdoms in harmony. But Dr. Mackinnon's narrative shows that the introduction of parliamentary government brought a new and formidable difficulty in its train. Scotland had all the grounds that England had for insisting on parliamentary control of the king's ministers, and a special ground of her own in addition: such control would bring emancipation from the trammels of English policy. She had, besides, a long list of grievances needing redress. Since the union of the two crowns, great changes had come in the world, particularly in the growth of colonies and the great expansion of trade in all directions. But under the Navigation Act and the general commercial system adopted in England, the people of Scotland found themselves shut out from all share in the advance. Even as regards direct trade with England herself, they were treated as people of a foreign country. As our author well remarks: —

"To all intents and purposes the English Legislature had regarded the Scots as aliens, the regal union notwithstanding. Accident had given both countries the same monarch; ill-will and the restrictive policy of the age kept them as far asunder as if a scion of the House of Orange ruled in England, and a Stuart continued to occupy the throne of Scotland."

In 1693 the Scottish Parliament entered upon a plan for building up a national commerce and a Scottish colonial system. Some of its acts were distinctly retaliatory towards England. There ensued a state of tension between the two countries which might easily have ripened into war, — in spite of the union of the crowns. The disastrous failure of the Darien colony, attributed with some little justification to English opposition and intrigue, inflamed to fever heat the indignation and wrath of the Scots. They resolved either to obtain a more satisfactory union with England or to escape from the connection altogether. The state of the succession to the crown gave them the needed opportunity. Dr. Mackinnon has done

good work in following the many threads of ministerial policy, party tactics, factional plots, and French intrigue connected with the succession question. He describes the passage of the Act of Security, and the motives of the Scottish leaders. He then takes up the course of negotiations looking towards a closer union, and gives much new light on the process by which at length a real "incorporating union" was brought about. He makes it clear that the Scottish idea of a closer union went no farther at first than a project for separate legislative action on common lines, or at most a federal connection of some sort. The insistence on a complete union was from the English side. Dr. Mackinnon shows how skilfully the English negotiators used the trade advantages of such a union, coupled with an offer of compensation for the shareholders of the Darien enterprise, as against the alternative of continued exclusion, disquiet, and possible war. He enters into the details of the religious, political, and financial questions that had to be settled: the security of the Presbyterian system against Episcopalian inroads; the securities for the peculiar laws and customs of Scotland; the "equivalent" to be allowed to Scotland in consideration of her freedom from debt, and the higher duties on foreign trade which the Union would impose on her; the number of members to be allowed her in each house of the United Parliament, etc. The effect of Marlborough's first victories is shown in the greater readiness of the Scottish negotiators to yield on subordinate points.

The final struggle in the Scottish Parliament, and the great commotion among the people, are well described. Then follow some chapters on the working of the Union, showing that its immediate results disappointed its champions, and led to attempts to "break" it. The real benefits of the Union to Scotland did not appear till after the rebellion of 1745. In a closing chapter on "Nationality and the Union" the author appears to grieve over the decay of Scottish national sentiment, as a result of the Union. But it may well be doubted whether sectional patriotism is a thing to be encouraged. There is now no nation of Scotland, and the real union of the two peoples, English and Scotch, into a single nationality is but happy evidence that their political union was wise and natural. That out of a recent past so full of all malice and uncharitableness, so close and cordial a union has been built up, is no slight token of the political sagacity that reigns on both sides of the Tweed.

History of Prussia under Frederic the Great, 1756–1757. By HERBERT TUTTLE, late Professor in Cornell University. With a Biographical Sketch of the Author by Herbert B. Adams. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co. 1896. Pp. xlvi, 159.)

THE third volume of Professor Tuttle's *History of Prussia*, published in 1888, brought the narrative of Frederic's reign down to the moment of the outbreak of the Seven Years' War. It was the author's intention

to devote the fourth volume to the events of that war, and to complete the reign of Frederic in the fifth. The completion of such a work would have enriched American historical literature in a department where it can at present show few great pieces of work. Professor Tuttle was peculiarly fitted, both by his training and by his abilities, to write on Prussian history. Few Americans have had the taste or the opportunity to make such an exhaustive study of Prussian and German institutions at first hand, and few have possessed Tuttle's keen insight and judicial fairness in estimating them.

The present volume is only a fragment, comprising the three chapters left in completed form by the author at his death in 1894. These chapters deal with the seizure of Saxony and the campaign of 1756, the diplomatic negotiations of the following winter, and the great series of battles in 1757 ending with Leuthen. The volume may be taken as a memorial of the author as well as a continuation of his history. Professor Adams has written for it an appreciative sketch of Professor Tuttle's life, and a bibliography of his writings. Tuttle's training for his work was in some respects unique. Beginning his career as a journalist soon after leaving college, he spent several years at Berlin as correspondent of the London *Daily News* and the New York *Tribune*, at that period when the new empire was passing through its formative era. During this time he was busily engaged in collecting materials for his *History of Prussia*, and, what was equally important, he was studying on the spot the inner workings of Prussian and German politics. Some of these latter studies bore fruit in a little volume on *German Political Leaders*, published in 1876. When it is considered that in no other country does the political life of the present stand in so close a relation to that of the past, the value of this preparation becomes readily apparent.

Tuttle's idea in his history was to present "the life of Prussia as a state, the development of polity, the growth of institutions, the progress of society." It covers a field, therefore, entirely distinct from that of Carlyle's *Frederick*, and is based largely on a great mass of new materials which have appeared since Carlyle's time. In the present volume, however, there is less of institutional study than in the earlier ones, since it is concerned with a period filled wholly with the events of war and diplomacy. The first chapter, on the "Seizure of Saxony," is a good sample of Tuttle's industry and fairness. The occupation of Saxony without a declaration of war was in violation of every principle of international law even as construed in that age. But, in the first place, "this change of authority was not an unmixed evil for the Saxon people. Great as were the hardships of military occupation, and irksome as was the rule of a foreign invader, the expulsion of Brühl and the overthrow of his system were compensating benefits to which the natives could not have been insensible" (p. 5). Again, the air of injured innocence assumed by the Saxon court at this time could certainly deceive nobody, since August and Brühl had known for the past two years that Frederic was secretly receiving

accurate information from the Saxon Foreign Office of their share in the coalition then forming. August's second letter of protest against the occupation could therefore hardly have been meant as a serious document, since his engagements with the imperial court were such as to render the concession of the right of passage to Frederic's armies an act of treachery. "If it had expressed real sentiments, and if international law had been understood a century and a half ago as it is understood to-day, the court of Vienna would have been the offended party, and its challenge would have converted the elector into an ally of Prussia" (p. 10). The final justification for Frederic's policy, if justification be found at all, must rest not on the basis of abstract right, but on that of a right born of necessity, and the seizure of Saxony must be placed along with the general plan of beginning the war at this time as a purely defensive movement. Knowing all that he did of what was passing between Dresden and Vienna, Frederic can easily be shown to have had considerable justification for his plea that he was beginning a defensive war.

It was an inevitable consequence of this arbitrary seizure of one state of the Empire by another that the house of Austria should use this apparent violation of the imperial constitution as a pretext to draw the other states of the Empire into the struggle for its own advantage. On the vexed question of the legality of this proceeding, Professor Tuttle preserves his usual balance. He has used the whole subject to illustrate the hopeless decrepitude and confusion into which the imperial administration had fallen. Of the preliminary edict issued by the Emperor against Frederic, he says that, "stripped of all its verbiage, the paper sounds like the hue and cry proclaimed by a sheriff against a notorious felon. This was absurd, of course, but it was not novel. The usage of the Empire still tolerated, or rather sacredly guarded, the fiction that its authority over the princes and other members was that of the officers of law over individuals, so that its violent tones neither deceived nor surprised" (p. 55). In the war of decrees and counter-decrees that followed, the one point that stands out prominently is the question whether Frederic's position was that of a rebellious subject or a hostile sovereign; whether his offence should be treated as constitutional or international. In either case the action of Austria was inconsistent; for she sought and secured the aid of the imperial body, on the ground that the offence was a German one, while negotiating for the aid of France in an international war. While hesitating to pronounce a final judgment on the constitutional questions involved, Tuttle believes that Frederic was technically wrong, but that "in a larger sense the proceedings against him were wholly devoid of any judicial character. The Austrians simply used the imperial machinery in support of their own national and dynastic interests. The emperor, the aulic council, the fiscal committee, and even . . . the diet itself, were not so many tribunals, which on account of the justice of her cause Maria Theresa was able to gain, but mere agents who lent their official characters and powers to her support" (p. 57).

That remarkable series of battles which distinguished the year 1757 was treated minutely, and in the main accurately, by Carlyle. Indeed, this may be said to have been the most truly historical portion of his work. Tuttle has not deemed it necessary to his purpose to enter at great length upon the subject, but has given in clear and compact form the essential facts about the campaign. His criticisms of Frederic's military operations, however, show that he has mastered the great body of literature that has grown up about the subject. Such a labor must have been enormous, and he is reported to have declared in his later years that "the wars of Frederic would kill him," — a prophecy which, unfortunately, proved too true. The present volume only increases the regret that its gifted author did not live to write the story of Frederic's later work as an administrator, a task for which he was especially fitted and which sadly needs the work of such a hand.

ULYSSES G. WEATHERLY.

L'Idée de l'État. Essai critique sur l'Histoire des Théories sociales et politiques en France depuis la Révolution. Par HENRY MICHEL. (Paris: Hachette et Cie. Deuxième édition. 1896. Pp. 659.)

WITHIN the last twenty years there has arisen in France a reaction against collectivism and toward individualism. To this eddy in the current of thought such books as the volume before us and Leroy-Beaulieu's *L'État et ses Fonctions* belong. It could scarcely be otherwise than that the constantly enlarging functions of the democratic state should awaken solicitude. Michel does not indeed wish to narrow the functions of the state. His object rather is to vindicate, for the individual, rights upon which the state may not encroach and claims which it may not disregard. Modern individualists have discarded the social contract as an historical fact, but they still accept it as a rational principle governing the relation between individuals and the state.

It is from this point of view that Michel examines the movement of ideas from the middle of the eighteenth century to our own day. He passes in review the writings of political philosophers, statesmen, political economists, sociologists, — in short, all who have dealt with the state, — and in each case he asks how the particular school or writer stands toward this question. As a history of the political thought of the last hundred years, the book is admirable. No one can read it without being struck with the ample learning, the discriminating judgment, the subtility of analysis, and the lucidity of expression displayed on every page. An introduction of a hundred pages deals with the period before the French Revolution. After characterizing briefly Voltaire, the Encyclopædists, and the physiocrats, the author takes up the individualistic movement of the century as embodied in its chief representatives, notably Rousseau. This outburst of individualism is attributed to the influence of the Cartesian philosophy and of

Christianity. But whatever may have been their origin, is not the general acceptance of individualistic ideas due to the political and economic situation? The individualistic philosophy of the eighteenth century is at bottom a protest against the absolute monarchy and the privileged orders. Discontent seizes the weapons nearest at hand. The more trenchant they are, the better they serve the purpose. Calvin's doctrine of predestination was an efficient weapon against a church that made salvation depend on sacraments.

The first two of the five books that form the body of the work deal with the reaction against individualism. In the first book an account is given of the political reaction as embodied in the writings of Saint-Martin, De Maistre, De Bonald, Ballanche, Lamennais, Haller, Bentham, Burke, Savigny, and Hegel. In the second book, devoted to the economic and social reaction, the author traces in the writings of the socialists, Saint-Simon at their head, the development of an enlarged conception of the functions of the state. Saint-Simon looks forward to the time when government, hitherto feudal, will pass into the hands of the industrial classes. Then its principal object will be "to ameliorate the lot of individuals." In another pregnant sentence Saint-Simon declares that political forms are less important than the law of property. This statement at once predicts a social revolution and indicates its character. Saint-Simon does not go so far as to deny the right of property, but he holds that the form of the right may change with the changing condition of society.

The third book treats of the individualistic movement in the nineteenth century, and in this connection the effect of the reaction even upon liberal opinion is clearly brought out. Among the political thinkers Royer-Collard, Benjamin Constant, and Lamartine receive special attention as representing respectively the political ideas of the Restoration, of the July Monarchy, and of the February Revolution. Characteristic of Michel's point of view is the remark that the doctrinaires regarded the franchise not as a right but as a function. Many of his readers will object to the implied assumption that liberal ideas and the doctrine of natural rights must be accepted or rejected together. A similar question in regard to the standard which the author applies suggests itself in connection with the account given in the same book of the views of the orthodox economists, who in their fear of socialism narrow the functions of the state. The author regrets their timidity, and sees in the rejection by recent writers of the doctrine of *laissez-faire* a return to the doctrines of the eighteenth century.

In the fourth book the author makes a study of writers who, like Comte, Spencer, and the scientific socialists, apply the method of science to the study of political phenomena. A trait common to these different systems is the disappearance of the opposition between the individual and the state. But such a reconciliation our author thinks can be effected only at the cost of the individual. He brings out clearly the fact that here there are two great systems face to face, the one teaching the reign of law in history as well as in science and the solidarity of successive generations, the other

attributing all progress to individual initiative considered as standing outside of and acting upon the course of events. The antithesis between these two systems is sharply brought out in the doctrines of M. Renouvier, which the author examines in the course of his fifth book, in which present tendencies are considered. According to this writer, the idea of nationality, which has played such a large rôle in the history of the present century, is misleading. The state is made up of groups separated by race, language, and religion, whose union consequently is not natural but voluntary. In like manner the impersonation of society as though it were a real being with rights and duties is without warrant; for rights and duties belong, and indeed can belong, only to individuals. In like manner the idea of progress has been misunderstood. There is no law of progress which governs society in its entirety, but only facts of progress. Progress then is due to the initiative of individuals or of voluntary associations, which break away from the dominion of custom and whose acts are not mechanical but the result of reflection.

In a closing chapter, in which the author sums up his work and brings forward his own views, there occurs a sentence which defines his position. Referring to the charge that the doctrine of natural rights is a menace to society, he remarks that the recognition of rational or natural rights can be dangerous only where against all justice their recognition is refused to the citizens. This statement at once raises the question of the origin of law. It has been the great service of the historical school to point out the connection between the laws of a community and its social and economic condition. But while law is the legal embodiment of the life of a community, it is also the expression of its will, no matter in what form that will may be formulated. But law does not, even under the most favorable circumstances, change as readily as do social and economic conditions, and hence discontent and the demand for change. But it is evident that the changes that are demanded must have the same relation to new conditions as do the existing laws to conditions that are becoming obsolete. Hence the ideals of reformers must have the same relativity as the conditions out of which they spring.

Some writers have carried the organic theory of the state so far as to overlook the fact that society is made up of individuals, and exists for their benefit. Against such views the doctrines of the individualists are a natural reaction. But reaction here, as elsewhere, goes to the other extreme. Individuals exist only in relation, and hence the social bond is as much a part of the natural order as is individual existence itself. To attempt to construct the state out of individuals, on the basis of contract, is to deny that the general has as much validity and necessity as the particular. It is to attempt to do artificially what nature has already done. Men make the state, but they can no more do otherwise than they can belie other natural instincts. Moreover, the form, which in any country or age they give to it, must be the result of national character. To divorce conduct from motive is to degrade history to annals.

Rights, to have any value, must be concrete, not mere vague abstractions. The right to live, upon which the author insists, is valueless unless supplemented by a poor-law. Even the most convinced individualist would scarcely claim that the conditions and rate of relief, varying as they do in different systems, come under the category of natural rights. If natural rights are so vague that they must receive their contents from positive law, they clearly have little value as a means of defending the individual against the omnipotence of the state. Fortunately, more efficient protection is found in the national conscience, which prevents the misuse of national power.

To dissent from the opinion of an author is by no means to disparage his book. Had M. Michel not been himself an individualist, his history of the individualistic movement since the eighteenth century would have been less appreciative and sympathetic. As it is, he has given us a most admirable account of the development of opinion, bringing out the salient points of conflicting views with such lucidity as to compel the reader to take a position. If that position is adverse to his cause, it is not the author's fault.

RICHARD HUDSON.

History of the Post-Office Packet Service, between the years 1793–1815. Compiled from records, chiefly official. By ARTHUR H. NORWAY. (London and New York: Macmillan and Co. 1895. Pp. ix, 312.)

CONTRIBUTIONS to the history of traffic are neither numerous nor always thorough in workmanship. Postal histories seem entitled to special attention, considering that they deal with the quintessence of traffic, and derive their information, in the main, from official records. Even in our day postal affairs and passenger traffic are not wholly separated, the fast trains and the principal ocean steamers being generally engaged in the mail service, without the profits of which many of them would not be maintained. Postal histories, then, have general value or interest, and it is pleasant to add that after the good beginning made by Joyce we have valuable contributions to English postal history from Hyde, Baines, and now Norway. Joyce undertook to give the postal history of England from the earliest time to the era of Rowland Hill; Hyde told the story of the seventeenth century; Baines offered modern reminiscences; and Norway gives details on the English mail-packet service from 1793 to 1815. In England a packet means a mail-boat, in the United States a passenger-boat.

The subject chosen by Norway is interesting and difficult. The period was one of war and extraordinary confusion, England being engaged in her struggle for maritime supremacy and a certain preponderance in the affairs of Europe. The struggle was highly successful, and Norway tells of the part played by the packets. Down to 1815 these packets were armed, in theory for defence, in practice for attack when occasion offered. Inci-

dentally they engaged in smuggling; but their main purpose was to carry information, official and commercial, with security and despatch, and to help in enlarging British influence, with all it implied. The details are hard to get at. The story of inland mails and mail-routes is not easily traced; sea-mails offer greater difficulties in times of peace, and necessarily lose the character of regularity in times of war, when the enemy seeks first of all to capture the mail-boats with their freight of despatches, correspondence, passengers, and treasure, the latter being uniformly carried in mail-boats. It is safe to say that Norway has done his work well. Very few of his facts will be challenged. His style is simple and vigorous; his pages breathe the salt air, and the many adventures he details should make his book attractive to readers not interested in mails and ocean routes. His illustrations indicate the revolution brought about by steam, and the Russell wagon shows how treasure and second-class passengers were carried early in this century between London and the principal packets. The change is profound, leading the author to say that "the packet service is dead" (p. 2). He describes a blind old man as "a not unfitting symbol of the decay which has fallen on the service" (p. 305).

If the author means that the great ocean mails are no longer carried in brigs and sloops, depending on the winds of heaven, he is right, and might have commented on the slow voyages made by the packets that should have been built for speed. If he means that we owe no debt to the age he discusses so well, there is room for dissent. The very routes of the ocean greyhounds were evolved in the age covered by Norway, and the principles under which the mail-contracts are let to these swift steamships are not essentially different from those of the contracts of a century ago. Take an obvious illustration. Norway mentions the origin of the service to Malta in 1806 (p. 178). Malta is one of the way-stations on the mail-route from London to Calcutta. The service to Corunna began in 1688, to Lisbon in 1705, to Gibraltar in 1727, to Malta soon after that point was taken by England. In those days the mail to India was carried round the Cape of Good Hope by the ships of the East India Company. The route to Malta fairly confronted England with the problem of a direct service to India, which was successfully met by Waghorn, and continues the most interesting mail-route under British control. In the period covered by Norway the English packet service was extended to Madeira, Brazil, and Guiana. These lines are mentioned as an incident, but were part of a great policy that contributed in no small degree to the British control of South American commerce. Indeed, it was in the struggles detailed by Norway that far-sighted men perceived the important principle that commerce is apt to follow the mails, and that a violation of this principle is fraught with mischief.

Norway's book is altogether too important not to be considered a valuable contribution to postal history. In its way it is final. But there is room for larger views. After all, the period from 1793 to 1815 was one of transition, and a full history of English mail-packets will tell us what

the age contributed to the enduring possessions of postal science. It will appear, perhaps, that Norway has not described the service "in its prime" (p. 303), but rather in its victorious transition from youth and youthful deeds to the maturity of manhood. The packet service of England had its prime in the days of William III. and Queen Anne. Its growth under the early Georges was not equal to the requirements of the empire. The struggle against Napoleon and for supremacy brought out the full resources of England, and its postal needs on land and sea were met as they arose. In sea-mails and everything implied it was the age described by Norway that gave England her supremacy, which foreign nations have envied but not effectually challenged.

C. W. Ernst.

Democracy and Liberty. By William Edward Hartpole Lecky. (New York, London, and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Co. 1896. Two vols., pp. xxi, 568; xix, 602.)

It is impossible in a review of ordinary length to give a complete idea, much less a thorough criticism, of a book that touches on so many aspects of politics and treats of so many problems in public life, as this last work by Mr. Lecky. It is necessary, therefore, to confine oneself to some of the more salient points which it presents. The first volume begins with a discussion of modern political institutions, and its dominant note is the decline of parliamentary government, attributed by the author to the wide extension of the suffrage, and to an entire abandonment of the connection between taxation and representation which was formerly the cardinal principle of the English government. Mr. Lecky is struck by the inefficiency of representative bodies in all countries, and he draws a picture of the political corruption in the United States, which, if somewhat highly colored, contains unfortunately far too much truth. Like many conservative Englishmen, however, he feels — and all the more keenly for his distrust of representative bodies — the great importance of the restraint on legislation furnished by the power of the American courts to hold statutes unconstitutional. It is certainly a striking fact that the Americans, among whom democracy on an extensive scale has been established longer than among any other people, should have been the first to learn to put their representatives under guardianship. The constitutions of many of the states are getting more and more elaborate, are limiting to a greater and greater extent the competence of the legislatures; and it is no less noticeable that within the last ten years there has been a decided increase in the readiness of the courts to hold statutes invalid on constitutional grounds. Curiously enough, this is quite as marked in the states where the judiciary is elective as it is in those where it is appointed. Nor does it seem to arouse any general disapprobation. Étienne Lamy has remarked that the great art in politics consists not in hearing those who speak, but in hearing those who are silent; and it is probable that if in America we could ascer-

tain the real sentiments of the people we should find that the activity of the courts in disregarding the acts of the legislature was highly popular.

Although Mr. Lecky is evidently of opinion that English representative institutions still work on a higher plane than those in other countries, he thinks that there is a marked decline in English parliamentary life; that there is a growing tendency to sacrifice important national interests to the ambition of the man, or the party, in order to win the votes of the various sections of the electorate. He points out the danger that legislation in the future will be the result of coalitions among a number of minorities each with a pet project that would stand no chance of being carried on its own merits. And in this connection he expresses the belief which is commonly held to-day, but which we do not share, that the great parties in England are destined to break in pieces, and be replaced by a number of small groups, such as are found in almost every legislative body on the continent. He does not attribute this to any general deterioration of the English people; for he holds that the character of the nation is by no means always shown by its public life, and that in England national character and the capacity for producing great men has not declined.

The main subject of Mr. Lecky's book is the connection between democracy and liberty, and on this he dwells at great length. He begins by referring to the fact, so often overlooked, that while in some ways the respect for personal liberty is much greater among Anglo-Saxons than in continental nations, in other ways it is much less.

"On the other hand," he says, "numerous restraints, prohibitions and punishments exist in England, and are strongly supported by English opinion, which would in other zones of thought be bitterly resented. It would seem, in many countries, a monstrous tyranny that poor parents should be compelled to send their children to school, and should be fined by a magistrate if they kept them at home in times when they most needed their services. The English Sunday wears to many Continental minds at least as repulsive an aspect as the Star Chamber would wear to a modern Englishman. That a man who wished to work on that day should not be allowed to do so; that a struggling shopkeeper should be forbidden, if he desired it, to open his shop; that a farmer should be prevented from reaping his own harvest when every fine day is of vital consequence to his interests; that poor men should be excluded by law on their one holiday from their place of meeting and refreshment; that nearly all forms of amusement, and even most of the public picture galleries, museums, and libraries should be closed on the day on which they could give the widest pleasure, would seem to many quite as serious an infringement of liberty as those acts against which Magna Charta and the Bill of Rights were directed."

The writer of this review remembers how a friend was told in Germany that it was absurd to boast of personal freedom in a country where a man was not allowed to buy a glass of beer on Sunday. The fact is that the Continental nations are less inclined than Anglo-Saxons to interfere on moral grounds with conduct which concerns the participants alone and does not affect their neighbors, while they are far more inclined to restrain

any acts that may influence the opinions or conduct of others. It is common, for example, to find on the continent that a man may drink as much as he pleases, but that without the permission of the government he cannot found a society for encouraging temperance; and that he may spend his Sundays as he likes, but may not start a religious body for the purpose of inculcating any particular observation of the day. In short, to put the matter somewhat broadly and inaccurately, it may be said that there is more private personal freedom in France than in England, but less social, corporate, or organic liberty.

Mr. Lecky takes up in turn the various kinds of liberty and their development of late years. From this point of view he discusses the subjects of religion, of education, of the observance of Sunday, of the restraint of gambling and drunkenness, and of marriage and divorce. He treats the questions that arise from the philosophic and the historical standpoint, and shows how far the tendency in each of these matters has been towards greater freedom, and how far towards greater restraint.

Perhaps the most interesting part of the book is that which is devoted to socialism and labor questions. The author begins with the fact so much emphasized of late, that socialistic theories are a "revival of beliefs which had been supposed to have been long since finally exploded — the aspirations to customs belonging to early and rudimentary stages of society." "This tendency," he remarks, "in the midst of the many and violent agitations of modern life, to revert to archaic types of thought and custom, will hereafter be considered one of the most remarkable characteristics of the nineteenth century. It may be traced in more than one department of European literature; in Tractarian theology, which seeks its ideals in the Church as it existed before the Reformation; in pre-Raphaelite art, which regards Raphael and Michael Angelo as a decadence, and seeks its models among their predecessors. These two last movements, at least, have in a great degree spent their force; but we are living in the centre of a reaction towards Tudor regulation of industry and an almost Oriental exaggeration of the powers of the State, though there are already, I think, some signs of the inevitable revolt which is to come." Democracy is certainly reversing most strangely the principles of its earlier career, and the socialists are advocating in its name doctrines which its founders regarded with the utmost aversion. Any one, indeed, who reads now for the first time Buckle's *History of Civilization* is puzzled and perplexed to understand how any one could ever have believed in a necessary connection between democracy and individual liberty.

Mr. Lecky traces the history of socialistic theories and their relation to democracy, noting how the French Revolution began with a condemnation of all restraints on the liberty of the individual, especially in such matters as restrictions upon the freedom of labor. From this time he follows the growth of modern socialism from Godwin and Saint-Simon, through the movements of 1848, down to Marx, Lassalle, and the writers of the present day who are firmly convinced that they are carrying out

the principles of 1789. He then proceeds to discuss the attempts to put socialistic theories into operation in the form of labor and factory laws. Although he considers that the attempt to organize a "vast, fluctuating, highly locomotive population . . . on the plan and framework of a socialistic state is the idlest of dreams," he recognizes the incalculable danger of experiments in this direction; and, like the classic writers, he feels that "the best security of the industrial fabric is to be found in the wide division and diffusion of property, which softens the lines of class demarcation, and gives the great masses of the people a close and evident interest in the security of property, the maintenance of contracts, the credit and well-being of the State." In spite of the increased sense of the inequality of fortunes, he believes that wealth is really becoming more and more evenly distributed. "If it is true," he says, "that, with the agglomeration of industries, great capital is more and more needed for successful industry, it is also true that a great capital is ceasing more and more to imply a great capitalist. It often consists mainly of the combination of a large number of moderate, or even very small, shareholders, and the chief industries of the world are thus coming rapidly to rest on a broad proprietary basis."

In the course of his discussion of socialism, Mr. Lecky brings into strong relief the relation between communistic principles and the institution of marriage. He points out that so long as the family exists, and parents bring up their own children, it will be impossible to overthrow the universal desire of providing for them, which can only be done by means of individual property; whereas, if all children were brought up by the State, it would be much less difficult to introduce the ownership of property in common. It is clear, therefore, that the continental socialistic writers, who decry marriage altogether, are far more logical than the English and American socialistic writers, who maintain their respect for it.

After reading the book, one cannot help feeling that Mr. Lecky's partisanship is a trifle too evident when he deals with questions of current English politics. This is unfortunate, as it mars to some extent the scientific value of his work. It must also be said that the book suffers a little from the lack of a systematic method of treatment. The subjects dealt with are not classified and arranged so as to give the reader a perfectly clear idea of their relation to one another or to democracy. Some of the phenomena, for example, which the author observes at the present day can hardly be attributed with certainty to democratic institutions. Political corruption, for example, was more rife in the England of Walpole and Newcastle than at the present day. Nor is the exceeding size of the sums that are squandered necessarily the result of an extended franchise. It is rather the result of increased productiveness and extravagance which may, perhaps, be connected with democracy, but which are certainly not a necessary result of the political institutions of the present day. The effects of democracy are indeed so mixed with the results

flowing from other causes that it is impossible for us, standing in the raging whirlpool of the present, to see clearly the various streams that are flowing about us. Although democracy is undoubtedly the cause of a good many evils, it is rash to attribute to that one source all the evils from which we suffer. It is, perhaps, safer to suspend judgment and say, with Edmond Scherer, "*La démocratie est une étape dans cette marche fatale vers un but ignoré, et dès lors la démocratie ne mérite tout à fait ni les craintes qu'elle éveille, ni l'ardeur qu'elle inspire.*"

A. L. Lowell.

The Journal of Captain William Pote, jr., during his Captivity in the French and Indian War, from May, 1745, to August, 1747. (New York: Dodd, Mead and Co. 1896. Pp. xxxvii, 223.)

The Pote journal is a manuscript volume of 234 closely written pages, $6\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ inches in size. The paper is of strong texture, and the quality of the ink is so good that one experiences no difficulty in reading every line of the manuscript. It was kept by Captain William Pote, jr., of that part of Falmouth, Me., now known as Woodford's, during his enforced residence at Quebec, as a prisoner of war. His fellow-prisoners were the Rev. John Norton and Nehemiah How, whose slender tracts of forty and twenty-two pages each have, up to this time, furnished the only record we have had of this captivity. Pote's narrative is very complete, and supplies the missing links in the chain of episodes and events. He was careful to note every incident which occurred, and nothing seems to have escaped his observant eye. When released, he took the precaution to hand the journal to one of the female prisoners, who concealed it about her person, and it thus escaped confiscation. On one of the fly-leaves is the signature of the chief engineer of Nova Scotia, John Henry Bastide, to whom the author reported on his arrival at Louisburg, and at the end is the autograph of Pote.

The "Account of the Journal" is written by Bishop John Fletcher Hurst, who acquired the manuscript while in Geneva, Switzerland, in August, 1890. He examined his "find" with curiosity and delight, though at first he was not quite sure of its value. On his return to America he submitted the treasure to Messrs. George H. Moore, Wilberforce Eames, and Charles L. Woodward, of New York, skilled students of colonial Americana, and their opinion influenced his determination to publish it. As a result, we have a valuable, interesting, and sumptuous book. The edition comprises 350 copies on Holland hand-made paper, and twenty-five extra copies on Japan paper, octavo. There is a frontispiece on parchment paper, showing Bellin's "Plan of Annapolis Royal," taken from Charlevoix's *Nouvelle France*. There is a sketch-map giving the route of Captain Pote's toilsome journey to Quebec. Dr. Hurst's "account" is supplemented by an exceedingly useful historical introduction, from the pen of that eminent genealogist and scholar, Mr. Victor H. Paltsits, of the

Lenox Library, who briefly recounts the story of the Louisburg expedition, and supplies the annotations, all of the appendix except "The Pote Family," and the index. The volume is rich in portraits, plans, and maps. Among these are Smybert's Sir William Pepperell, Governor William Shirley, the city and fortifications of Louisburg, after Gridley, view of Quebec, from Popple's map, fac-simile pages of the original Pote journal, Annapolis Royal, and Bastide's pay-bill to Pote. Accompanying this volume, and bound up in the same style, is the large folded map by Charles Morris, of the Northern English colonies and French neighboring settlements, 1749, taken partly from actual surveys, and partly from the most approved draughts and other accounts.

In the appendix will be found accounts of the Pote family, John Henry Bastide, the superior officer of Pote, to whom the journal was given, Colonel John Gorman, Captain David Donahew, and John Paul Mascarene, Lieutenant-Governor of Nova Scotia. Added to the journal is a list of prisoners' names, who died while the author was at Quebec.

Captain William Pote, jr., was the master of the schooner *Montague*, which was employed for a time in carrying artificers and supplies for the repair and defence of the English fort at Annapolis. He was captured by the French and Indians, with his vessel, on May 17, 1745, in Annapolis Basin, between Goat Island and Scotch Fort on the shore, about five miles from Annapolis Royal. His capture was regarded as a serious loss by the English; for he was a skilful navigator, and well versed in the art of making surveys, several of which are still in existence. He was taken to Quebec by a circuitous route, and endured great hardships along the way. After pillaging the *Montague*, the captors pinioned Pote and his ill-fated companions, and conveyed them ashore into the presence of the general, who sent the party to the French stronghold as prisoners. Their adventures and privations are faithfully set down in the pages of the *Journal*. They remained in prison two years and three months. Though repeated applications were made in their behalf, it was not until July 30, 1747, that they were released, and, under a flag of truce, conveyed by the *Comet Bumb* to Cape Breton. He thus describes his departure, the spelling, punctuation, and capital letters of the original text being preserved: —

> Thirsday ye 30th July 1747 at about 2 Pm we Come to Sail and Took our Departure from Quebec which I have been Longing and wishing for above two Years after we had Sailed about a mile and a half ye Capt Informd us it was ye Generals ordres we must be put down below ye Deck, and order^{d} us all down. ye other two masters of Vessells Viz James Sutherland and Willm Lambert and my Self was ordered down in ye Cabbin after which ye Compases was ordered by ye Capt to be all Lock^{d} up. and we Kept Below for Some time till they had passed Several Eminent Dangers Viz Shoals Rocks and Sands &c ye Capt Came down in ye Cabbin and Draw^{d} his Cutlash and Leaving ye Scabord Behind him Ran up upon ye Deck with all possible Expedition Swearing by God and all angels and Saints yt if any of his people ye french Sailors was In any manner Delitary and did not Carefully observe his orders to a moment he would Separate their heads from their Bodys with his Cutlash. and Spoke from time to time with an audible Voice Starboard port and thus &c. and Swore by all yt was Good yt he

would murther Some of them In a Verey Short time. we hearing Such a Confus[d] Noise upon Deck and Susspected this was on purpose to Deceive us as we had been so long acquainted with their Subtilty.

They arrived at Louisburg on the 14th of August. The *Journal* is carefully edited, and as a contribution to the history of the Five Years' War, it furnishes a chapter of rare value and interest, and marks an event of no common literary importance.

GEORGE STEWART.

Acadia: Missing Links of a Lost Chapter in American History. By an Acadian (EDOUARD RICHARD), ex-member of the House of Commons of Canada. (New York: Home Book Company, 45 Vesey Street. Two vols., pp. 392, 384.)

WHEN Parkman first treated the Acadian question twelve years ago, his mind was in a state of reaction against the sentimental view of the deportation which Longfellow had embodied in *Evangeline*. The Carlylian admiration of what was strong, even though also cruel and relentless, was much in vogue, and Parkman's narrative of the Acadian tragedy is quite in Carlyle's spirit. To him the Acadians appeared to have met a fate, stern but, on the whole, deserved. Nearly ten years later in *A Half Century of Conflict* he quietly retracted something; but both narratives are as gall and wormwood to those who understand the Acadian side of the question.

It was not long before answers to *Montcalm and Wolfe* began to appear. The Abbé Casgrain published in 1887 his *Pèlerinage au Pays d'Évangeline* — a strong book marred by an absurd title — and M. Rameau de Saint-Père, a French gentleman of means who has devoted forty years to the study of the history of the Acadians, re-published in 1889 his *Colonie Féodale en Amérique*, a work of less merit than Casgrain's, but showing great industry. These two books embody the French and Acadian view of the deportation. Neither of them has been translated, and there was distinctly room for a work in English which should be an answer to Parkman. This Mr. Richard now offers.

In collecting materials to answer Parkman, the Abbé Casgrain found much that was new. The principal source of information on the Acadian question had been hitherto the volume of *Nova Scotia Archives*, published by the government of that province in 1869, under the editorial care of Dr. Thomas B. Akins. Casgrain searched with great industry at London and Paris. He unearthed also important documents hitherto buried in the archives of the Seminary at Quebec, which was closely associated with the Acadian missionaries, and, to complete his preparation, he visited the settlements of the dispersed Acadians which continue to this day not only in Canada, but also in France and the United States. His zeal was rewarded by his being able to show that the Acadians were the innocent victims of both English and French cruelty, and that their sufferings were enormously greater than had hitherto been supposed. This view of the

question was accompanied by the charge that Parkman had wilfully closed his eyes to evidence lying before him, and that Dr. Akins, the compiler of the volume of *Archives*, had designedly omitted documents favorable to the Acadians. The defence of Dr. Akins, a gentleman highly respected, was that he had published what he had found at Halifax, and that he had never been in Europe to make researches. His agents, however, had reported in regard to the archives there, and it is hard to resist the conclusion that he was either imposed upon by others or misled by his own prejudices. Parkman made partial amends in his later volume, and when the smoke of the controversy has blown away it will be reasonably clear that Casgrain's view is substantially correct.

One says Casgrain's view, because Mr. Richard, though his work is more copious, has brought to light no new records, and adds little to the discussion. He is an Acadian by descent, and gives some pathetic instances of the sufferings which his own ancestors endured (II. 120, 212, 255 *n.*). In most cases the members of families were separated from each other and reunion was often impossible. These painful memories still linger in Acadian homes, and from childhood Mr. Richard has brooded over the harrowing tale. This explains and excuses much that he writes. He claims to have thought more intensely on the question than any one else (I. 186), but this, instead of an advantage, may be a disqualification for writing calm history. He is unfair to nearly every one concerned in the deportation. Lawrence, the English governor of Nova Scotia, who is responsible for it, was cruel and relentless enough, but Mr. Richard's language is too strong. Lawrence is "totally devoid of moral sense and utterly heartless" (I. 342), "a scoundrel" (II. 22), "an odious despot" (II. 38), deaf to mercy "like the wolf, like the cat," and, finally, "his soul leers . . . in all its naked hideousness" (II. 60). Mr. Richard labors hard to show that Lawrence deported the Acadians solely that he might grow rich by seizing their property. Vague contemporary charges are indeed made, but the *Canadian Archives Report* for 1894 shows clearly that there was at Halifax a general fear of the French sympathies of the Acadians when war with France was imminent. This of course does not justify, but it explains the deportation.

Mr. Richard's language regarding Dr. Akins is equally unmeasured, and he goes so far as to reproach him for omitting documents of whose existence we have no knowledge (I. 194). Parkman, however, is his especial victim. The Puritan historian is "superficial and dishonest" (II. 159), "a cheat" and a "literary malefactor" (II. 190). When Mr. Richard says that Parkman "has reduced historical trickery to a fine art" (II. 159), one only wishes that a few more could learn the trick; and when he says that he "is never accurate" (II. 162), we are not listening to the language of sober reason. Parkman has obvious faults, but a French-Canadian should be grateful to the scholar who first taught the English-speaking world that New France has a history.

Mr. Richard's criticism of Parkman invites inquiry into his own

method. He has an acute mind and a liberal spirit, when his prejudices are not aroused, but little narrative power. Keen as is his interest in the subject, he has not prepared himself adequately for his task. It is amazing to find that a historian of the deportation has not read Winslow's *Journal* (II. 114), which contains the only detailed contemporary narrative, and is easily accessible in the publications of the Nova Scotia Historical Society. Mr. Richard quotes Casgrain frequently, but, in other places, copies him almost *verbatim* without acknowledgment (cf., *e.g.*, II. 242 with Casgrain's *Pèlerinage*, Paris edition, 1890, pp. 155, 156). He has not yet learned the sound method that Parkman knew so well, of giving precisely the book or document which is used as authority. It is exasperating to have "an historian" quoted (II. 310) without knowing who, and to have an admittedly imaginary letter printed as if real (I. 124). If the author had revised his book, cut out all repetition, all the imaginary mental operations of his characters, and all vituperation, he would have reduced its bulk by one half, and, at the same time, have made it more effective. Even as it stands, it is noteworthy, and ought forever to silence the flippant plea that the sufferings of the Acadians were light and well-deserved.

GEORGE M. WRONG.

The United States of America, 1765–1865. By EDWARD CHANNING, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of History in Harvard University. (New York: Macmillan and Co. 1896. Pp. ix, 352.)

THIS volume is the fourth in "The Cambridge Historical Series." It covers the political history of the United States from the passage of the Stamp Act to the surrender at Appomattox. The author has sought to tell his story simply and yet to give the most important results of modern research. He has not tried to air any new ideas or theories, or to go out into the byways in search of strange facts, but only to relate in a plain, straightforward fashion the main historical events of a century. The preface modestly puts aside any claim of originality, and frankly acknowledges dependence on the larger and more trustworthy of the secondary histories in writing a considerable portion of the volume. It is plain enough, however, that he has written with great judgment, and used both original and secondary material with the trained discernment of the scholar; while the very effort to keep within beaten paths and not to run far afield in search of needless scraps of learning has made the book sane and sensible and suited to the needs of the readers for whom it is meant. The narrative is unadorned, but the tale is well told, and its parts are well balanced.

To the special student of American history, perhaps also to the average reader, the first chapter is of the utmost value; so valuable is it that the book would have merit were the succeeding pages of little worth. In this chapter, which treats of the industrial and social life of the colonies in the

middle of the century, Professor Channing is thoroughly at home, and speaks as one with authority; every sentence is the result of careful thought and study, and every paragraph is crowded with information. That there is nothing startling and little that is new does not detract from the worth of pages where each statement is the conclusion of scholarly investigation. In other chapters the author has shown almost equal skill in filling his pages with facts and in summing up a situation in a few words. For example, the commercial relations between America and Europe in the years preceding the War of 1812 are presented in a single paragraph with clearness and with fulness sufficient to enable the ordinary reader to appreciate the chief difficulties and perplexities of the times.

The limitations of the foreign reader have been kept in mind in the preparation of this volume, inasmuch as it belongs to a series intended largely for European readers. This fact has caused the intrusion of some material and explanations that otherwise might have been omitted. On the other hand, although the social and industrial life of the American people at various times is clearly and succinctly set forth, and although these passages contain a great deal of valuable and well-selected matter, the author has made no serious effort to show how the character of the people has been continually changing, and how these changes have affected the forms, the problems, and the progress of the state. No British reader can understand the Jacksonian era in politics unless he sees and knows the Jacksonian era in the conduct and energies of the men who made up parties and took part in government, unless he sees that the extravagances and excitement and excesses of partisanship were more than equalled by the turbulence and buoyancy of every-day life, unless he sees that for the first time the new West and the frontier had taken the whip-hand in political management and that the masses of the people were ready to act upon the teachings of ultra-democratic philosophy. Professor Channing had done so much in the small space allowed him that it is somewhat unseemly to criticise him for not doing more; but his book would be of more value to the casual reader if he had connected his social studies with the political phenomena.

Although the book is evidently written with care and painstaking, there are a few evidences of the truth of the assertion which the author makes in his preface, — that "it is practically impossible to be absolutely accurate in a work of this size." The smallness of the volume adds in a way to the difficulties of attaining accuracy, because a short, unqualified assertion may contain a modicum of error though it be true on the whole, or a statement true in itself may induce quite wrong conclusions. It is scarcely correct to say that the jurisdiction of the supreme court "is confined to cases 'arising under this constitution'" (p. 127), or to say that Washington issued his proclamation of neutrality in 1794 and to convey the impression that it was issued some time after the landing of Genet and after he had broken "the promises which he had made to the secretary of state" and after he had defied the government (pp. 147, 148). Although Pennsylvania

may be justly contrasted with Virginia in considering the effects of slavery, it is not quite right to declare that there were no slaves in the former state at the beginning of the century (p. 162). One is at liberty at least to doubt the assertion that "the Jeffersonian system of commercial warfare as a matter of fact brought about the repeal of the Orders in Council." Henry Adams says, "Every one knew that the danger, already almost a certainty, of an American war, chiefly caused the sudden and silent surrender, and that the ministry, like the people, shrank from facing the consequences of their own folly."

One who believes that since the adoption of the Constitution the American people have been legally a state, and that Calhoun and Jefferson Davis were technically as well as morally wrong, will regret to find that Professor Channing has added the weight of his name to the latter-day doctrine that Webster proclaimed a new theory of the Constitution and that Hayne defended the old, the one therefore legally correct. Regret will be deepened by finding that the author quotes with apparent approval the meaningless opinion of Mr. Lodge that at first the Union was looked upon as a mere "experiment" from which each state had the "right peaceably to withdraw." That the Union was at first an experiment, the success of which was uncertain, no one will deny; but that fact does not make the new state a confederation; the fact that a law may prove ineffective and be broken does not prove that it was not meant to be law after it has been established and obeyed. The trustworthiness of Mr. Lodge's statement on this matter might be seen by the fact that in the very paragraph from which the words above quoted are taken, he also says that "when the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions appeared they were not opposed on constitutional grounds, but on those of expediency and of hostility to the *revolution* [*!*] which they were considered to embody." This is not only poor logic but false in fact. The fourth volume of Elliot's Debates contains the answers of the Federalist state legislatures repudiating the doctrines of the Resolutions on constitutional grounds.

In spite of a few trivial errors, and in spite of the fact that the author has, as I believe, gone wrong on the great fundamental principle underlying our constitutional history, the book is a result of sound scholarship and good sense, and is a valuable addition to the works on American history. It deserves to be widely read both in Europe and in America; and the reader may be sure that he can nowhere obtain a clearer, fairer narrative, or one fuller of valuable and well-chosen facts.

A. C. McLaughlin.

The Life of Thomas Hutchinson, Royal Governor of Massachusetts Bay. By James K. Hosmer. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co. 1896. Pp. xxviii, 453.)

Governor Hutchinson's title to commemoration in an extended biography rests solely upon his conduct of various public trusts in Massachu-

setts, and his merits as a historian. In both these respects, we think, recent writers unduly magnify his deserts. As a historian his pages shine only by contrast with the dry and promiscuous records of great and small events left by his predecessors, from Bradford and Winthrop to Prince, not excluding the *Magnalia*. In point of style, his simple, natural sentences are as pleasing and as free from solecisms as the average compositions of the best English scholars of his time. He is not, however, equally happy in his narrative. This fact is explained by his negligent use of materials. He tells us that for thirty years he had been collecting data for his history from all available sources. The papers he inherited from his father and grandfather must have been rich in details that could be used to great advantage in clearing many obscurities, which apparently he did not deem worthy of consideration. His access to other private collections, especially those of the Mathers, ought to have enabled him to elucidate some neglected points which now appear to be important; but from these he culled only superficially, alluding to them in a manner to tantalize rather than satisfy the reader.

His failure to avail himself of the records of the British government may be excused on account of the attendant difficulty and expense; but there was no excuse for his ignoring the newspapers and other contemporaneous literature or any of the records of the province. Yet the secretary's files and the journals of the representatives of the period during which he was in the public service, he seems to have consulted rarely, or not at all.

He appears to have adopted as the basis of his history of the province, the legislative journals of the governor and council, commonly known as the General Court Records. What the *News-Letter* was to Penhallow, and, indirectly, to his plagiarist, Niles, — what Bradford's history was to Morton, — these defective and inadequate volumes were to Hutchinson. The proofs of this are abundant; but the single instance of his silence with regard to the disastrous expedition under Admiral Vernon against Carthagena must suffice here. By the great fire of 1747 both the legislative and executive records of the council covering that period were destroyed. Although at the time Hutchinson was a prominent member of the legislature, he makes not the slightest allusion to this event, which threw a pall over Massachusetts and Virginia by the loss of a large part of the quotas they contributed to Vernon's forces — a calamity which awakened the sympathies of Europe, was celebrated in elegiac strains in Thomson's *Seasons*, and is imperishably associated with the name of the home of Washington.

His carelessness is also shown in his inexcusable misrepresentation of important events within his official cognizance, as well as in his account of the administrations of Phips, Stoughton, Dudley, — in short, nearly all who preceded him in directing the executive affairs of the province.

One intimately familiar with the details of the actions and motives of public men, throughout the whole period which his history covers, gets the

impression that the author had a purpose ulterior to an impartial description of the progress of the people, which is his professed aim. The feeling is irresistible that the historian is more intent upon showing how the theories he entertained of the need of closer relations with, and dependence upon, the imperial government were regularly evolved, and upon magnifying his own efforts to establish them.

His silence upon matters indicative of the advance of civilization — the cultivation of the amenities of social intercourse and the growth of humane sentiments — is provoking. Between the date of the province charter and the end of his career a revolution had taken place in New England in every department of human industry, in the art of living, and in the means of intellectual culture, greater, perhaps, in proportion, than during the same number of years before or since. All the steps of this wonderful progress Hutchinson deems unworthy of especial notice. As a judge of courts of ecclesiastical, civil, and common-law jurisdiction, he could scarcely have failed to be aware of the process of development in each, yet he gives us no account of the agency by which great changes in all of them were effected; on the contrary, his incautious statements have, in some instances, misled those who, in studying our jurisprudence, have too implicitly relied upon his authority.

Yet these defects of the historian are overlooked by his apologists for no conceivable reason, unless it be that none of his contemporaries having had the same motive, or enjoying the leisure, the pecuniary means, or the command of resources required for the execution of such a work, his performance, however inferior in absolute merit, and however incommensurate to his opportunities, is without a rival.

As a politician and public officer, his views and achievements are extolled, and his faults are palliated with the partial zeal of the advocate, rather than the judicial candor of the historian. The opinion entertained of him by the patriots of the American Revolution is ascribed to fallacious views of the constitutional relations of England and her American colonies, and to personal resentment or partisan hostility. To sustain the latter accusation, his own questionable imputations of unworthy motives to his opponents are repeated with, at most, only equivocal apologies or feeble intimations of dissent; and, to vindicate the former charge, the tyrannical principles of the ministers of George III. are assumed to be in strict accordance with the British constitution.

English writers, adopting the traditions of the lawyers, still naturally cherish the ultra-Tory views professed by Blackstone and Lord Mansfield. Our historians of the new school deferentially concur in accepting these opinions as incontrovertible against the cardinal doctrines of the great lawyers and political philosophers who were the chief agents in preparing the English nation for the Revolution of 1688, and against the impassioned protests of later statesmen like Pitt and lawyers like Camden. Some of the more enterprising of this new school, in their zeal to excuse the Tories of the American Revolution, go farther than their British rivals, and hold

that the theories of the early advocates of civil liberty became obsolete upon the accomplishment of the English Revolution; that that overturn, instead of being chiefly memorable as having exterminated the old superstition of the

"Right divine of kings to govern wrong,"

changed the fundamental law, and gave to Parliament an ascendency which had not previously been accorded to it, thus making it essentially despotic. To this, however, no English writer of acknowledged authority has as yet assented. On the contrary, the general voice of England applauds Macaulay's echo of the opinion, "of all the greatest lawyers, of Holt, of Treby, of Maynard and Somers," that "the whole English law, substantive and adjective, was exactly the same after the Revolution as before it."

The shifting issues of the American Revolution were finally reduced to this single question of the absolute supremacy of Parliament; the Tories affirming it, the patriots denying it.

Now, in this issue, we shall assume — since the limits of this review preclude extended argument — that all the law and the facts are not against the patriots; and that those of us who adhere to the American doctrine, even if we choose to waive the privilege of pleading in bar the judgment which our fathers obtained by the arbitrament of arms — the *ultima ratio regum* — in their war against unconstitutional acts of Parliament, need never fear of being worsted in an encounter with the ablest champions of Toryism, if we are wise enough not to discard the patriots' panoply.

The comprehension of the full import of the doctrine that there were possible proceedings of Parliament that were *ultra vires* was the result of long deliberation and experiment, during which its adherents sometimes hesitated and were often inconsistent. But, dispassionately considered, it is difficult to see how it involves a paradox or derogates from the lawful supremacy of Parliament, or impairs the sovereignty of the crown or of the nation.

The theory of collateral and mutual rights between the mother country and her colonies derived from this doctrine was treated by Hutchinson as monstrous and the promulgation of it as seditious. It is fair to suppose that he failed to perceive its practicability, but this seems to have been the result of an inveterate prejudice founded on his contempt for democratic ideas. He met the arguments of the patriotic party by the sophistical counter-arguments of the high Tories. By a line of reasoning equally plausible, Filmer had learnedly demonstrated the absolute authority of Charles II. not only to rule and levy taxes, but to make and execute the laws. On the abstract question of the omnipotence of Parliament he was willing to admit that the inherent rights of an Englishman would remain in him, notwithstanding an act of Parliament to the contrary; but he qualified this admission by absurdly affirming that the exercise of the inherent right must be suspended during the continuation of the act.

Before the interference of Parliament in the affairs of the province had been resented as unconstitutional, the power of the prerogative which, in the days of the colony, had gradually grown more and more oppressive, until it culminated in the usurpation of Andros, was reasserted, and had long been a source of friction between the crown and the province.

In all the conflicts that occurred with the Privy Council and with Parliament, Hutchinson's sympathies were with the home government, and he acted as if he believed that the functions of a governor and the duty of a loyal subject were principally to admonish the people and restrain their inconsiderateness and seditious tendencies, and to favor the purpose at Whitehall and Westminster to coerce the colonies into proper subjection as mere tributaries of the realm.

He was born a conservative. In early manhood he courted the society of the young scions of the nobility among the officers of the army and navy stationed at Boston, and he informs us that as a child the sufferings and death of Charles I. made him weep. This sentimental tenderness in a descendant of ancestors who, he well knew, had endured or witnessed the cruel persecutions of the Puritans in the reign of that unfeeling monarch, indicates a natural proclivity in harmony with his subsequent career.

For all his complaisance, he received from his official superiors the empty meed of their approval for having done his duty. This did not satisfy his ambition. He craved higher distinction if not greater reward. He understood something of the arts of the courtier. Like Joseph Dudley, between whom and him the parallel is, in many respects, striking, he let it be understood in England that he was not opposed to an abridgment, in the province, "of what are called English liberties." He resisted zealously, though sometimes covertly, every suggestion for relaxing the rigor of imperial control and every protest against British interference, and he was astute in finding some ground for sneering at, or disparaging, every aspirant to larger liberty. He was superserviceable as an informer both against individuals and public measures deemed by him unfavorable to the designs of the Privy Council, or at variance with the declared will of Parliament. He never remonstrated against, if he did not suggest, those instructions and orders in council strictly forbidding the governor to assent to any bill to encourage those trades and manufactures in the province which were in any degree prejudicial to the trades and manufactures of the kingdom.

He visibly adhered to the Congregational denomination in which he was brought up and for which, evidently, he had a strong partiality on account of the simpler rites and primitive discipline which his Puritan ancestry had helped to establish. But his tolerant inclination to the Church of England, shown in his unconcern at the schemes of the Bishop of London to establish the Episcopal hierarchy in America, might have ended in outward conformity to a Low Church ritual, had not prudence restrained him from rashly committing an act by which he would have forfeited all hope of retaining the good-will and political influence of the

powerful body of Dissenters in England — a sacrifice not to be willingly suffered unless with the more than equivalent assurance of royal favor and support.

Such are some of the characteristics of the man whose vaulting ambition, having carried him to the highest attainable civil positions, at length "o'erleaped itself."

That he had good qualities, socially, does not so much concern the biographer as do the services which he rendered to the public. Most men are well thought of by their friends and neighbors, and no refined mind but must be often charmed at the exhibition of pure and simple tastes in men of high station, and touched by their demonstrations of parental tenderness or conjugal love and fidelity. These attractive traits are not singular in any age. They were possessed by hundreds of fameless fathers and husbands in and about Boston in Hutchinson's day, and before and since.

The destruction of Hutchinson's house and his papers by the mob was as infamous an act of lawlessness as was ever perpetrated in Boston, and in the minds of all decent men will always provoke indignation and excite pity and regret. But impartial observers of the manner in which popular impulses find expression will remember that such acts of violence by men of English stock are usually either the blind resentments of the actually oppressed or are incited by fear of the loss of liberties dearer than life and property. In England almost every great reform since the Conquest has been brought about by just such means. Until the reform acts furnished a safety-valve by extending the privilege of electors, the mob was more worthy to be deemed the "fourth estate" of the kingdom than the press. This Hutchinson must have known, and ought to have considered in forecasting the consequences of an abridgment of popular liberties.

No lover of peace and good order can sincerely lament that the contemplation of Blackstone's picture of the beauties of the English system had not deluded our fathers into adopting and perpetuating it here, or regret that in England the freedom of speech and of the press, and the extension of the elective franchise and of eligibility to Parliament, which, directly or indirectly, are attributable to the American Revolution, have purged it of its constituent element of violence upon which its admirers are reluctant to dwell.

Mr. Hosmer joins the ranks of Hutchinson's defenders with the frank avowal that his fame "deserves a *rescue* after the long obloquy," and that he has found it a grateful task to attempt for him a "*Rettung*" — adopting the word which Lessing applied to his projected essays for retrieving the reputation "of great men of the past to whom harsh measure has been dealt out." No one who has compared Mr. Hosmer's *Life of Samuel Adams* with the present volume will be disappointed to find that, as between the two, he is more in sympathy with Hutchinson. This is a necessary consequence of his concurrence in the new-school views from which we dissent. Hence, too, we are not surprised to find in the present book

indications that the author has not escaped the infection which, Macaulay declares, biographers "are peculiarly exposed to — the *Lues Boswelliana*, or disease of admiration."

In his zeal to give the color of merit to the cause in which Hutchinson so signally failed and so grievously suffered, he likens the Tory refugees to the exiled Huguenots, and speaks of "that one error" — "their mistaken and unfortunate choice of sides in that last crisis" — as the extent of the offence which "has cancelled in the minds of their countrymen all their excellence."

He finds sanction for Hutchinson's aristocratic ideas in an oligarchic apothegm by Governor Winthrop, and in Matthew Arnold's doctrine of "the remnant" — both of which he cites with no word of disapproval, and fortifies with his own declaration that "many, possibly an increasing number, in our own day will say that" Hutchinson "was nearer right than his enemies." He leaves with us the impression that in his opinion the political system which our fathers bequeathed to us, and to which he applies Fisher Ames's comparison of a raft — always partly under water but never sinking — is not without besetting perils. "Many," he lugubriously tells us, "who until now have floated upon the raft confidently begin to feel that it must be forsaken."

He seizes upon Herbert Spencer's declarations "that his faith in democracy is gone, and that we are on the high road to military despotism" as a good excuse to "ordinary men" for doubting the stability of "institutions heretofore cherished and implicitly trusted." Having sounded this demoralizing note, he concludes that it is wise to "make the best of" the situation, and seeing we are "on the raft for good and all," to assume an air of confidence solely in deference to the gratuitous and somewhat conflicting theory that, in "an Anglo-Saxon community, the people can and ought to take care of themselves."

He strives to hold the scales of judgment in equipoise, but without a clear perception of the essence of the injustice that he would avoid. What he assumes as the basis of an explanation is not always according to the fact. His mistaken parallel of the constitutional objection to the exaction by Parliament of duties of impost from the colonies to the controversies in our day concerning the expediency of tariff or free trade does not extenuate the offence of the advocacy of parliamentary supremacy. It serves only to obscure his meaning to those of his readers who are aware of the acts — never complained of and rarely evaded — which were annually passed by the provincial legislature for placing, upon imported goods, duties to be collected by our own officers of the customs. His charge, therefore, of wholesale "smuggling" by the New England merchants — an offence which he charitably endeavors to extenuate by dividing the responsibility with the conniving collectors of the customs — needs to be qualified, since, if he means to limit it to the evasion of acts of Parliament, he is begging the question: he should not close his eyes to the fact that, if the denial of the constitutionality of those acts was valid, they were void;

and that even a custom-house oath prescribed by a void statute was then, as now, neither legally nor morally binding.

The defects we have thus summarized are attributable to the same fault of which we have accused Hutchinson — failure to make use of the materials which the public records afford. But in this respect Mr. Hosmer's shortcoming is not exceptional. It is a common fault, and one which finds easy condonation in historical circles where, as a rule, speed in book-making wins more applause than thoroughness or exactness. Had he studied the charter and the records of the province as industriously as he has the compilations of other authors, he would have avoided such a slip as the error of limiting the governor's right of veto in the election of councillors. The same precaution would have prevented his confounding the bills of public credit with the issues of the Land Bank. Neither would he have regarded with favor the action of Parliament in suppressing the latter. The retroactive declaration by which the Bubble Act was used for that purpose was an abuse of power which Mr. Andrew McFarland Davis, who has given us the benefit of his exhaustive examination of the whole subject, condemns as unreasonable and tyrannical. At all events, there is no doubt, as he asserts, that it led men to question whether they could abide the exercise of any such power — thus fostering a spirit of resistance which culminated in the Revolution.

However his pessimistic views may invite dissent, there are other features of Mr. Hosmer's work which entitle him to unqualified praise. Chief among these is the fidelity and thoroughness with which he has explored all the materials left by Hutchinson, and the respectful consideration which he has given to the labors of others in or about the same field, including the essays wherein writers of another new school of history have endeavored to trace to remote antiquity ideas and institutions which are claimed to have attained fruition if not perfection in our Anglo-American republic. Nor is he less to be commended for his habit of never consciously concealing any fact that might be availed of to the disadvantage of the subject of his biography. Although he may incline to a construction either favorable or unfavorable of any act or sentiment, he never omits to present it honestly for the consideration of the reader.

These are admirable qualities, but they are not sufficient to give his book the value of an authority. When we consider how much Mr. Hosmer has done in the line of biography and how skilfully he has used the materials at hand, it not only excites our respect for his ability and our wonder at his industry, but our regret that he has not been encouraged to drink at the fountain-head, regardless of the time required, and with absolute exemption from all distracting cares.

Abner C. Goodell, Jr.

The Winning of the West. By THEODORE ROOSEVELT. Vol. IV., Louisiana and the Northwest, 1791–1807. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1896. Pp. vi, 363.)

MR. ROOSEVELT has done a real service to our history in his volumes on the West. He has rescued a whole movement in American development from the hands of unskilful annalists; he has made use of widely scattered original sources, not heretofore exploited; and with graphic vigor he has portrayed the advance of the pioneer into the wastes of the continent. He has considered his subject broadly, in its relations to world-history, not in the spirit of the local historian. This is an admirable thing to do; and Mr. Roosevelt's appreciative sympathy with the frontiersman, due in part to his own Western experiences, has enabled him to depict the movement as probably no other man of his time could have done. The difficult question of the relations between the Indian and the pioneer he has handled in a courageous and virile way that enables the reader to correct the well-intentioned, but not altogether well-founded, criticisms of the Indian relations of the nation by Eastern writers. He has brought into prominence an important, but much-neglected, subject by unfolding our relations with Spain and England respecting the frontier, and has given a valuable treatment of the tortuous intrigues of Western leaders with the Spaniards and the French. These are some of the strong features of Mr. Roosevelt's work. They indicate the value of his contribution to the work of constructing the truly national history of the United States, — a work that remains to be accomplished.

The author's conception of his subject is well indicated in its title: it is of the acquisition and early settlement of the West that he writes. He is not particularly concerned with the reactive influences of the West upon the East, nor with the development of institutions, nor with the later history of events, in the areas across which the waves of pioneer life passed. It is the dramatic and picturesque aspects of the period that most interest him, — the Indian fighting, the intrigues with Spain, and the exploration of the far West. He handles the subject with dash and lightness of touch; and sometimes this facility shows itself in a readiness to pass over institutional development with a comment of praise or blame, instead of information that the reader has a right to expect. He frequently fails to work his subject out into its less obvious relations; and the marks of actual haste are plain in careless proof-reading and citations. He does not hesitate to use his pages as a means of impressing his views of parties and party policies upon his readers, and he frequently enlivens his pages with a *hæc fabula docet*, for the benefit of the present generation.

The fourth volume adds evidence to the existence of these merits and defects. The opening chapters afford abundant proof of Mr. Roosevelt's skill in handling the picturesque. The campaigns of St. Clair and Wayne are not likely to be better presented than in the author's pages; and he has an excellent analysis of the confused conditions of treaties, of the diffi-

cult or impossible task of discriminating between friendly and unfriendly Indians, and of the forces of expansion that would have found occasion for the conquest of the wilderness, even if the savages had not given occasions. The reluctance of the government to undertake offensive operations against the Indians is forcibly illustrated by citations from Knox's and Pickering's papers. That the East finally backed the West, was due, the author thinks, to four main reasons: In some states, as in Virginia and Georgia, the frontiersmen were of such numerical importance as to affect the action of the state; the fathers or grandfathers of a large class of people had been frontiersmen, and frontier interests and traditions survived in older localities; in many communities were people whose kinsmen or friends had gone to the border; and the feeling of race and national kinship could be depended on to support the frontiersman when victory was doubtful. Mr. Roosevelt assents to Professor McLaughlin's view of British responsibility in these Indian wars, and criticises the British for treachery in abandoning their Indian allies.

Under the caption "Tennessee becomes a State," the author brings together an interesting mass of material on the difficult Indian questions that confronted Governor Blount; the economic and social conditions of the raw community; the land speculations; the treacherous intrigues of Carondelet with Wilkinson and other Western leaders, as well as with the savage enemies of these frontiersmen; the attempt of Elijah Clark, of Georgia, to set up an independent community in the lands claimed by Spain; and the new constitution of Tennessee.

One of Mr. Roosevelt's most interesting suggestions is with respect to the continuity between Western filibustering movements; they were parts in a current of tendency. Burr's conspiracy and the conquest of Texas were only later manifestations of attempts like those of Colonel Morgan at New Madrid, Elijah Clark, and George Rogers Clark. In further illustration of the continuity of this movement that culminated in the Mexican War, the author might have quoted Franklin's letter to his son in 1767, suggesting "that a settlement should be made in the Illinois country . . . raising a strength there which on occasions of a future war might easily be poured down the Mississippi upon the lower country, and into the Bay of Mexico, to be used against Cuba, the French islands, or Mexico itself." In this connection, Mr. Roosevelt's account of George Rogers Clark's relations to Genet in an effort to lead an expedition against the Spaniards at New Orleans, under the French flag, is of much value. This part of Clark's career has been ignored or glossed over by his admirers, but on the basis of the Draper Manuscripts, in the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Mr. Roosevelt elucidates the interesting episode. Probably the most serious criticism to be made upon his account of the matter, is with respect to his bitter comments on Jefferson's relations to the movement. He declares that it is impossible that Jefferson should not have known the purposes of Michaux, the French botanist, who acted as one of Genet's agents in the West; and he thinks Jefferson was really engaged in a "characteristic

. . . tortuous intrigue" against Washington, and was thwarting his wishes as far as he dared in regard to Genet. This is a serious charge, one of the most serious ones that have ever been brought against Mr. Jefferson. It is, in effect, that while holding his position as Secretary of State, and officially promoting a policy of neutrality, he was secretly assisting a movement which involved the expatriation of leaders in the Western country, the fitting out of a hostile expedition on American soil, against a friendly power, and the replacement of a weak and decadent nation at the mouth of the Mississippi by a powerful nation. The only evidence which Mr. Roosevelt offers for this view of Jefferson is the fact that Jefferson gave Michaux a letter of introduction to Governor Shelby of Kentucky. There is nothing in the letter to indicate a secret purpose, nor do Jefferson's published writings of this period indicate any desire to assist France in the conquest of Spanish lands; the only paper that looks even remotely in that direction bears the written approval of Washington. On the other hand, Jefferson had always taken comfort in the fact that, with a weak power at its mouth, the Mississippi would be ours when we needed it; and he declared only a few years later, when France did acquire Louisiana, that "there is on the globe one single spot, the possessor of which is our natural and habitual enemy. It is New Orleans." He was even ready to engage in alliance with England to prevent this French acquisition. Thus the antecedent probabilities are against Jefferson's willingness to yield New Orleans, even to a power he liked so well as France. But Mr. Roosevelt omits an important factor in the question, both in his treatment of Clark's expedition and in his account of the exploration of Lewis and Clark later. Jefferson had long been interested in the exploration of a transcontinental route by way of the Columbia and the Missouri. He had written letters to Washington and Madison, from France in 1786, asking information regarding portages between the Potomac and the Ohio, in order to foster the fur-trade between Virginia and the far West. Ledyard, a Connecticut Yankee, had even started with Jefferson's patronage to cross Russia to Kamtchatka, to sail to Nootka Sound and thence return to the United States by way of the Missouri. Ledyard did not succeed; but Jefferson kept the project in mind, and, in 1792, proposed to the American Philosophical Society to send an explorer up the Missouri to the Columbia. Michaux offered his services and they were accepted, and as the representative of this Society, Jefferson gave him a letter of introduction. His recall, as soon as Genet's plans became known, put a stop to his journey. There are several confidential letters of Michaux to George Rogers Clark, among the Draper Manuscripts, but none of them intimate any connection with Jefferson, though they do with Brown of Kentucky. If Mr. Roosevelt knows of this relation of Michaux to Jefferson's plans for exploration, it was certainly a grave mistake not to mention it, both because of the importance of it to a candid estimate of Jefferson's part in this French intrigue, and because of its interest as a stage in the evolution of the project of the Lewis and Clark expedition. Minor defects in the treatment of Clark's

attempt are the neglect to note the relation of Thomas Paine to the matter, and the suspicious correspondence between Wayne and O'Fallon. If Mr. Roosevelt had given more painstaking attention to this important part of Genet's activity, he might perhaps have secured important documents from the French archives upon the extent to which that government was involved in this effort to secure Louisiana in the period before Napoleon; there is no evidence that he attempted to do this. Mr. Roosevelt might also have given more generous recognition of the services of Gayarré on the years embraced in this volume.

The Yazoo Land Company, Carondelet's and Wilkinson's later relations, and Blount's English intrigue are briefly set forth in the work, while Jay's and Pinckney's treaties are considered chiefly on the basis of printed material, without an attempt to exploit Spanish, English, or French archives on these important diplomatic episodes in relation to the West.

The Kentucky Resolutions of 1798 and 1799 are disposed of by Mr. Roosevelt in a paragraph of a dozen lines, while he gives about two dozen pages to the picturesque narrative of St. Clair's disaster. That this mode of treatment is open to objection is clear when it is remembered that, in his previous volume, he had unfolded at some length the particularism of Kentucky with respect to the Mississippi. He makes no effort to relate the philosophy of Kentucky's Resolutions to this earlier experience, nor does he give his readers any insight into the sides taken by Kentucky leaders on the Resolutions. This way of looking at his subject finds illustration also in Mr. Roosevelt's treatment of Ohio in the same epoch. No considerable attempt is made to describe the development of political institutions, state and local, in the Northwest in this period, nor to account for the forces that brought about the division of the Northwest Territory. Such an account would be most helpful in the light it would cast upon the democratic influence of the back country on the New England Federalists who had migrated there, and upon the part played by the Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Virginia settlers in the Northwest. It was because the expanding regions of the country embraced Democracy, while the Federalists remained stationary, that Jefferson's party came to control the government, and, therefore, a more detailed study of the incompatibility of temperament between Federalism and the West would be an important contribution. But Mr. Roosevelt does not like "the doctrinaire politicians of whom Jefferson was chief." He expresses his contempt in a somewhat characteristic paragraph, as follows: —

"The sin of burning a few public buildings [by the British, at the capture of Washington] is as nothing compared with the cowardly infamy [!] of which the politicians of the stripe of Jefferson and Madison, and the people whom they represented, were guilty in not making ready, by sea and land, to protect their capital, and in not exacting full revenge for its destruction. These facts may, with advantage, be pondered by those men of the present day who are either so ignorant or of such lukewarm patriotism that they do not wish to see the United States keep prepared for war and show herself willing and able to adopt a vigorous foreign policy whenever

there is need of furthering American interests or upholding the honor of the American flag."

Nor do the politics of the frontiersmen please the author; for, in commenting on St. Clair's defeat in the presidency of Washington, he laments that "the foolish frontiersmen, instead of backing up the administration, railed at it and persistently supported the party which desired so to limit the powers and energies of the National Government as to produce mere paralysis. Under such conditions the national administration, instead of at once redoubling its efforts to ensure success by shock of arms, was driven to the ignoble necessity of yet again striving for a hopeless peace." The fact is that the frontiersmen were not likely to support and strengthen the power of the Federalist administration, unless they could see that its main policy did not rest on interests antagonistic to their own; and it would have been more useful for the author to have worked out in detail, by historical evidence, the reasons for this distrust, than to have thus expressed his opinion of Jefferson, Madison, and modern Americans. While one can appreciate the energetic Americanism of Mr. Roosevelt, one can also lament that he finds it necessary to use his history as the text for a sermon to a stiff-necked generation.

In further illustration of Mr. Roosevelt's way of looking at his subject, may be noted his neglect of the land companies and new state projects of western New York and the Susquehanna region, and of the Whiskey Insurrection.

The chapter entitled "Men of the Western Waters" gives a clear statement of the essential solidarity of the West, — its distinctive type that of the Southerner of the uplands, not of the coast regions. The Northeast did not have any considerable influence on the West in this formative period, and there was as yet "no hard and fast line drawn between North and South among the men of the Western waters." As yet the typical Westerner, north and south, was the small pioneer farmer working without slaves, with his home a log hut in the forest clearing. Between him and Federalist governors like St. Clair and Sargent, there were natural antagonisms. The author notes the contrast between the West of our own time and that of the older day as shown in the lack of urban life in the older West, while in the new West great cities like Tacoma and Seattle have sprung up with incomparable rapidity. During the first decade of its statehood, Colorado had a third of its population in its capital city, while Kentucky, which grew as fast as Colorado, did not have more than one per cent. in its capital city. This whole chapter is the best economic and social study which Mr. Roosevelt has yet made in his Western work.

Of the chapters on the Louisiana purchase, Burr's conspiracy, and the explorations of Lewis and Clark and Pike, less can be said. They are interestingly done; but they add nothing of importance to the work of Henry Adams, and the Coues editions of Lewis and Clark and Pike.

Taken as a whole, the volume will be to the general reader a revela-

tion in American history. But the special student must regret that Mr. Roosevelt does not find it possible to regard history as a more jealous mistress, and to give more time, greater thoroughness of investigation, particularly in foreign archives, and more sobriety of judgment to his work.

FREDERICK J. TURNER.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives. By M. P. FOLLETT. (New York, London, and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Co. 1896. Pp. xxvi, 378.)

MISS M. P. FOLLETT, in her book, *The Speaker of the House of Representatives*, has made a really notable contribution to the study of the growth of American governmental institutions; and she has, for the first time, put down on paper, for the benefit of the literary class, certain facts which are accepted as truisms by the men who actually shape the developments of our institutions, but to which the merely theoretical students of these institutions have been almost absolutely blind. The very reason why Miss Follett's work is so creditable is a rather severe commentary upon the mental attitude of many of these students. She has studied the subject at first hand; with the *Congressional Record*, *The Debates of Congress*, and the *House Journal*, as the highest authorities, but with frequent reference to the published statements of the chief actors in the various struggles, or of their really competent critics. Above all, she has faced facts as they are; and has not been blinded by seeming analogies between our own and the English system. Unfortunately, the average student of our methods of congressional government cannot rid his mind of the thought that it must be studied in the writings of those who know nothing of the practical work of Congress, and in consequence it is fairly astounding to see how little knowledge these writers usually have of the most important features of their subject, and how idle are their proposed remedies for any existing wrong. A really practical politician is continually irritated at the disregard which the men who merely call themselves practical politicians show for the work of the scholar and student; but this disregard is unfortunately entirely justifiable in many instances. A few years ago a number of very well-meaning students of congressional government conceived the idea that what we needed was parliamentary responsibility, in the English sense. One or two of the leaders of this cult, notably Mr. Woodrow Wilson, were men of marked ability, who have done admirable work in other lines, and who in this instance were misled solely because they did not know, and could not see, the real conditions under which our government worked; but their teachings on this point were as idle as if they had tried to model New York municipal government on Plato's *Republic*. Yet for some years their writings were not answered, because they were regarded with indifference by those who knew enough to answer them, and with reverential awe by those who did not. No man practically acquainted with our governmental methods considered them worth an answer, and the students whose knowl-

edge of these methods was obtained purely from the study of the excellent English writers who wrote on English government, considered them unanswerable. It was not until Mr. Lawrence Lowell took the trouble once for all to demolish them that their theories were seriously refuted. To any man who could study in more than one language, and who had ever read the writings of the great Belgian publicist Émile de Laveleye, they needed no refutation.

Naturally, when students could content themselves with work along such merely imitative lines they could not be expected to do work that was worth doing. The mental attitude that made the one possible made the other impossible; and in consequence the great feature of our recent institutional development, the enormous growth of the speaker's power, was never seriously studied. The first sign of an awakening to its importance was given by Professor Albert Bushnell Hart, when two or three years ago he published an article upon "The Speaker's Power," in the *Atlantic Monthly*. I well remember the pleasure this article caused men like Mr. Reed and Mr. Carlisle. Politicians had grown to take it for granted that no so-called student of Congress, if a man of scholarly traditions and college education, would be practically acquainted with even the central features of this subject, and the article came like a revelation. What was there hinted at, or sketched in outline, Miss Follett has now done with a thoroughness and philosophic grasp of her subject that will make her book indispensable to every future student of congressional government. She has collected her facts with indefatigable industry, and grouped them with an admirable sense of proportion and of historic perspective; she has shown the reason and necessity for the growth of the power of the speaker with singular clearsightedness and skill.

With all of Miss Follett's views it is not necessary to agree. She does not seem to have estimated correctly the relative weight in leadership of Mr. Reed and Mr. Carlisle, and in one place at least she fails to put proper emphasis upon the fact that Mr. Reed made a far greater advance in the development of the speaker's power than any man who ever held the office. But these are slight criticisms. As a whole, her work is marvellously well done. She shows how of necessity the ideal of the speaker as a mere moderator has tended to disappear. Incidentally she shows that this ideal is not a wholesome one. A large proportion of the academic reformers always treat the fact that the speaker is no longer a mere moderator, as a misfortune to be deeply deplored. In reality, as Miss Follett shows, the speakers who have tried to act merely as moderators, and not as party leaders, have invariably failed to do the great and useful work for the nation which has been done by the men who administer the office in accordance with the deep-rooted principles of American institutional growth. The names of the speakers who were moderators and nothing else have now been rightfully forgotten; but the names of the great party leaders, from Clay to Reed and Carlisle, who held the speaker's chair, will always be remembered, and their work was of lasting good to the people.

Miss Follett begins by an excellent study of the speakership in colonial times, and of the status of the president in the Continental Congress. Following this, she has dealt with the present conditions of the speakership, grouping all the facts together for the first time; but perhaps the most important part of her work is found in chapters four to nine, where she deals with the functions of the speaker in their order, and where she discusses with clearness the growth of the three fundamental powers which the speaker has gradually assumed, and the assumption of which has made him a mighty political authority, second only to the president, — the functions of acting against filibustering, of appointing committees, and of recognizing only those members whom he deems entitled to speak. All of these three powers have been savagely inveighed against, notably by many thoroughly well-meaning academic reformers; but Miss Follett shows clearly that it would be an evil thing to have the speaker act as an unbiassed judge, instead of as a party leader, and that it is in the interest of good government that he should wisely, firmly, and boldly exercise the powers, and accept the great responsibilities, which have come to be associated with an office which can now only be successfully filled by a man who is both a great statesman and a great party leader.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

Southern Quakers and Slavery. A Study in Institutional History. [Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science. Extra Volume XV.] By STEPHEN B. WEEKS, Ph.D. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. 1896. Pp. xiv, 400.)

THE sober *format* of this volume and its unalluring title will probably keep the general reader from attempting its perusal, and may even induce the historical student to place it on his shelves with its leaves uncut. Dr. Weeks's labors do not deserve such a fate, however; for he has worked faithfully not merely in a comparatively new field, but also in an interesting one. His monograph will naturally appeal most to members of the Society of Friends, for it is filled with details in which they alone will take great interest; but it will also appeal to every serious student of that now defunct institution of slavery which dominated our history for fully half a century. Its chief interest from the latter point of view lies, I think, in the fact that it brings into relief the witness that a considerable body of people in at least three important Southern States bore for a number of decades to the moral, and, as the Quakers were in the main a thrifty people, to the economic evils of slavery. The witness thus borne by men who migrated by hundreds and thousands from the South is a fact of great importance to the historian who endeavors to determine impartially how far the people of the South are to be blamed for their adherence to an institution which the rest of the civilized world had given up, and which their great revolutionary leaders, like Washington and Jefferson, had denounced in emphatic terms. Dr. Weeks, of course, sees fully the importance of the witness

against slavery thus borne by the religious body whose history he traces; but I am not sure that he has not been prevented from stressing it sufficiently by the multifarious details that he has felt compelled to give. In giving these details he has followed the precedent set him by most of our writers of historical monographs, but I cannot help believing that he and they would do well either to abridge their details or to relegate them in the main to footnotes. I think, too, that Dr. Weeks follows another bad precedent when he makes use of terms and expressions of too large and high significance to find fitting place in what is, after all, only a study — though a most worthy one — in local history. The fact that the North Carolina yearly meeting actively resumed its work after the Civil War is an important one, and doubtless deserves a separate chapter; but I cannot see why Dr. Weeks should entitle that chapter "The Renaissance of North Carolina Yearly Meeting." Equally suggestive of the ludicrous is the chapter-heading "John Archdale and the Golden Age of Southern Quakerism." I should add, however, that our author's style is inflated only in his chapter-titles; for the rest he is as straightforward and unpedantic as one could desire.

Dr. Weeks divides his book into twelve chapters, to which he adds four appendices. His first chapter is introductory, and the second gives a brief but satisfactory account of the "status of dissent in the South" in the seventeenth century. The third chapter describes "the planting of Quakerism in Virginia and the Carolinas," and is, of course, filled with details of the sort familiar to students of American ecclesiastical history (if such a term may be used of the Quakers). If the reader will use his imagination, he need not find the chapter dry; but I must confess that the story of the planting of Methodism about a hundred years later interests me more. Still these early Southern Quakers, especially William Edmundson, the founder of his sect in North Carolina, were men and women who bore heroically many hardships and persecutions which their co-religionists have done well to record and remember. Chapter IV. continues the annals of the Society by describing its progress in Carolina under John Archdale, and, as I have intimated, somewhat belies in interest its grandiloquent title.

The expansion of the Society in the eighteenth century next occupies our attention and demands a considerable amount of space. Dr. Weeks handles his details with not a little skill, and succeeds in bringing out quite clearly the fact that Southern Quakers of this century divide into two well-defined groups or stocks, — those lying nearer the seacoast representing the expansion of the native element, and those settled in the inland counties representing "the later immigrants, many of them Germans or Welshmen by birth or descent, who were destined to replant Quakerism in the South, and without whose representatives the Society would be almost extinct in these states to-day." This Quaker migration is, our author reminds us, almost identical in character and time with that of the Scotch-Irish. It affected North Carolina mainly, but was also felt by South Carolina and Georgia. Dr. Weeks gives many important details concerning it, but none

more typical of the section or more amusing than the fact he cites concerning the original Charleston Friends, who "considered themselves under the jurisdiction of no yearly meeting save London" (which had established them in 1680). South Carolina's provincial loyalty affected even her Quakers, it would seem.

The sixth chapter describes briefly, but interestingly, the social life of the Friends, but a considerable portion of it is devoted rather to giving short biographical accounts of noted individuals. The next chapter gives a succinct account of the relations of the Society to the Established Church — relations not by any means creditable to the latter. Then we have an equally good discussion of the way in which Quakers have borne testimony in the South against war, which leads us naturally to the most important chapter in the book, which treats of the testimony they bore against slavery. Dr. Weeks describes clearly the way in which the Friends first purged their own Society of the evil, and then set about reforming their neighbors with a good conscience, having plucked the beam from their own eyes. Their methods of procedure were naturally peaceful, and they secured numerous emancipations and coquetted with the schemes for colonization, although there were abolitionists among them from early times. Indeed, the first man in America to preach immediate and unconditional emancipation was Charles Osborn, born in North Carolina, and Levi Coffin, of "underground railway" fame, came from the same state. But, as I have said, the most important fact in connection with the Southern Quakers and slavery is their withdrawal from the South and their settlement in the free Middle West. This forms the subject of Dr. Weeks's tenth chapter, the interest of which is not equal to its importance only through the fact that it is filled with details of the driest sort. As one wades through these, one finds one's self wondering how the Southern Quaker communities ever stood the drain of a migration that began before the present century and took from Virginia and North Carolina thousands of good citizens of whose thrift and probity Ohio and Indiana respectively were to reap the benefit. Southern Quakerism was indeed left in a perilous state, which is described in Dr. Weeks's eleventh chapter; but it stood the strain of constant losses through migration and it even went through the horrors of the Civil War. Since that time it has been growing slowly but naturally, and our author's last chapter gives his book a happy ending, especially as it contains a graceful tribute to the noble work of the Baltimore Friends for the relief of their Southern brethren — a work with which the honored name of Mr. Francis T. King will always be connected.

The appendices to the volume will, of course, make it valuable to specialists, and represent, as indeed does every page of his book, great labor on the part of Dr. Weeks. They give us "Detailed Statistics of Southern Quakers according to Census of 1890," "Time and Place of holding Yearly Meetings in Virginia and North Carolina, 1702–1895," "List of Friends' Meetings in the Southern States," and last, but not least, a full bibliography, which is followed by an equally satisfactory index. As

one examines this index or turns the pages of these appendices or goes carefully through the leading chapters with their multiplicity of detail, one cannot but acknowledge that Dr. Weeks is a scholar capable of both exhaustive and enthusiastic work. He has laid both a whole religious denomination and a section under obligations to him, and he has done a considerable service to his fellow-historians. I am sure that he will get much of the gratitude he deserves; but, after all, the approbation of his own student's conscience at the faithful and successful completion of his important task will be, as it ought always to be, his best reward.

W. P. TRENT.

Biography of James G. Blaine. By GAIL HAMILTON [ABIGAIL DODGE]. (Norwich, Conn.: The Henry Bill Publishing Company. 1895. Pp. iv, 722.)

A REVIEW of Miss Dodge's biography is a task for some public man associated with Mr. Blaine, acquainted with the currents of public life during the last thirty years, able from his own recollections to supplement and to correct the statements of the book. For this is not in reality a biography at all: it is the history of a family, written by a kinswoman who was practically an inmate of the household; it is a volume of letters, few of which bear upon public affairs, or even on the public life of James G. Blaine, set in a framework of the rhetorical and antithetical statement in which the author was so skilful. More than half the thick volume is given up to details about others than Mr. Blaine himself, with many accounts of children's sayings and neighbors' gossip; it does not invite the criticism of a serious biography.

Considering the eminence of Mr. Blaine and his influence on the national government, it is unfortunate that the plan of the book should be so unscientific, and its contribution to our knowledge of the man so scanty. No authorities are anywhere mentioned or cited. The chronology is so defective that it is not till twenty years after his marriage that we hear in the book of his having a wife; the letters are printed in a haphazard manner, so that writer and recipient are not to be distinguished, or are hidden under initials. There is neither an index nor a list of papers; and one feels timid about accepting any historical statement from the author, after learning (p. 64) that Gallatin was Washington's Secretary of the Treasury. It was not in the mind of the author, whose shrewd and incisive pen is now forever motionless, to use critical tints; the book is all in black and white; so far as we learn from it, Mr. Blaine appears to have had no other fault than that of interrupting other senators.

Yet indirectly and unconsciously the book brings the reader into appreciative relations with its subject; and by its very omissions and laudations throws some light upon a career which did not fulfil its own promise. In the first place it brings out the oft-forgotten fact that Blaine came of well-to-do, distinguished, and educated ancestry. His father was a Princeton

man; his grandfather had travelled abroad; his great-grandfather had an honorable part in the Revolution; the Ewings were of his kindred, and wisely refused him a government clerkship. Young Blaine lived in western Pennsylvania, one of the most wide-awake parts of the country; and he had a good education for the times. He was born with interest in public affairs. At seventeen years we find him writing to a friend (p. 88): "Taylor stock has been rising very rapidly in the market since the old general returned to the United States . . . and such is the wild enthusiasm of the American people for a military hero that he will run ahead of anything that either party can bring out." His transfer at twenty-four to Maine made him a New Englander, and at once brought him into politics. By heredity, training, and natural interest, Blaine was prepared for public life.

It is with the private life of the Blaine family, however, that the book is chiefly concerned. Mr. Blaine enjoyed his family, loved his children, participated in their education, and was overwhelmed by the loss of three of them near the end of his own life. He was fond of foreign travel. He had extraordinary power of work — could think out his problems in the liveliest company, minded no interruption, and had a Napoleonic power of going to sleep at will. On the question of his fortune and its sources, a question which was never clearly answered during his life, the book gives no information; though there are a few hints of large investments in coal lands and other places (pp. 247, 255).

But in all these respects Blaine differed little from a hundred of his compeers. It is his public life which entitles him to a biography; and upon his public life we get here only the statements of an ardent admirer, and allusions which must be pieced together and eked out from other sources. It was as Speaker from 1869 to 1875 that Mr. Blaine first became famous. Nothing can be more manly than his own statement about his candidacy (p. 216): "I mean to win if I can fairly and honorably. If I cannot, there's the end. But if successful, I shall not have the self-reproach of having done one unworthy act to secure the place; and if unsuccessful, the same consciousness will be my compensating and consoling fact." There are also some interesting passages on the difficulty of making up committees (pp. 228, 260). But we must turn to Follett's *Speaker of the House of Representatives* to learn the real force and success of his speakership, and the fatal impression which it made upon men who had his destiny in their hands.

For in these six years Mr. Blaine made the reputation which he held during the rest of his life. How much injustice may have been done him the book does not record; for to the author all charges were malignant, and every investigation ended in a final triumph for the Speaker. Perhaps after twenty years it is possible to emerge from the marshes of personality and to form some judgment as to Mr. Blaine's standards and responsibility. It was a period of corruption, the old frauds of war-time supplemented by the confusion of frantic railroad-building. It was a period when, as now,

public men regularly and openly used their offices to build up their own political advancement. As Miss Dodge says (p. 293), Mr. Blaine "never made a point of small things. No such honesty as dividing his official from his personal correspondence ever complicated his use of the frank." Not to make a point of small things is no evidence of evil; but it tallies with a widespread belief that Mr. Blaine went further, and sought to use his public station to aid his private fortunes. Even if it were so, it would have been hard to fix public reprobation upon him, but for his great tactical blunder in seizing the Mulligan letters. The biography throws absolutely no new light upon that transaction, but leaves it evident that he feared to have those letters brought before a committee of investigation. The letters themselves were insufficient as evidence; Mr. Blaine's course alone gave them a barbed point, for it seemed to negative his claim that he had nothing to conceal. Thenceforth, though thousands of his party-friends persistently believed in him, there was a fraction which looked upon him as a man of low standards, and eventually they prevented him from reaching his great ambition, — the presidency.

The biography reviews, with little that is new, the campaigns of 1876, 1880, 1884, 1888, and 1892, in all of which Mr. Blaine was a great figure. Here may be found the record of the phrase of Robert G. Ingersoll's, which passed into a kind of proverb: "Like an armed warrior, like a plumed knight, James G. Blaine marched down the halls of the American Congress and threw his shining lance full and fair against the brazen forehead of every traitor to his country and every maligner of his fair reputation." On the whole, the man rises in one's estimation from quadrennium to quadrennium. A born fighter, he made relentless enemies; but who could spare from our political annals that characterization of Conkling which cost him the nomination of 1876 (p. 174): "The contempt of that large-minded gentleman is so wilting, his haughty disdain, his grandiloquent swell, his majestic, supereminent, overpowering turkey-gobbler strut has been so crushing to myself and all the members of this House that I know it was an act of the greatest temerity for me to venture upon a controversy with him." In 1880 he threw his influence for the largest-minded and most statesmanlike of his rivals. In 1884 his canvass was brilliant and for the most part dignified. In 1888 he had the courage and ability to repel all attempts to nominate him. It must be admitted, and the biography does not disprove the statement, that Mr. Blaine deprived himself of the presidency by raising up opposition which he need not have raised, by an obtuseness as to what the public might consider unbecoming. But he bore his defeats far better than such a greater man as Webster.

Yet, without the presidency, Mr. Blaine had one opportunity to make a great reputation as a statesman, — his service as Secretary of State in 1881. On this period, and this alone, does Miss Dodge's biography render a substantial service to American history. In pages 490 to 503 appears a most intimate and confidential correspondence between President-elect Garfield and his future Secretary of State. We see Mr. Blaine insisting, almost as a

condition of his acceptance, that the President shall take Mrs. Garfield's advice; we find counsel — almost peremptory — as to cabinet officials; we see a keen analysis of the sections of the Republican party, including "the Reformers by profession . . . noisy but not numerous, pharisaical but not practical, ambitious but not wise, pretentious but not powerful. They can be easily dealt with, and can be hitched to your administration with ease" (p. 491). We see plans laid for placating or securing the Grant men. It is the work of a political mechanician of genius.

Here we have the key of the aggressive policy of Garfield's short administration: the Republican party was to be consolidated within, and the country aroused by a vigorous foreign attitude. Nothing better illustrates the essential weakness in Mr. Blaine's character; he could manage parties, he could inspire a president, but he could not gauge the nation's love for peace and quiet. His Pan-American idea was magnificent, but it was inconvenient. President Arthur abandoned it, and when, in 1889, Mr. Blaine again became Secretary of State he himself seemed disillusionized, and appeared as a conservative and restraining force. Had he enjoyed the dozen years of public life which a man of his age might fairly have expected, he might have become again a great force in the nation.

Mr. Blaine has often been compared with Henry Clay, but this biography shows how small was the likeness between them. Both were energetic, magnetic leaders, speakers of the House, secretaries of state, repeatedly disappointed candidates for the presidency. But Clay was a great figure, and filled a great place; while of Blaine the best-intentioned biographer makes out a man genial, kindly, eager, shrewd, renowned, but not extraordinary. His notions on finance and government were good, he stood out often against illiberal associates, but he never aroused his fellow-men to magnificent thoughts or deeds, or compelled them to turn back from destruction. Henry Clay would have been great if he never had held office. James G. Blaine was eminent because he could secure elections. Who would choose to spend a day in Augusta in 1884, rather than a day at Ashland in 1840?

ALBERT BUSHNELL HART.

History of the Jewish Nation after the Destruction of Jerusalem under Titus, by the Rev. Alfred Edersheim, M.A., D.D., Ph.D. Revised by the Rev. Henry A. White, M.A. With a Preface by the Rev. William Sanday, D.D., LL.D. (London and New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1896, pp. xiv, 553.)

A peculiar interest attaches to the work of Dr. Edersheim because he was so well versed in both Jewish and Christian literature. It is in part for this reason that a third edition of the book under notice seemed called for, though the first edition appeared in 1856. It is, however, much more than a new edition that Dr. White has given us. It is the result of a comparison of the first edition, not only with Dr. Edersheim's modifications of thought found in his later works, but also with the later literature in the

general field, particularly as presented by Schürer. When Dr. Edersheim wrote his first preface only one volume of the voluminous work of Grätz had appeared. The point of view of Dr. Edersheim is well known among readers of Jewish history; and in this revised edition no attempt has been made to seem to attribute to him "opinions which he would not have himself indorsed." In the divine dispensation Israel was originally chosen and separated from all other nations to be the depositary of spiritual truth and preserved till the divine purposes were accomplished in the embodying of the fulness of divine truth and divine fact in the person of the Lord Jesus Christ, with whose coming the preparatory, typical dispensation gave place to what is real. "Israel was meant to be a theocracy." It may be said, therefore, without further example, that the reviser's work has been done in a spirit of sympathy with the author's point of view. Within these limits, however, numerous changes have been made by way of correcting inaccuracy or inadequacy of statement in geography, history, and date. No chapter has escaped this painstaking revision, an important part of which consists in the severity of taste that omits irrelevant matter and compresses redundancy of statement. The map is omitted, and from the appendix of five parts, that on the Wisdom of Ben Sira; but there is added a discussion of "The Great Synagogue," "The President of the Sanhedrin," "The Site of Bethar," "The Treatise *De Vita Contemplativa*." These additions to the appendix are real contributions by way of modifying the treatment given their subjects in the older edition and of presenting the later literature with its conclusions. The index is an altogether new and admirable feature, greatly enlarging the usefulness of the book. This new edition is a readable, handsomely printed volume, and, though retaining from the older edition something of an uncritical historical judgment, it has a certain charm because of the author's inborn sympathy with every phase of Jewish life.

G. R. F.

Students of history, especially those who are interested in the so-called philosophy of history, will find as much which concerns them in Professor F. H. Giddings's *Principles of Sociology* (New York, Macmillan, 476 pp.) as will the professional sociologist. It is characteristic of these times that the problems which used to be left to the philosopher alone are now being attacked from many different sides and by methods which, if not wholly free from speculation, are, far more than used to be the case, those of sound investigation. Kidd's *Social Evolution* and Adams's *Law of Civilization and Decay* are by no means final books nor models of sound investigation, but they are very interesting signs of the times, and signs of the sort are likely to multiply rapidly in the next quarter of a century. In the present book, the historical student will find much to his purpose, both in the theoretical introduction and in the short passage on the "Philosophy of History," as well as in the more directly historical Book III., which is entitled "The Historical Evolution of Society." Professor

Giddings is by no means entirely free from speculative method and oftentimes is lacking in clearness, but the book is a strong and well-reasoned contribution to this field of knowledge.

The premature death of M. Julien Havet, at the age of forty, cut short a most promising career, and was a great loss to historical science. He was a scholar of extraordinarily keen critical judgment, and no doubt taste as well as circumstances led to his choice of subjects of study; but it is greatly to be regretted that all his published work is upon topics of somewhat special or temporary interest. Besides two volumes — *Les Cours royales des Îles Normandes* and *Lettres de Gerbert* (983–987) — his famous *Questions Mérovingiennes* and some shorter studies and book reviews are all that he has left us. His friends have done well for his fame to collect these more fugitive writings into the two large volumes of the *Œuvres de Julien Havet* (Paris, Ernest Leroux, 1896, pp. 456, 524). The first volume is entirely occupied with the *Questions Mérovingiennes*, which are here published in some cases with *pièces justificatives* and with the answers which M. Havet made to criticisms upon his conclusions. The second volume contains some forty of his briefer studies and more important book reviews, together with a list of others which are not republished. Perhaps the most interesting papers in the second volume are the five articles on medieval tachygraphy, illustrated by a series of fine plates.

The Connecticut Historical Society has recently issued two noteworthy volumes of *Collections;* Volume III. containing, among other papers, Gershom Bulkeley's *Will and Doom;* and Volume V. completing the *Talcott Papers*, the first volume of which (Volume IV. of the *Collections*) was issued in 1892. The *Will and Doom* is a remarkable document, and deserves the attention of all interested in New England history during the last quarter of the seventeenth century. Sir Henry Ashurst, at one time the agent of Connecticut in England, characterized the work well when he called it "a history of the miseries of Connecticut under the arbitrary power of the present government, wherein he [Bulkeley] mightily commends Sir Edmund Andros's government and says all the malicious things he possibly can invent, with great cunning and art." This work has hitherto existed in but one manuscript, sent over to the Board of Trade by Lord Cornbury, governor of New York, of which a copy was made for the Connecticut Society in 1848. It was printed by the society in 1875, but the edition was destroyed by fire in the office where the work was being done. The value of the paper lies partly in its literary style and expression, for it is an example of no little importance of the historical writing of the period; and partly in its bearing upon the New England revolution of 1689, for the author, although a bitter partisan, was a man of learning and influence, and voiced the sentiments of those who opposed the government of the colony. The publication of so extravagant a defence of Andros is timely, in view of the recent attempts to rehabilitate the character of the much-maligned governor; and, although the

work has little historical value, it shows how bitter was the hostility of parties in a period of great political excitement. The second volume of the *Talcott Papers* is an improvement upon the first, and that is saying a good deal. It shows the advantage of experience on the part of the editors, — for no effort has been made in it to modernize the spelling, punctuation, and capitalization of the documents, — and it contains a number of papers throwing light upon the period, which are not, properly speaking, a part of Governor Talcott's correspondence. All things considered, the *Talcott Papers* are among the most valuable of the publications of any of our local historical societies.

C. M. A.

The *Thirteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology* to the secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, for the fiscal year 1891–1892, by the director of the bureau, Major J. W. Powell, has just appeared (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1896). The director's report describes the field operations, office researches, and publications of the bureau, and is followed by six important monographs by members of his staff. Mr. William H. Holmes presents an ingenious and interesting paper on the "Prehistoric Textile Art of the Eastern United States," Mr. Gerard Fowke one on their "Stone Art." Mr. Cosmos Mindeleff presents two elaborate studies, one on "Aboriginal Remains in the Verde Valley, Arizona," the other a careful description of the ruins of the Casa Grande, in the same territory, based on examinations and surveys made before the beginning of the preservative works ordered by Congress in 1889. Rev. J. Owen Dorsey contributes a paper on "Omaha Dwellings, Furniture and Implements," Mr. Frank Hamilton Cushing a full and important monograph entitled "Outlines of Zuñi Creation Myths." All these papers, save the last, are illustrated. The whole report gives evidence of careful planning of the year's work, and scientific execution.

The West Indies and the Spanish Main, by James Rodway (London, T. Fisher Unwin; New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, pp. xxiv, 371). This volume, which in bulk and typographic form suggests the *Stories of the Nations* of the same publishers, is an attempt to condense into a single narrative the tangled history of these Caribbean lands, which have scarcely known another bond than one of geography. To the inevitable sketchiness of such a task Mr. Rodway is himself not blind; but he handles his story with the easy command of one long familiar with its details, and has known how to make much of those romantic and picturesque elements which give it a semblance of unity. He has the advantage of long residence in the region of which he writes. A part of his material, too, he had already dealt with in his three-volume history of British Guiana and in his many studies upon that colony. These are grave merits, but they bring with them their defects. The centre of gravity of his work lies clearly on the Main; it is the deeds of the British on sea and shore which frankly fill the

foreground of his thought, and his sympathies are even more British than his theme. His journalistic style, always companionable and full of gusto, drops often into clumsiness; and in his touch of ethical questions there is a robust obtuseness of moral sense which borders close upon the brutal. His critical method, both in the choice and in the use of his sources, is a distinct advance beyond that of his history of Guiana; but there is still something of the same proneness to paraphrase his sources and to indulge in loose or hazy statement. The volume is enriched with maps and with a multitude of pictures, the prosaic exactness of modern photography elbowing oddly the imaginative engravings from old Gottfried's *Reisen* and from Stedman's *Surinam*, with their Indians and negroes having naught of the negro but his color or of the Indian but his nakedness.

We have just received No. 7 of the *Bulletin of the Bureau of Rolls and Library of the Department of State*, dated September, 1894. (Is there profit in maintaining these serial dates?) It contains a brief list of territorial and state records deposited in the bureau, a hundred pages of "Miscellaneous Index," and the conclusion of Vol. II. of the "Documentary History of the Constitution." The last consists of five or six hundred pages of documentary material relating to the proposal of amendments to the constitution by Congress and to the action of the states thereupon; valuable matter, presented in proper style. But it is time to call public attention (we have not seen it done elsewhere) to the extraordinary character of the "miscellaneous index" matter presented in Nos. 1, 3, 5, and 7 of the *Bulletin*. The only explanation given in these bulletins concerning this index is the following, printed at the head of the instalment in each issue: "For the purposes of this index the several classes of papers deposited in the Bureau of Rolls and Library are considered as one collection. The bureau, under existing equipment, cannot confine its indexes or catalogues to any one particular class or collection of papers without neglecting others to which there exists at present little, if any, clue." In spite of this declaration, the 424 pages of index-matter thus far published are almost exclusively an index to Chapter A, No. 78. But an index of what a character! Of the four instalments thus far published, each runs in alphabetical order, and all, save the first, from A to Z. But the reader of, for instance, No. 1, has perhaps perceived that, while there were numerous entries from Dagworthy to De Bois, there were no subsequent D's, the next entry being under Easton. Or, if he were looking at the F's in No. 3, he saw that there were none after Fox, the next name in the index being Gallatin. Now that we have No. 7 before us, the explanation becomes clear. The entries extending in the alphabet from Dagworthy to De Bois have been placed in No. 1, those from Defiance to Dickinson (Philemon) in No. 5, those from Dickinson (Philemon) to Dyer in No. 7, those from Easton to Flying Camp in No. 1, those from Foard to Foreign Affairs in No. 3, those from Foreign Affairs to Fox (Edward) in No. 5, those from Fox (Edward) to Furnival in No. 7, those from Gallatin to Gervais in No.

3, those from Gibbs to Goldsborough in No. 5, those from Gooch to the end of G in No. 7, and so on. Could a calendar of historical documents, published at the end of the nineteenth century by one of the chief governments of the world, be constructed on principles more extraordinary? It will be seen that we have not even the regularity which would be attained if an index from A to Z were broken into fragments and the fragments were dealt evenly into four piles, which should then be separately printed.

No. 8 of the *Bulletin* completes the calendar of the correspondence of Jefferson, which, with those relating to Madison and Monroe, has been so highly useful to students.

The title of Mr. Max Farrand's pamphlet, *The Legislation of Congress for the Government of the Organized Territories of the United States, 1789–1895* (William A. Baker, Newark, N.J., 101 pp.), sufficiently explains its scope and purpose. The legislation by Congress is traced in a clear and logical manner through its various stages to the present time. The period from 1789 to 1836 the author regards as one of experimental legislation. There was no complete break in 1836, but in the organic act for Wisconsin of that year Congress sifts and remoulds the accumulated legislation, and sets a model for all subsequent acts. The work shows a careful analysis of the legislation. An appendix (pp. 57–93) gives a chronological synopsis of the acts of Congress respecting the territories from August 7, 1789, to August 3, 1894.

The eighth volume of Mr. Abner C. Goodell's monumental *Acts and Resolves, Public and Private, of the Province of Massachusetts Bay*, issued within the last few months, though with the imprint "Boston, 1895," is designated as the third volume of the Appendix. It contains the resolves, orders, and votes of the legislature during the years 1703–1707, and lists of the legislature for those years, all edited with the scrupulous care and minute accuracy which characterizes all Mr. Goodell's work, and accompanied with more than five hundred pages of fine-print annotations, which certainly supply every needed help, documentary and other, toward the understanding of the text. In connection with this we should take notice of a volume entitled *Supplement to the Acts and Resolves of Massachusetts which were published for the Commonwealth under authority of Chapter 104, Resolves of 1889, containing such Legislative Proceedings recorded in the Public Archives as are omitted in the Authorized Edition, together with Addresses, Messages, Letters, and Proclamations*, collected and arranged by Edwin M. Bacon, Vol. I., 1780–1784 (Boston, George H. Ellis, 1896. 254 pp.). The secretary of state of Massachusetts has issued several volumes of a collection of its early legislation under the authority of a resolve which required him to collate, index, and publish the acts and resolves from 1780 to 1806. Mr. Bacon has discovered fifty-six resolves of the years 1780–1784, which have been omitted in this state edition. He makes these the basis of the first volume of his own supplementary series.

He adds a large number of legislative orders and votes, the addresses, messages, and proclamations of the governors, and, in abridged form, a number of letters found in the archives and illustrating the history of Massachusetts at the close of the Revolution.

We notice somewhat tardily Vol. XII. of the *New Jersey Archives*, printed by the state (Paterson, The Press Printing and Publishing Co., 1895, cxxiv, 729 pp.). It continues the remarkable, and indeed unique, enterprise inaugurated by Vol. XI., namely, the printing of everything — news items, communications, advertisements — relating in any way to New Jersey, that can be found in American newspapers, beginning in 1704. As the editor, Mr. William Nelson, of Paterson, the corresponding secretary of the New Jersey Historical Society, justly remarked in the preface to Vol. XI.: "No similar volume has been previously published in America, if anywhere in the world." The present volume covers the years from 1740 to 1750, inclusive. It is copiously annotated and thoroughly indexed as to persons, places, and subjects. It is understood that Vol. XIX., to be issued shortly, will continue these excerpts to the end of 1755. To the historical student it is needless to dwell upon the surpassing value of this collection. It is most earnestly to be hoped that the example will be followed in other states.

As the first of these volumes, Vol. XI., was published before the beginning of this REVIEW, it may not be inappropriate for us to call attention to one of the most interesting and important features of their plan. Each is preceded by a large instalment of a History of American Newspapers and Printing, principally relating to the eighteenth century. Prepared with extraordinary care by the editor, this is much the completest account of the early American newspapers that has ever been printed. For the older states a full account is given of all the newspapers printed therein prior to 1801, with notices of printing in the various towns, biographical sketches of the printers, etc. Vol. XI. having given these valuable data for the states from Alabama to Maryland, inclusive, Vol. XII. continues the plan by printing over a hundred pages of fine-print matter on the early history of newspaper-printing in Massachusetts, presenting full accounts of more than twice as many Massachusetts newspapers of the last century as were ever mentioned before in any single work. In both volumes this newspaper history of each state is followed by a list of files of the eighteenth-century newspapers of that state, compiled by Mr. Nelson from more than twenty of the principal libraries particularly rich in such treasures. Vol. XII. gives this matter for Massachusetts, and enables the inquirer to learn where a file of any of the old Massachusetts newspapers may be found. Vol. XIX. will continue this matter, in the alphabetical order of the states, to New Jersey, inclusive. The chapters of newspaper history already given are illustrated with numerous fac-similes of headings of old newspapers.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL

Town Records of Great Britain.

[The following list contains titles of printed collections, inventories, and calendars of borough records of Great Britain. Most of the titles have been abbreviated. The compiler believes that no important collection of municipal records has been omitted. Only the more valuable contributions to periodical literature and to the transactions of learned societies are included in the list. With a few exceptions, parish and gild records and extracts published in town histories are excluded. H. or B. at the end of a title signifies that a book is in the Harvard College Library or the Boston Public Library respectively.]

GENERAL WORKS.

Great Britain.

Reports of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts. 14 reports with appendices. London, 1870–96. H. B.

Rotuli Chartarum, 1199–1216. By T. D. Hardy. *Record Commission.* London, 1837. H. B.

Gross, Charles. The Gild Merchant. 2 vols. Oxford, 1890. H. B.

Merewether, H. A., and Stephens, A. J. The History of the Boroughs and Municipal Corporations of the United Kingdom. 3 vols. London, 1835. H. B.

Wales.

Archæologia Cambrensis, published by the Cambrian Archæological Association [see especially the supplement of original documents, 4th Ser., Vol. X.]. London, 1846–96. H. B.

Cartæ et alia Munimenta quæ ad dominium de Glamorgan pertinent. Curante G. T. Clark. 4 vols. Dowlais and Cardiff, 1885–93.

Registrum vulgariter noncupatum "The Record of Caernarvon." *Record Commission.* [London,] 1838. H. B.

Ireland.

Chartæ, Privilegia et Immunitates Hiberniæ, 1171–1395. *Irish Record Commission.* [London, 1829–30.] Reprinted in 1889. H. B.

Historic and Municipal Documents of Ireland, 1172–1320. By J. T. Gilbert. *Rolls Series.* London, 1870. H. B.

SCOTLAND.

Ancient Laws and Customs of the Burghs of Scotland. [By Cosmo Innes.] *Scottish Burgh Records Soc.* Edinburgh, 1868. H. B.

Miscellany of the Scottish Burgh Records Society. Edinburgh, 1881. H. B.

Records of the Convention of Royal Burghs. [1295–1738. By J. D. Marwick.] 6 vols. Edinburgh, 1866–90. H.

CINQUE PORTS.

Charters of the Cinque Ports. By Sam. Jeake. London, 1728. B.

Lyon, John. History of Dover [with transcripts of the custumals of the Cinque Ports]. 2 vols. Dover, 1813–14. H. B.

PARTICULAR TOWNS.

Aberdeen. Charters and other Writs illustrating the History of Aberdeen, 1171–1804. Edited with translations by P. J. Anderson. Aberdeen, 1890. H.

Extracts from Aberdeen Burgh Records, 1715–6, 1745–6. Historical Papers, edited by Jas. Allardyce, I. 39–54, 195–278. *New Spalding Club.* Aberdeen, 1895. H. B.

Extracts from the Accounts of Aberdeen [1398–1645]. *Spalding Club, Miscellany*, V. 39–182. Aberdeen, 1852. H.

Extracts from the Council Register of Aberdeen, 1398–1747. [By John Stuart.] *Spalding Club.* 2 vols. Aberdeen, 1844–48. *Scottish Burgh Records Soc.* 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1871–72. H. B.

Extracts from the Registers of Aberdeen [1317–1508]. *Spalding Club, Miscellany*, V. 1–38. Aberdeen, 1852. H.

Inventories of the Records of Aberdeen. Aberdeen, 1890. H.

Register of Guild Burgesses of Aberdeen, 1399–1631. *Miscellany of New Spalding Club*, I. Aberdeen, 1890. H. B.

Turreff, Gavin. Antiquarian Gleanings from Aberdeenshire Records. Aberdeen, 1859. Second edition, Aberdeen, 1871. B.

Ayr. Charters of Ayr. *Ayr and Wigtown Archæol. Assoc.* Edinburgh, 1883. B.

Banff. Cramond, Wm. The Annals of Banff. *New Spalding Club.* 2 vols. Aberdeen, 1891–93. H. B.

Barnard Castle. Charters granted to the Burgesses of Barnard Castle. G. Allen's Darlington Press, n.d.

Barnstaple. Chanter, J. R. The Barnstaple Records. *North Devon Journal*, 1879–81; *North Devon Herald*, 1879–81.

Basingstoke. The Book of Accounts of the Wardens of the Fraternity of the Holy Ghost in Basingstoke, 1557–1654. [By J. E. Millard. Southampton, 1882.] H.

Bath. Falconer, R. W. List of Charters, etc., connected with Bath. [Bath, 1858.]

The Municipal Records of Bath, 1189–1604. By A. J. King and B. H. Watts. London, [1885]. H. B.

Bedford. A Schedule of the Records and other Documents of Bedford. Printed by order of the Corporation. Bedford, 1883. H.

Belfast. The Town Book of Belfast, 1613–1816. By Robert M. Young. Belfast, 1892. H. B.

Birmingham. Survey of the Borough and Manor of Birmingham made in 1553. Translated by W. B. Bickley. With notes and introduction by Joseph Hill. Birmingham, [1891].

Bodmin. [Wallis, Rev. J.] The Bodmin Register. 20 numbers. Bodmin, 1827–38. B.

Bristol. Bristol. The City Charters [translation only]; containing the original institution of Mayors, Recorders, etc., compared with, and corrected according to the Latin originals. Bristol, 1736.

Bush, Henry. Bristol Town Duties, a collection of original documents. Bristol, 1828.

Charters and Letters Patent granted to Bristol. By Samuel Seyer. Bristol, 1812. H. B.

Ricart, Robert. The Maire of Bristowe is Kalendar. Edited by L. T. Smith. *Camden Soc.* Westminster, 1872. H. B.

Wadley, T. P. Notes or Abstracts of the Wills contained in the Great Orphan Book and Book of Wills in the Council House at Bristol [1381–1605]. *Bristol and Gloucestersh. Archæol. Soc.* Bristol. [1882–6]. H. B.

Canongate. Extracts from the Records of Canongate, 1561–1588. *Maitland Club, Miscellany*, II. 281–360. Edinburgh, 1840.

Canterbury. Minutes collected from the Ancient Records of Canterbury [1234–]. By Civis [Wm. Welfitt]. [Canterbury, 1801–2.]

Translation of the Charters granted to Canterbury. By a Citizen [C. R. Bunce]. Canterbury, 1791. H.

Carlisle. Royal Charters of the City of Carlisle. By R. S. Ferguson. *Cumb. and Westm. Antiq. and Archæol. Soc.* Carlisle, 1894. H. B.

Some Municipal Records of the City of Carlisle. By R. S. Ferguson and W. Nanson. *Cumb. and Westm. Antiq. and Archæol. Soc.* Carlisle, 1887. H. B.

Carmarthen. Royal Charters and Historical Documents relating to Carmarthen. By J. R. Daniel-Tyssen. Carmarthen, 1878. H.

Chesterfield. Records of the Borough of Chesterfield. Collected by [J.] Pym Yeatman. Chesterfield and Sheffield, 1884. H.

Clitheroe. Ancient Charters and other Muniments of Clithero. By John Harland. Manchester, 1851. H.

Clonakilty. Townshend, Dorothea. Notes on [*i.e.* from] the Council Book of Clonakilty. Municipal Records, 1675–1802. *Cork Hist. and Archæol. Soc., Journal*, 2nd Ser., I. Cork, 1895. B.

Clun. [Salt, Thomas.] A Concise Account of Ancient Documents relating to Clun. [Shrewsbury,] 1858.

—— Ancient Documents relating to Clun. *Shropshire Archæol. and Nat. Hist. Soc., Transactions*, XI. 244–71. Shrewsbury and Oswestry, 1888.

Colchester. Harrod, Henry. Calendar of the Court Rolls of Colchester. Colchester, [1865]. B.

—— Repertory of the Records and Evidences of Colchester. Colchester, [1865]. B.

—— Report on the Records of Colchester. Colchester, [1865]. B.

Cork. Council Book of the Corporation of the City of Cork, 1609–1800. By Richard Caulfield. Guildford, 1876. H. B.

Some unpublished Records of Cork [1815–1818]. By C. G. Doran. *Cork Hist. and Archæol. Soc., Journal*, I. 48–54, 71–6, II. 107–13, 131–4. Cork, 1893–4. B.

Coventry. [Fetherston, J.] Selected List of Charters and other Evidences belonging to the Corporation of Coventry. [Coventry, 1871.]

Cullen. Cramond, William. Annals of Cullen: being Extracts from the Records, 961–1887. Second edition. Buckie, [1888]. H.

—— Inventory of the Charters, Burgh Court Books, etc., belonging to Cullen. Banff, [1887].

Cupar. Charters and other Muniments belonging to Cupar. Translated by G. Home. Cupar-Fife, 1882. H.

Denbigh. Williams, John. The Mediæval History of Denbighshire. The Records of Denbigh. Wrexham, 1860. H.

Dublin. Calendar of Ancient Records of Dublin. By J. T. Gilbert. 5 vols. Dublin, 1889–95. H.

Dumbarton. Dumbarton Burgh Records, 1627–1746. Dumbarton, 1860. H. B.

Dundee. Charters and Public Documents of Dundee, 1292–1880. Dundee, 1880. H.

Warden, A. J. Burgh Laws of Dundee, with the History, etc., of the Guild of Merchants and Fraternities of Craftsmen. London, 1872. H. B.

Dysart. Muir, William. Gleanings from the Records of Dysart, 1545–1796. *Maitland Club.* Edinburgh, 1862. H. B.

Notices from the Local Records of Dysart. [By W. Muir.] *Maitland Club.* Glasgow, 1853. B.

Edinburgh. Acts, Statutes, etc., of the Provost, Bailies, and Council of Edinburgh, 1529–1531. *Maitland Club, Miscellany*, II. 75–120. Edinburgh, 1840.

Charters and other Documents relating to Edinburgh, 1143–1540. [By J. D. Marwick.] *Scottish Burgh Records Soc.* Edinburgh, 1871. H. B.

Extracts from the Records of Edinburgh, 1403–1589. [By J. D. Marwick.] *Scottish Burgh Records Soc.* 4 vols. Edinburgh, 1869–82. H. B.

(Edinburgh.) Inventory of Selected Charters and Documents from the Charter House of Edinburgh. [Edinburgh,] 1884.

Ellesmere. Charters of Ellesmere [1343–1656]. *Salopian Shreds and Patches*, IX. Shrewsbury, 1891. H.

Exeter. Cotton, W., and Woollcombe, H. Gleanings from the Records of Exeter. Exeter, 1877. H.

Exeter City Muniments. *Notes and Gleanings . . . of Devon and Cornwall*, II.–V. Exeter, 1889–92. B.

Fordwich. Woodruff, C. E. A History of the Town and Port of Fordwich, with a transcription of the custumal. Canterbury, [1895]. H.

Glasgow. Abstracts of Protocols of the Town Clerks of Glasgow, Vol. I. 1547–55. [By Robert Renwick.] Glasgow, 1894.

Burgh Records of Glasgow, 1573–1581. [By J. Smith.] *Maitland Club*. Glasgow, 1832. B.

Documents relative to Glasgow. Descriptions of Lanark and Renfrew, compiled about 1710 by William Hamilton of Wishaw, App. II. *Maitland Club*. Glasgow, 1831. B.

Extracts from the Records of Glasgow, 1573–1662. [By J. D. Marwick.] *Scottish Burgh Records Soc.* 2 vols. Glasgow, 1876–81. H. B.

Memorabilia of Glasgow, selected from the Minute Books, 1588–1750. Glasgow, 1835. New edition, Glasgow, 1868. Index. *Maitland Club*. Glasgow, 1836. B.

Gloucester. Calendar of Records of the Corporation of Gloucester. Compiled by W. H. Stevenson. Gloucester, 1893.

Rental of all the Houses in Gloucester, A.D. 1455, from a roll in possession of the Corporation. Edited with translation by W. H. Stevenson. Gloucester, 1890.

Harwich. Charters granted to Harwich . . . translated by order of the Corporation. London, 1798.

Hawick. Wilson, James. Annals of Hawick, 1214–1814. Edinburgh, 1850.

Hereford. Johnson, Richard. The Ancient Customs of the City of Hereford. London, 1868. Second edition, London, 1882. H. B.

Huntingdon. A Collection of Ancient Records relating to Huntingdon. By Edward Griffith. London, 1827. H. B.

Ipswich. Accounts of the Chamberlains of Ipswich for the year 1555. By W. S. Fitch. n.d.

Domesday de Gippewyz. Printed in Vol. II. of The Black Book of the Admiralty, edited by Sir Travers Twiss. *Rolls Series*. London, 1873. H. B.

Great Domesday Book of Ipswich. By C. H. E. White. Ipswich, 1885. H. B.

Notices from the Great Court and Assembly Books of Ipswich [17th century]. By W. E. Layton. *The East Anglian*, New Series, I.–V. Ipswich, 1885–93. B.

(Ipswich.) Principal Charters granted to Ipswich . . . translated [by R. Canning]. London, 1754. H.

Irvine. Muniments of Irvine. *Ayrshire and Galloway Archæol. Assoc., Archæol. and Hist. Coll.* 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1890–91. H. B.

Kendal. A Boke of Recorde or Register containing all the Acts and Doings within the town of Kirkbiekendall, beginning in 1575. By R. S. Ferguson. *Cumb. and Westm. Antiq. and Archæol. Soc.* Kendal, 1892. H. B.

Kenfig. The Kenfig Charters. *Cambrian Archæol. Assoc., Archæologia Cambrensis*, 4th Ser., II. 172–190, 243–56, 313–19. London, 1871. H. B.

Kidwelly. Kidwelly Charters [translation]. *Cambrian Archæol. Assoc., Archæologia Cambrensis*, 3d Ser., II. 273–81, III. 1–22. London and Tenby, 1856–7. H. B.

Kilmaurs. The Charters of Kilmaurs. Kilmarnock, 1874.

Kingston-upon-Thames. The Charters of Kingston-upon-Thames, translated by George Roots. London, 1797. H.

Kinsale. The Council Book of Kinsale, 1652–1800. By Richard Caulfield. Guildford, 1879. H. B.

Kirkwall. Mackintosh, W. R. Curious Incidents from the Records of Kirkwall. Kirkwall, 1892.

—— Glimpses of Kirkwall. Kirkwall, 1887.

Lanark. Extracts from the Records of Lanark, 1150–1722. [By R. Renwick.] Glasgow, 1893. H.

Leeds. Wardell, James. Municipal History of Leeds [with an appendix of documents]. London, 1846. H. B.

Leicester. Charters of Leicester. By John Nichols. *Bibl. Topog. Brit.*, VIII. 931–68, 1347–8. London, 1790.

Jeaffreson, J. C. An Index to the Ancient Manuscripts of Leicester. Westminster, [1878]. H.

Lincoln. Civitas Lincolnia, from its Municipal and other Records. Lincoln, 1870.

Liverpool. City of Liverpool. Copies of Charters, etc. Liverpool, [1881].

City of Liverpool. Selections from the Municipal Archives and Records, from the thirteenth to the seventeenth century inclusive. By J. A. Picton. Liverpool, 1883. H.

City of Liverpool. Municipal Archives and Records (1700–1835). By J. A. Picton. Liverpool, 1886. H.

[Picton, J. A.] City of Liverpool. Report on the Records and Documents. Liverpool, 1881.

London. Analytical Index to the Remembrancia, 1579–1664. By W. H. and H. C. Overall. London, 1878. H.

Analytical Indexes to Volumes II. and VIII. of the series of Records known as the Remembrancia, 1580–1664. By W. H. and H. C. Overall. London, 1870. H.

(London.) Calendar of Letters from the Mayor and Corporation of London, 1350–70. By R. R. Sharpe. London, 1885. H. B.

Calendar of Wills enrolled in the Court of Husting, 1258–1688. By R. R. Sharpe. 2 vols. London, 1889–90. H. B.

Historical Charters and Constitutional Documents of London. By an Antiquary [W. de Gray Birch]. London, 1884. Revised edition, London, 1887. H. B.

Memorials of London and London Life in the XIIIth, XIVth, and XVth Centuries. A series of extracts from the archives of London, 1276–1419. By H. T. Riley. London, 1868. H. B.

Munimenta Gildhallæ Londoniensis: Liber Albus, Liber Custumarum, et Liber Horn. By H. T. Riley. *Rolls Series.* 3 vols. London, 1859–62. H. B.

Louth. Charters of Louth, Lincolnshire, and Free Grammar School of Edward VI. London, 1831.

Louth: Old Corporation Records. By R. W. Goulding. Louth, 1891. H.

Ludlow. Charters of Ludlow. *Salopian Shreds and Patches,* VIII. 201–261. Shrewsbury, 1889. H.

Copies of the Charters and Grants to Ludlow. Ludlow, [1821].

Lymington. Records of the Corporation of New-Lymington, in the County of Southampton. Extracted from the town muniments. By Charles St. Barbe. London, [1848?]. H.

Lynn-Regis. Harrod, Henry. Report on the Deeds and Records of King's Lynn. King's Lynn, 1874.

Maidstone. The Charters and other Documents relating to Maidstone, in the County of Kent. By W. R. James. London, 1825. H.

Manchester. Constables' Accounts of the Manor of Manchester, 1612–1776. By J. P. Earwaker. 3 vols. Manchester, 1891–2. H. B.

[Court Leet Records.] A Volume of Court Leet Records of Manchester in the sixteenth century. By John Harland. *Chetham Society.* Manchester, 1864. H. B.

—— Continuation, 1586–1602. By John Harland. *Chetham Society.* Manchester, 1865. H. B.

Court Leet Records of Manchester, 1552–1846. By J. P. Earwaker. 12 vols. Manchester, 1884–90. H. B.

Monmouth. Charters of Monmouth. Newport, 1826.

Montgomery. Ancient Charters of the Borough [Henry IV.–Charles II.]. *Powysland Club, Collections relating to Montgomeryshire,* XXI. 1–34. London, 1887.

Neath. Original Charters and Materials for a History of Neath. Collected by G. G. Francis. Swansea, 1845.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Extracts from the Municipal Accounts of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1561–1688. M. A. Richardson's Reprints of Rare Tracts, Vol. III. Newcastle, 1849. H.

Gibson, J. F. The Newcastle-upon-Tyne Improvement Acts and

Bye-laws, 1837–77. With an introductory historical sketch. Newcastle and London, 1881.

Northampton. Liber Custumarum: the Book of the Ancient Usages and Customes of Northampton, from the earliest records to 1448. By C. A. Markham. Northampton, 1896.

Norwich. Evidences relating to Town Close Estate. [Documents admitted in the cases of Stanley *v.* the Mayor, etc., of Norwich. Norwich, 1886.]

Leet Jurisdiction of Norwich during the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries. By Wm. Hudson. *Selden Soc.* London, 1892. H. B.

L'Estrange, John. Calendar of the Freemen of Norwich, 1317–1603. Edited by Walter Rye. London, 1888. H. B.

Nottingham. Records of the Borough of Nottingham: a series of extracts from the archives of Nottingham [1155–1625]. [By W. H. Stevenson.] 4 vols. London and Nottingham, 1882–89. H. B.

Royal Charters granted to the Burgesses of Nottingham, 1155–1712. [By W. H. Stevenson.] London and Nottingham, 1890. H. B.

Oswestry. Oswestry Corporation Records. *Bye-gones relating to Wales and the Border Counties*, 1876–79, 1882–83. Oswestry, 1877–83. H.

Records of the Corporation of Oswestry. By Stanley Leighton. *Shropshire Archæol. and Nat. Hist. Soc., Transactions*, II.–VII. Shrewsbury and Oswestry, [1879–84].

Oxford. Madan, F. Rough List of Manuscript Materials relating to the History of Oxford, contained in the printed catalogues of the Bodleian and College Libraries. Oxford, 1887. B.

Royal Letters addressed to Oxford. By Octavius Ogle. Oxford, 1892. H. B.

The Oxford Market [1020–1760]. *Oxford Hist. Soc., Collectanea*, II. 1–135. Oxford, 1890. H. B.

Oxford City Documents, 1268–1665. By J. E. T. Rogers. *Oxford Hist. Soc.* Oxford, 1891. H. B.

Selections from the Records of the City of Oxford [1509–1583]. By W. H. Turner. Oxford and London, 1880. H. B.

Peebles. Charters and Documents relating to Peebles, 1165–1710. [By Wm. Chambers.] *Scottish Burgh Records Soc.* Edinburgh, 1872. H. B.

Renwick, Robert. Gleanings from the Records of Peebles, 1604–1652. Peebles, 1892. B.

Pontefract. Booke of Entries of the Pontefract Corporation, 1653–1726. By Richard Holmes. Pontefract, 1882. H. B.

Charters of Pontefract. S. Fraser's Reports of . . . cases of controverted elections, I. App. 2 vols. London, 1791–3.

Preston. [Addison, John.] Extracts from Ancient Documents in the Archives of Preston. Preston, [1842]. H.

(Preston.) Charters granted to Preston. Translated by John Lingard. 2 pts. Preston, 1821. H.

Rolls of Burgesses at the Guilds Merchant of Preston, 1397–1682. By W. A. Abram. *Record Soc. of Lancashire and Cheshire*, IX. [London,] 1884. H. B.

Prestwick. Records of the Burgh of Prestwick, 1470–1782. [By John Fullerton.] *Maitland Club*. Glasgow, 1834. B.

Reading. Reading Records. Diary of the Corporation. Vol. I. 1431–1654. By J. M. Guilding. 4 vols. London and Oxford, 1892–96. H.

St. Albans. Charter and Constitutions granted to St. Albans. Translated by E. Farrinton. St. Albans, [1813].

Gibbs, A. E. The Corporation Records of St. Albans. St. Albans, 1890. H. B.

Salisbury. Charters and Documents illustrating the History of the Cathedral and City of Sarum [1100–1300]. By W. D. Macray. *Rolls Series*. London, 1891. H. B.

S[wayne], H. I. F. Gleanings from the Archives of Salisbury. *Salisbury and Winchester Journal*, Nov. 25, 1882 — Dec. 27, 1884.

Sandwich. Boys, Wm. Collections for a History of Sandwich, with notices of the other Cinque Ports. Canterbury, 1792. H.

Shaftesbury. Mayo, C. H. The Municipal Records of Shaftesbury. Sherborne, 1889. H. B.

Sheffield. Extracts from the earliest Book of Accounts of Sheffield, 1566–1707. By J. D. Leader. Sheffield, 1879.

Shrewsbury. Bailiffs' Accounts of Shrewsbury, 1275–77. By C. H. Drinkwater. *Shropshire Archæol. and Nat. His. Soc., Transactions*, 2nd Ser., III. 41–92. Shrewsbury, 1891.

The Orders of the Corporation of Shrewsbury, 1511–1735. By H. W. Adnitt. *Shropshire Archæol. and Nat. Hist. Soc., Transactions*, XI. 153–210. Shrewsbury, 1888.

Southampton. Jeaffreson, J. C. List of Charters, Letters Patent, and other Muniments of Southampton. Southampton, 1886.

Stirling. Charters and other Documents relating to Stirling, 1124–1705. [By R. Renwick.] Glasgow, 1884. H. B.

Extracts from the Records of Stirling, 1295–1752. [By R. Renwick.] *Glasgow Stirlingshire and Sons of the Rock Soc.* 2 vols. Glasgow, 1887–89. H. B.

Stratford. Extenta Burgi de Stratford in comitatu Warewike; facta anno 1252. [Middle Hill Press, 1840?]

Extracts from the Accounts of the Chamberlains of Stratford-upon-Avon, 1585–1619. By J. O. Halliwell. 3 vols. London, 1866–7.

[Halliwell, J. O.]. A Brief Hand-list of the Records of Stratford-upon-Avon; with notes of a few of the Shakesperian documents. [London,] 1862. H.

Halliwell, J. O. A Descriptive Calendar of the Ancient Manuscripts

and Records of Stratford-upon-Avon; including notices of Shakespeare and his family. London, 1863. B.

—— A Nominal Index to the Descriptive Calendar. London, 1865. B.

—— Selected Extracts from the Ancient Registry of the Causes tried in the Court of Record at Stratford-upon-Avon in the time of Shakespeare. London, 1867. B.

—— Stratford-upon-Avon in the Times of the Shakespeares. London, 1864.

Swansea. Charters granted to Swansea. By G. G. Francis. [London,] 1867.

Dillwyn, L. W. Contributions towards a History of Swansea. Swansea, 1840.

Walsall. Sims, Richard. Calendar of Deeds and Documents belonging to Walsall [King John to 1688]. Walsall, 1882. H.

Wenlock. Wenlock Corporation Records. By H. F. J. Vaughan. *Shropshire Archæol. and Nat. Hist. Soc., Transactions*, 2nd Ser., VI. 223–83. Shrewsbury, 1894.

Weymouth. Moule, H. J. Descriptive Catalogue of Charters, etc., of Weymouth and Melcombe-Regis, 1252–1800, with extracts. Weymouth, 1883. B.

Wigan. Charters of Wigan, in Latin and English. Warrington, 1808.

Winchester. Ancient Consuetudinary of Winchester. *Archæol. Journal*, IX. 69–89. By Edward Smirke. London, 1852. B.

Liber Winton. Printed in Vol. IV. of Domesday Book. *Record Commission*. [London,] 1816. H. B.

Transcripts from the Municipal Archives of Winchester. By Charles Bailey. Winchester, 1856. H.

Worcester. Woof, Richard. Catalogue of Manuscript Records and Printed Books in the Library of Worcester. Worcester, 1874.

Wycombe. Charters and Grants relating to Chipping Wycombe. Wycombe, 1817. H.

Yarmouth (Great). Repertory of Deeds and Documents relating to Great Yarmouth. Great Yarmouth, 1855.

York. Extracts from the Municipal Records of the City of York [Edward IV.–Richard III.]. By Robert Davies. London, 1843. H.

Youghal. The Council Book of the Corporation of Youghal, 1610–1800. By Richard Caulfield. Guildford, 1878. H. B.

CHARLES GROSS.

NOTES AND NEWS

The celebrated historian of Greece, Professor Ernst Curtius of Berlin, died on July 11, aged 82. Curtius was born in September, 1814, at Lübeck, of which town his father was syndic. Educated at the Katharinum, he went in 1834 to Bonn, where he was especially a pupil of Brandis. When Brandis, in 1837, was called to Greece by King Otto, he took Curtius with him. The three years which he spent in Greece, with Brandis and K. O. Müller, laid the foundation of that intimate knowledge of the land which gave character, in so important a degree, to his chief works. Obtaining his doctor's degree in 1841, he taught in a gymnasium at Berlin, where in 1844 he was made a professor extraordinarius, and was given charge of the historical and linguistic education of the prince who was afterward the Emperor Frederick. In 1850 his *Peloponnesos* was published. In 1856 he became a professor at Göttingen, whence in 1868 he was called back to Berlin. His most famous work was his *Griechische Geschichte* (1857–1861), than which no history of Greece since that of Grote has won a wider reputation. If inferior to Grote in respect to the political aspects of Greek history, Curtius was unsurpassed in the insight, enthusiasm, and eloquence with which he displayed the relations of Greek history to Greek art and literature. The great German excavations at Olympia and Pergamon and the founding of the German school of classical studies in Athens were due more largely to Curtius than to any other man, and his influence in the philological-historical section of the Prussian Academy was exceedingly great. He was, moreover, a man of noble character.

B. Hauréau, eminent as a student of mediæval manuscripts, literature, history, and philosophy, died in Paris on April 30, aged 83. He edited the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth volumes of the *Gallia Christiana*, and wrote many of the notices in the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, various works on the history of the scholastic philosophy, a *Histoire Littéraire du Maine* (1842–1852 and 1870–1877), etc.

M. Edmond de Goncourt, known by various works on French history, more especially the social and political history of the present century, died on July 16, aged 74.

M. Hector de la Ferrière, editor of the letters of Catherine de' Medici and author of various books respecting the history of the sixteenth century, died on May 2, aged 85.

M. Eugène de Rozière, noted for studies in the history of old French law, and especially for his *Formules Mérovingiennes*, died on June 17, aged 66.

Dr. James Raine, a canon of York since 1888, and known by many publications illustrating the mediæval history of that province, died on May 20.

William Henry Smith, formerly general agent of the Associated Press, editor of the *St. Clair Papers*, and author of a number of historical works relating to Ohio and the West, died near Chicago on July 26, aged 62.

Dr. J. M. Toner, whose collection of books and manuscripts relating to Washington is one of the most precious possessions of the Congressional Library, and who has elaborately edited several volumes of Washington's journals, died during the summer.

Professor George L. Burr of Cornell University has been since the latter part of May engaged at the Hague in researches for the Venezuela-Guiana Boundary Commission.

Professor Edward Channing of Harvard University and Professor Dow of Michigan spend the present academic year in Europe.

In the *Educational Review* for September Miss Lucy M. Salmon, professor of history in Vassar College, has a paper on Unity in College Entrance History.

ANCIENT HISTORY.

The second volume of Professor W. M. Flinders Petrie's *History of Egypt* (Methuen and Co.) has now been published. It covers the period of the seventeenth and eighteenth dynasties.

The American School of Classical Studies in Rome will have its quarters during the coming year in the Story Villa on the Via Gaeta. The director for 1896–1897 is Professor Minton Warren, of the Johns Hopkins University. Professor Allan Marquand of Princeton will be associated with him as professor of archæology. Applications for admission may be made to the director, in care of Messrs. Sebasti and Reali, 20 Piazza di Spagna, Rome, or to Professor C. L. Smith of Cambridge, Mass., acting chairman of the managing committee. Of the highly valuable work done by the school during its first year, under the care of Professors Hale and Frothingham, perhaps the most interesting feature has been the examination of the site of Norba. The *Harvard Graduates' Magazine* for June contains an account of the school and of its first year's work, by its first director, Professor W. G. Hale.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: W. M. Flinders Petrie, *Pharaoh of the Hard Heart* (Century Magazine, August); A. J. Delattre, *Le Pays Chanaan, Province de l'Ancien Empire Égyptien* (Revue des Questions Historiques, July); C. Johnston, *The Letter of an Assyrian Princess* (Johns

Hopkins University Circulars, June); Brandis, *Zur Verwaltungsgeschichte des römischen Reiches* (Hermes, XXXI. 2); P. Vigneaux, *Essai sur l'Histoire de la Præfectura Urbis à Rome* (Revue Générale de Droit, May); E. Beaudouin, *La Colonisation Romaine dans l'Afrique du Nord* (Revue Générale de Droit, May); A. H. J. Greenidge, *The 'Provocatio Militiæ' and Provincial Jurisdiction* (Classical Review, June).

MEDIÆVAL HISTORY.

The Oxford University Press has in preparation a new *Historical Atlas of Modern Europe*, to consist of ninety colored maps of moderate size and cost, accompanied by letter-press. Mr. R. L. Poole is the general editor. He has had assistance from Professors York Powell, Prothero, Bury, Tout, and other well-known scholars. Mediæval history is included.

The *Revue de l'Orient Latin*, which appears once in two months, is henceforth to be accompanied by a supplement, appearing once in three months, and devoted to the interests of special scholarship, while the *Revue* itself will be addressed rather to the general public.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: W. J. Ashley, *The Beginnings of Town Life in the Middle Ages* (Quarterly Journal of Economics, July); Léon Le Grand, *Les Maisons-Dieu, leurs Statuts au XIII^e^ Siècle* (Revue des Questions Historiques, July); E. H. Parker, *The Origin of the Turks* (English Historical Review, July).

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY.

The Heeren and Ukert series, *Geschichte der europäischen Staaten*, is henceforth to be under the editorial cafe of Professor Karl Lamprecht. It is expected that Professor Pirenne of Ghent will contribute a history of Flanders and Brabant; Professor Bachmann a history of Bohemia; Professor M. G. Schybergson of Helsingfors a history of Finland; Professor Brückner a history of Russia, of which the first volume has already appeared. It is announced that, in the volumes produced under the new editorship, more attention will be paid to economic and social history.

The Société Belge de la Librairie has published the seventh volume of Father Sommervogel's *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*. This volume contains the writers from Roeder to Thonhauser.

Messrs. G. P. Putnam's Sons announce a new series of *Leaders of the Protestant Reformation*, uniform in style with their series of *Heroes of the Nations*. The volumes already arranged for deal with the following lives: Erasmus, by Professor Emerton; Luther, by Dr. H. L. Jacobs; Zwingli, by Dr. S. M. Jackson; Cranmer, by Dr. A. V. G. Allen; Melanchthon, by Dr. J. W. Richard.

Vol. III., No. 3, of the *Translations and Reprints from the Original Sources of European History*, issued by the historical department of the

University of Pennsylvania, is concerned with the period of the later Reformation. In this enormous field seventeen somewhat miscellaneous documents are given in translation, edited by Mr. Merrick Whitcomb.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: S. R. Gardiner, *Cromwell and Mazarin in 1652* (English Historical Review, July); R. Koser, *Neue Veröffentlichungen zur Vorgeschichte des siebenjährigen Krieges* (Historische Zeitschrift, LXXVII. 1); H. Marmonier, *La Question de la Maddalena* (Revue Historique, September); H. Hueffer, *L'Assassinat des Plénipotentiaires Français à Rastadt* (Revue Historique, July); Marquis Costa de Beauregard, *La Mort de l'Empereur Paul I.* (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, 1896, 3); P. de la Gorce, *Les Annexions Italiennes en 1860; l'Invasion des États Pontificaux* (Le Correspondant, May 10).

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

The most recent historical publications of the British government are the following: Vol. VII. (1848–1850) of the new series of *State Trials;* the second edition of Mr. Scargill-Bird's *Guide to the Principal Classes of Documents preserved in the Public Record Office;* Vol. XIII. (1581–1582) of the *Acts of the Privy Council of England*, edited by Mr. J. R. Dasent; the *Calendar of the Close Rolls* from 1327 to 1330; Part VI. of the *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquis of Salisbury*, issued by the Historical Manuscripts Commission; and the second and third volumes of the *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Earl of Dartmouth*, issued by the same commission. The second Dartmouth volume deals with the American papers. We shall expect to examine it more fully later.

Vol. XLVII. of the *Dictionary of National Biography* extends from Puckle to Reidfurd. From the point of view of the historical student, the most important articles are: that on Pulteney, by Principal Ward; that on Pym, by Mr. Gardiner; that on Queen Elizabeth's Earl of Sussex, by Mr. Robert Dunlop; that on Ralegh, by Professor J. K. Laughton and Mr. Sidney Lee; and that on Dalhousie, by Sir Alexander J. Arbuthnot.

Messrs. Sheehan of Ann Arbor announce the issue of a series of *Reprints Illustrative of English History*, edited by Mr. W. D. Johnston of the University of Michigan. The aim of the series is to comprehend in a handy form the most important documents illustrative of the chief movements of English history, together with other illustrative materials, an introductory essay, and an annotated bibliography. The political and constitutional development of England and the relations between Church and State will all receive attention.

The Irish Literary Society of London has begun the compilation of an extensive work of reference dealing with the authorities upon Irish history, contemporary and modern.

The Navy Records Society proposes to issue during the present year *Holland's Two Discourses on the Navy, 1639 and 1660*, edited by Mr. J. R.

Tanner; and *Navy Accounts and Inventories under Henry VII.*, edited by Mr. M. Oppenheim. It is expected that the volumes for next year will be the *Journal of Sir George Rooke, 1700 to 1702*, edited by Mr. Oscar Browning; the second roll of *Anthony's Declaration of the Navy, 1546*, edited by Professor Elgar; and papers relating to the blockade of Brest, 1803–1805, edited by Mr. John Leyland.

A movement is on foot for a restoration of the ancient Norman church at Austerfield, one of the sacred places of Pilgrim history. The restoration, which is said to be much needed, will be directed strictly toward the end of bringing the church as nearly as possible to its original condition. Contributions may be sent to the honorary secretary of the fund, Mr. John Walker, Bawtry, Yorkshire.

Mr. James Gairdner has reprinted from *Archæologia* a paper which he recently read before the Society of Antiquaries on the battle of Bosworth, based upon careful investigations made upon the spot.

Messrs. Blades of London have issued an extensive *Bibliography of the King's Book or Eikon Basilike*, by E. Almack (270 pp.).

Dr. Thomas Hodgkin, the historian of the later Roman Empire, has published through Messrs. Methuen and Co. in London, and Messrs. Houghton, Mifflin and Co. of Boston, an excellent biography of George Fox.

The eighth volume of Mr. H. B. Wheatley's new edition of the *Diary of Samuel Pepys* (Macmillan), now published, brings the diary to an end. The ninth volume will contain an introduction, a paper on the London of Pepys's time, a map, an elaborate index, and appendices.

The fifth volume of Traill's *Social England* covers the period from 1715 to 1815. Among the most important chapters are those by Dr. John Brown on Nonconformity and the Wesleyan Movement, 1688–1815; by Mr. R. E. Prothero on the history of English agriculture during the last century; and by Mr. G. Townsend Warner on the development of the great English industries during the same period.

The British Museum has purchased from Viscount Bridport the greater portion of his large collection of the papers and correspondence of Lord Nelson, in sixty volumes, presenting upwards of six thousand letters, together with diaries and other matter. It has also acquired from the Earl of Sheffield the whole of the autograph manuscripts of Gibbon which once belonged to the first Earl. These include the autobiographical sketches and various journals and correspondence.

The first two volumes of the autobiography of the late Earl Selborne, edited by his daughter, Lady Sophia Palmer, have been published by Messrs. Macmillan and Co. They contain memorials of his family, and an account of his own career down to 1865.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: F. Haverfield, *Early British Christianity* (English Historical Review, July); Thurneysen, *Wann kamen die*

Deutschen in England (Englische Studien, XXII. 2); F. W. Maitland, *Canon Law in England*, I. (English Historical Review, July); Klaehr, *Die Schulen von Eton und Winchester im sechszehnten Jahrhundert* (Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik, CLII. 1).

FRANCE

The department of printed books in the Bibliothèque Nationale has issued a twelfth volume (Paris, Didot, 799 pp.) of its *Catalogue de l'Histoire de France*, consisting of an author-index to the eleven volumes of subject-catalogue which have now appeared. The catalogue is not to be continued farther.

The Société de l'École des Chartes has begun the publication of a series of monographs under the general title *Mémoires et Documents*, chiefly to consist of the theses presented for the diploma of *archiviste-paléographe*.

In the Foreign Statesmen Series published by Macmillan and Co., the last issue is a book on *Philip Augustus* by Rev. W. H. Hutton.

M. Richard Waddington has brought out in the form of a book, *Louis XV. et le Renversement des Alliances: Préliminaires de la Guerre de Sept Ans, 1754–1756* (Paris, Firmin-Didot), those important and original studies of a much-disputed crisis, of which he has given a foretaste in the pages of the *Revue Historique*.

Professor W. M. Sloane's *Life of Napoleon Bonaparte*, which has for some time been appearing serially in the Century Magazine, will now be issued by the Century Company as a book in four substantial and elaborately illustrated volumes.

M. G. Weill has followed his book on Saint-Simon by another of similar excellence, on *L'École Saint-Simonienne* (Paris, Alcan).

The first volume of the *Mémoires du Baron d'Haussez* (Paris, Calmann-Lévy), published this summer, furnishes valuable information respecting the course of French affairs from 1814 to 1824, during which the Baron d'Haussez was a deputy and a prefect.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: A. Jessopp, *The Baptism of Clovis* (Nineteenth Century, September); L. Batiffol, *Le Châtelet de Paris vers 1400*, I. (Revue Historique, July); M. de la Rocheterie, *Marie Antoinette* (Le Correspondant, June 10); Ghika, *La France et les Principautés Danubiennes, de 1789 à 1815* (Annales de l'École Libre des Sciences Politiques, May); Anatole de Gallier, *Robespierre, ses Principes, son Système Politique* (Revue des Questions Historiques, July); P. Bailleu, *Zur Geschichte Napoleon's I.* (Historische Zeitschrift, LXXVII. 1); F. Aulard, *Le Lendemain du 18 Brumaire* (Revue de Paris, April 1); W. M. Sloane, *Life of Napoleon Bonaparte* (Century Magazine, July ——); E. Lamy, *Le Gouvernement de la Défense Nationale* (Revue des Deux Mondes, May 15); *The Govern-*

ment of France since 1870 (Edinburgh Review, July); H. Doniol, *Négociations et Négociateurs de la Libération du Territoire en 1871* (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, 1896, 3).

ITALY, SPAIN, PORTUGAL.

In the *Archivio Storico Italiano*, in the second number for this year, Mr. Horatio F. Brown gives an account of the English publications on Italian history, from 1890 to 1895.

An important contribution to the history of the union of Italy has been made by the publication of the first volume of Luigi Chiala's *Giacomo Dina e l' Opera sua nelle Vicende del Risorgimento Italiano*. Dina was a noted supporter of Cavour and editor of the Turin newspaper which was Cavour's organ.

A new historical journal for southern Italy has been instituted under the editorial care of Professor R. V. Scaffidi of Reggio. It is entitled *Rivista Calabro-Sicula di Storia e Letteratura*. The price of foreign subscriptions is 12 lire. The most prominent historical scholars of southern Italy promise their collaboration.

M. Gabriel Syveton, in his *Une Cour et un Aventurier au XVIII^e^ Siècle: le Baron de Ripperda* (Paris, Leroux), has given a completer study than has ever before been given of that prime minister, and a carefully constructed history of Spanish politics from 1725 to 1729.

Mr. T. Fisher Unwin has published a *History of the Portuguese in South Africa* by Dr. G. McC. Theal, extending from the earliest times to the present day.

GERMANY, AUSTRIA, SWITZERLAND.

The *Historische Zeitschrift*, deprived of its chief editor by the death of Treitschke, is now placed under the editorial care of a committee consisting of Archivrath Paul Bailleu of Berlin, Drs. L. Erhardt and Otto Hintze of the same city, and Professors Otto Krauske of Göttingen, Max Lenz of Berlin, Moriz Ritter of Bonn, Konrad Varrentrapp of Strassburg, and Karl Zeumer of Berlin. Dr. Friedrich Meinecke will continue to be the managing editor. The editors intend, besides the *Zeitschrift*, to issue a series of monographs under the general title of *Historische Bibliothek*.

The *Monumenta Germaniæ Historica* is continued by the publication of *Auctorum Antiquissimorum, tomi XIII. pars 3, Chronica Minora sæc. IV. V. VI. VII.*, edited by Mommsen; and of *Legum sectio IV. Constitutiones, etc., tom. II.* (1198–1272), edited by Ludwig Weiland.

Professor Ludwig Pastor has, in the *Revue des Questions Historiques* for July, a summary review of the recent historical publications of Germany.

The fourth "Versammlung deutscher Historiker" took place at Innsbruck, September 10–14.

A new translation of Janssen's *History of the German People at the End of the Middle Ages*, executed by M. A. Mitchell and A. M. Christie, is being published at St. Louis by B. Herder. The first two volumes have appeared.

Dr. Sigmund Riezler has published (Stuttgart, Cotta) a highly important contribution to the history of German civilization, especially of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, in his monograph entitled *Geschichte der Hexenprocesse in Bayern.*

An important contribution to our knowledge of Bismarck's history during the years from 1851 to 1860, is afforded by the recently published *Bismarck's Briefe an den General Leopold von Gerlach*, edited by Horst Kohl (Berlin, Häring).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: F. Rachfall, *Deutschlands Geschichte vom ökonomischen Standpunkte* (Preussische Jahrbücher, LXXXIII. 1); H. F. Helmolt, *Die Grenze des alten Deutschlands* (Historisches Jahrbuch, XVII. 2); T. Hampe, *Sittenbildliches aus Meisterlieder-Handschriften* (Zeitschrift für Kulturgeschichte, IV. 1, 2); E. Otto, *Die Wehrverfassung einer kleinen deutschen Stadt im späteren Mittelalter*, I. (Zeitschrift für Kulturgeschichte, IV. 1, 2); K. T. von Buttlar, *Das tägliche Leben an den deutschen Fürstenhofen des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Zeitschrift für Kulturgeschichte, IV. 1, 2); W. Goetz, *Der Kompromisskatholizismus und Kaiser Maximilian II.* (Historische Zeitschrift, LXXVII. 2); H. Delbrück, *Friedrich der Grosse und der Ursprung des siebenjährigen Krieges* (Preussische Jahrbücher, LXXXIV. 1); William D. McCrackan, *Andreas Hofer, the Hero of the Tirol* (New England Magazine, July); F. Meinecke, *Boyen und Roon* (Historische Zeitschrift, LXXVII. 2); E. G. Bourne, *Leopold von Ranke* (Sewanee Review, August); F. Meinecke, *Heinrich von Treitschke* (Historische Zeitschrift, LXXVII. 1).

AMERICA.

The Navy Department has just issued the third volume of the *Official Records of the Union and Confederate Navies in the War of the Rebellion.* This volume covers the operations of the cruisers from April 1, 1864, to December 30, 1865, and completes the first series of the publications as planned by the Department. It includes, among other matters of great interest, a large amount of documentary material respecting the cruises and engagements of the *Kearsarge* and *Alabama*, of the *Florida*, *Tallahassee*, *Rappahannock*, *Stonewall*, and *Shenandoah.*

The first volume of the official compilation of the *Messages, Proclamations, and Inaugural Addresses of the Presidents from 1789 to 1897*, edited by Hon. James D. Richardson, has appeared. It extends from 1789 to 1817.

The last issues in the series of *Old South Leaflets* have been: Winthrop's "Little Speech" on Liberty; Cotton Mather's "Bostonian Ebene-

zer" from the *Magnalia;* Governor Hutchinson's account of the Boston Tea Party; Adrian van der Donck's description of New Netherlands in 1655; the debate of the Constitutional Convention in 1787 on the suffrage in Congress; Columbus's memorial to Ferdinand and Isabella on his second voyage; the Dutch Declaration of Independence in 1581; Captain John Knox's account of the battle of Quebec; Hamilton's report on the coinage; and William Penn's Plan for the Peace of Europe.

Messrs. Longmans, Green and Co. announce a series of *Harvard Historical Studies*, comprising works of original research by teachers and graduates of the university, and likewise collections of documents and bibliographies. At least three volumes are expected to be completed annually. The first three will be on the suppression of the African slave trade in the United States of America, 1638 to 1870, by Professor W. B. Du Bois of Wilberforce University; on the contest over the ratification of the Federal Constitution in Massachusetts, by Professor S. B. Harding of Indiana University; and a critical study of nullification in South Carolina, by Professor David Houston of the University of Texas.

The latest issues in the *Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science* are a monograph on the History of Taxation in Connecticut, 1636–1776, by Mr. F. R. Jones, and one on Slavery in New Jersey, by Mr. H. S. Cooley.

Under the title *With the Fathers: Studies in the History of the United States*, Professor J. B. McMaster, of the University of Pennsylvania, has published a collection of historical essays recently contributed to various magazines. They relate to the Monroe Doctrine; the third term tradition; the Know-nothings; the framers and framing of the Constitution; Franklin in France; the British evacuation of New York, etc.

Hon. Edmund G. Ross, who was a member of the Senate at the time of the impeachment of President Johnson, and was one of the seven Republican senators who refused to vote for conviction, has published at Santa Fe a small but interesting volume entitled *History of the Impeachment of Andrew Johnson.*

Mr. Joseph Williamson has issued in two volumes a *Bibliography of the State of Maine* from the earliest period to 1891 (Portland, 1896, 738, 699 pp.). His plan confines itself to writings printed in or having reference to Maine, and writings of which the authors were at the time of writing or publication residents within that state. The arrangement is chronological, and the book is thus open to criticism in respect to convenience of use; but its importance and value will nevertheless be great.

Vol. XXVII. of the *New Hampshire State Papers*, edited by Mr. Albert S. Batchellor, is also called "Town Charters, Vol. IV." and "Masonian Papers, Vol. I." It contains the township grants of lands in New Hampshire included in the Masonian patent, issued subsequently to 1746 by the Masonian proprietary. These are presented in alphabetical order from A

to M, and are accompanied with plans, bibliographical citations, and complete indexes (Concord, the Public Printer, 1896, 588 pp.).

This summer's course of Old South Lectures for Young People, given weekly at Boston, related to the American Historians, from Bradford to Parkman.

Messrs. Houghton, Mifflin and Co. have published the *Life and Letters of Charles Bulfinch, Architect,* edited by his granddaughter, Miss Ellen Susan Bulfinch; a work whose text and illustrations cast much light upon the history of American architecture during the first half of the present century.

The *Twenty-seventh Report of the Record Commissioners of the City of Boston* contains the selectmen's meetings from 1787 to 1798, published after the usual manner. The index of names seems to us open to criticism. To find, for instance, under the name Boardman, the bare enumeration of 295 pages (out of 350 in the volume) upon which that name occurs, is no aid to the student. These longer items in the index should somehow be subdivided.

The Nantucket Historical Association, founded in 1894, has issued, as Bulletin No. 1, a highly interesting paper on *Quakerism in Nantucket since 1800,* by Henry B. Worth.

The July and October numbers of *The Publications of the Rhode Island Historical Society* contain continuations of Mr. Henry C. Dorr's Providence Proprietors and Freeholders.

The Record Commissioners of Providence have issued the tenth volume of the *Early Records of the Town of Providence.* It contains the proceedings of the town council from 1692 to 1714, and consists chiefly of probate matters. It is thus closely related to the sixth and seventh volumes, which contained early wills.

Messrs. Henry Holt and Co. are the publishers of Vol. II. of *Biographical Sketches of the Graduates of Yale College, with Annals of the College History,* by Mr. Franklin B. Dexter. The volume, admirable for fulness and accuracy, extends from May, 1745, to May, 1763. Among the graduates of these years were Judge Thomas Jones, Bishop Seabury, Silas Deane, and President Stiles.

The Connecticut Historical Society has made considerable progress in the preparation of a new volume of *Collections.* It will contain, with other similar Revolutionary matter, "A Concise Journal or Minutes of the principal movements toward St. John's (Chambly) of the siege and surrender of the forts there in 1775." This is an interesting journal of the Rev. Dr. Trumbull, a chaplain in the army, and gives a detailed account of all the military operations in which he was engaged during the period mentioned. Letters and papers of Trumbull's relating to the expedition will also be included. The Society are also preparing to print a portion of the early

votes of the town of Hartford. This will be the first such publication, of any considerable extent, in Connecticut.

We understand that there has been some delay, by reason of legal obstacles, to the printing of the old Dutch records of New York City by the Board of City Record. We hope that the delay may result in the printing of the Dutch text, and in an enlargement of the proposed edition.

The comptroller of the state of New York has discovered, in the attic of the old State Building, a large quantity of records of the Revolutionary War, offering data respecting sixty-four military organizations in the colonial and Continental services, and four privateers belonging to the state. The records contain the names of over 30,000 soldiers of New York.

Under the name of The Colonial Society, a new club has been started in Philadelphia which will devote itself to the publication of facsimiles of rare or unique books, and also of new works relating wholly to the history of Pennsylvania.

The Southern Historical Association held its first annual meeting at Washington on June 12. The inaugural address was delivered by the President, Hon. William L. Wilson. Dr. Stephen B. Weeks read a paper on the promotion of historical studies in the South; Mr. Thomas M. Owen a paper on the documentary history of the state of West Florida. Mr. Theodore L. Cole presented the first part of a bibliography of the statute law of the Southern states.

In the July number of the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* the most interesting documents printed are: the continuation of the defence of Colonel Edward Hill; certain decisions of the Virginia General Court, 1626–1628; and a collection of proceedings relating to the boundary line between Virginia and Carolina, 1710. The October number contains the narrative of Bacon's Rebellion drawn up by the royal commissioners, Berry and Moryson.

The Virginia State Society of the Cincinnati has printed (Richmond, J. W. Randolph Company, 118 pp.) a volume containing the proceedings of the Society from 1783 to its disbanding in 1824.

James F. Meegan of Atlanta, Ga., has issued a limited edition (250 copies) of Charlton's *Life of Major-General James Jackson*, an important and rare book of Georgia history.

Joutel's *Journal of the Last Voyage of La Salle*, originally published in London in 1714, is to be issued in reprint as the first book put forth by the Caxton Club, organized in Chicago in 1895. The volume has been edited and annotated by Melville B. Anderson of the Leland Stanford University.

The State Historical Society of Wisconsin will shortly issue a catalogue of its bound newspaper files, arranged geographically and in chronological order by decades, enriched by historical notes. An alphabetical index of editors and publishers will be added.

No. 6 of the *Parkman Club Publications* is an interesting narrative of negro slavery in Wisconsin, by Mr. John Nelson Davidson.

Mr. Benjamin F. Shambaugh of the State University of Iowa continues his useful series of *Documentary Material relating to the History of Iowa*, published by the State Historical Society. No. 5 contains, with annotations, the acts of Congress relating to the territory of Iowa and its admission into the Union. No. 6 presents the documentary history of the early propositions for a constitutional convention and of the abortive constitution of 1844. No. 7 gives the constitution of 1846 and other documents related thereto.

In the July number of the *Annals of Iowa* the leading article is one by Hon. Theodore S. Parvin on General Robert Lucas, first governor of the Iowa Territory.

A movement has been undertaken in Halifax toward organizing the celebration of the landing of Cabot upon this continent in 1497. The celebration will be connected with the meeting of the Royal Society of Canada, which is to take place in Halifax on June 24, 1897.

Rev. Dr. C. H. Mockridge, canon of St. Alban's Cathedral, Toronto, has published a work entitled *The Bishops of the Church of England in Canada and Newfoundland, being an Illustrated Historical Sketch of the Church of England in Canada, as traced through her Episcopate.*

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: C. de Charencey, *L'Historien Sahagun et les Migrations Mexicaines* (Muséon, 1896, 2); C. W. Macfarlane, *Pennsylvania Paper Currency* (Annals of the American Academy of Political Science, July); *The Frontier Forts of Pennsylvania* (Pennsylvania Magazine, July); J. W. Jordan, *The Military Hospitals at Bethlehem and Lititz during the Revolution* (ibid.); W. C. Ford, *Defences of Philadelphia in 1777*, continued (ibid.); W. S. Baker, *Washington after the Revolution, 1784–1799*, continued (ibid.); P. L. Ford, *Lord Howe's Commission to Pacify the Colonies* (Atlantic Monthly, June); Woodrow Wilson, *General Washington* (Harper's Magazine, July); Woodrow Wilson, *First in Peace* (Harper's Magazine, September); P. Barré, *La Formation Territoriale et les Litiges des Frontières des États Américains*, II. (Revue de Géographie, April); J. B. Henneman, *Tennessee History by Tennesseeans* (Sewanee Review, August); F. A. Churchill, *McClellan's Peninsular Campaign* (United Service, August), a critique of Mr. Rhodes's article in the April number of this REVIEW.

Mr. TALCOTT WILLIAMS asks us to point out that whereas, by regrettable error, his review of Professor Edwin A. Grosvenor's "Constantinople" implied the absence of a list of Byzantine emperors and Turkish sultans, the book in fact contains such a list; and that the Byzantine list in particular represents careful research and is a highly useful addition to the equipment of study in this field.

The Principles of Political Economy.

By WILLIAM ROSCHER, *Professor of Political Economy at the University of Leipzig.*

With an Essay upon the Historical Methods in Political Economy, by L. Walowski, Member of the Institute of France.

CHAPTERS ON GOLD AND SILVER MONEY, — LABOR AND CAPITAL.

Three specially written appendices, by Dr. Roscher, on **Paper Money, International Trade,** and the **Protective System.**

That which first strikes the readers in Dr. Roscher's work is its rare symmetry. Order is its first law.
— *Philadelphia Times.*

This work affords a view of these questions from the unbiassed standpoint of a German Professor, and gives the means of considering understandingly the arguments of politicians and the assertions of campaign literature.

Two volumes. 8vo. Regular price, Cloth, $6.00; Sheep, $7.00; Half Calf, $9.00.

Special price until Nov. 1, 1896, half the regular price net.

A LESSON FROM HISTORY.

The French Revolution.

TESTED BY MIRABEAU'S CAREER. Twelve Lectures on the History of the French Revolution, delivered at the Lowell Institute, Boston, Mass. By Dr. HERMANN E. VON HOLST, Author of "Constitutional and Political History of the United States," and "The Constitutional Law of the United States," Head Professor of History in the University of Chicago.

At the invitation of the trustees of the Lowell Institute of Boston, Hermann E. von Holst gave, in the condensed form of twelve one-hour lectures, a summary of his reflections on the causes of the French Revolution, as tested by Mirabeau's career.

These lectures met with the unanimous commendation of Boston's intellectual circles, and awakened the deepest interest on their delivery in Chicago.

Mirabeau stands out as the central figure of the times; the greatest statesman of France. Never has his life been sketched with more genuine admiration for his noble qualities, with a clearer perception of his real greatness of character, with similar appreciation of the effect of his times and his environment on the development of his natural genius.

"The Heritage of Louis XIV and Louis XV," the full significance of the maxim "L'état c'est moi," the relation of king to the orders of clergy, nobility, and people, and their relation to one another, are shown with such clearness as to furnish material for comparison with existing relations.

Such a mass of information and suggestion is condensed into each of these lectures, that no extracts would adequately represent their character.

LECTURE HEADINGS.

1. **The Heritage of Louis XIV and Louis XV.**
2. **Paris and Versailles.**
3. **Mending the Old Garment with New Cloth.**
4. **The Revolution before the Revolution.**
5. **A Typical Family Tragedy of Portentous Political Import.**
6. **The States-General.**
7. **A Party of One Man.**
8. **The 5th and 6th of October and the Memoir of the 15th.**
9. **The Decisive Defeat of November 7, 1789.**
10. **Other Defeats and Mischievous Victories.**
11. **Mirabeau and the Court.**
12. **The End. A Unique Tragedy.**

"Dr. von Holst's lectures on the French Revolution, at the Lowell Institute, constitute one of the several important events in the way of bringing some of the foremost scholars of the age in the various departments of science and letters into contact with the Boston public that for a long period has distinguished the work of that unique and invaluable institution." — *Boston Herald.*

2 vols. 12mo. Cloth. $3.50, net.

CALLAGHAN & CO., CHICAGO.