The appearance of the first volume of Charles McLean Andrews' *The Colonial Period of American History* is a notable event in American historiography. The importance of this lies not only in the intrinsic merit of the work itself embodying as it does the application of a highly refined and exacting historical methodology and an unrivalled knowledge of the sources of colonial history but also in the fact that it represents the results of a gradual re-orientation in the approach to the study of early American history.

In 1889 Professor Andrews was awarded his doctorate at Johns Hopkins. It was there that Herbert B. Adams was conducting the seminar that was attracting many of America's most brilliant young men. It is also a matter of interest that in that same year Herbert L. Osgood received his doctorate as the result of achievement under the guidance of John W. Burgess, having, prior to undertaking his graduate studies at Columbia, spent a year in Germany. While each of these men was destined to make notable contributions to the study of American colonial history, the outlook in that field may not at the time have seemed especially promising to most students. In fact, many thought that the major labor, if not already accomplished, was at least to be brought to an early conclusion. For in 1874 George
Bancroft had issued Volume X of his *History of the United States of America from the Discovery of the Continent* and in 1882 had added two volumes which brought this great work down to the beginning of the national period; in 1889, under the editorship of the distinguished librarian of Harvard, Justin Winsor, there appeared Volume VIII—the last volume—of the *Narrative and Critical History of America*, which was largely concerned with colonial history; John Fiske, the philosopher-historian, also of Harvard, in that same year published his *Beginnings of New England* and was well along in the preparation of his *American Revolution* and his *Discovery of America* to appear respectively in 1891 and 1892; while the Nestor of American historians, Francis Parkman, was about to release the manuscript of the last volumes in that great series on France and England in the New World. These older historians by 1889 had also been joined, among others, by a young Harvard doctor of philosophy, Edward Channing, who had received his inspiration in Henry Adams' seminar and who, besides offering other evidences of promise, had rendered valuable assistance in the preparation of the *Narrative and Critical History*.

However, by 1889 new conceptions of history were gaining ground, new approaches were being considered and tried, a new and more rigid methodology was being advocated. All this was destined to have an influence upon work in the field of American colonial history. In that very year, it may be pointed out, Ernst Bernheim published his epoch-making *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode und der Geschichtsphilosophie* throwing new light upon historical criticism, historical evidence, and historical interpretation. The relation of this work to the subsequent progress of historical research in Europe and America has an importance that is undoubtedly very great, though this influence, as far as America was concerned can easily be exaggerated, because American historical scholars were already developing a method and technique that was distinctly an improvement on the German system. The appearance of the *Lehrbuch* was but one evidence of a most extraordinary development that had taken place in historical research in Germany by reason of which the history of that country and of Europe was being rewritten. The influence of this was already being felt in America. It is indeed a matter of significance that both Andrews and Osgood re-
ceived their advanced instruction under men who had been trained in the '70s in the seminars of master German historians and that as a young college graduate Osgood had had personal contacts with the German scholars Wagner, Schmoller, Gneist and Treitschke. For Adams studied at Göttingen, Berlin, and Heidelberg, Burgess at Göttingen, Leipzig, and Berlin. Each came under the influence of such scholars as George Waitz at Göttingen who, before his removal to Berlin in 1875 to succeed Pertz as the principal editor of the _Monumenta Germania historica_, was drawing large numbers of students from various parts of the world into his lecture course and seminar on early German institutions and who was in the midst of the preparation of his monumental _Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte_ which appeared from the press between the years 1844 and 1878. It is also to be noted that both Adams and Burgess studied at Berlin where Savigny had long since placed the writing of legal history in Germany upon a scientific basis in the publication of his masterly _Geschichte des römischen Rechts im Mittelalter_ and where the great Leopold von Ranke was at the height of his influence, having already trained most of the leading historians of Germany, among them Waitz. Therefore, when these men after returning to America took up their graduate instruction at Johns Hopkins and Columbia respectively they were fully under the influence of the new historical conceptions and were able to present to their own advanced students the possibilities of a new type of American history, especially along institutional lines.

However, in the case of Andrews, although he proceeded to introduce the seminar at Bryn Mawr upon taking up his work in that institution, it was the new school of English historians, as represented by Maitland, Gross, Seebohm, Round, and Vinogradoff, particularly the first-named, that was destined to exercise a much more decisive influence than the German historians upon his general approach to the study of history. This school, while undoubtedly influenced profoundly, even if indirectly, by the phenomenal progress of German studies, especially those of a legal and institutional nature, had come into existence as the result of the decided reaction that took place to German conceptions of historical interpretation embodied in the work of such writers as Kemble, Freeman, Hallam, and Green, among the leaders of the so-called English Teutonic
school. Adams at Johns Hopkins must also be identified in outlook with the latter group and it is a matter of interest that Andrews, who as a student had had no contact with German universities, flatly rejected the Germanic theory of the origin of American institutions, which was in vogue at that time, and after he himself became a teacher preferred to send his students to England and France rather than to Germany for study. It is not without significance that after the publication of his *River Towns of Connecticut* in 1889, he should have turned to English medieval history and as a result have written in 1890 a paper on "The Village Community," which challenged the views of von Maurer, Kemble, Freeman, and Maine, and in 1892 produced his *Old English Manor*. Then followed his two volumes in 1896 and 1898 on *The Development of Modern Europe* and in 1902 his *Contemporary Europe, Asia and Africa*, with his *History of England* appearing in 1903. Thus equipped with an unusually rich background of study and writing in the broad field of history and the giving of courses at Bryn Mawr in general history from "Adam" to McKinley for fifteen years, he finally turned his attention to the American colonial period, an interest in which he had developed as the result of his work in the field of English history, especially his exploratory investigations into the exercise of sovereign power over the colonies. It is also not without its bearing upon his choice of this field that in 1892 he made an examination of a number of the Board of Trade papers at the request of the Librarian of The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Frederick D. Stone, preparatory to the copying of the "Journal" and other papers, the transcripts of which are now in the library of that society.¹

The early years of the twentieth century witnessed the forging to the front of three men as the leading authorities in American colonial history. These were Andrews at Bryn Mawr and later at

¹ The completion of this monumental task in 1892 is a tribute to the foresight of one of the Society's ablest librarians and to those members of the Society who made it possible for the work to be carried forward. Embracing 90 volumes of transcripts of the Board of Trade Journals, 1675–1782; 24 volumes of *Papers, Proprieties*, 1697–1776; and 31 volumes of *Papers, Plantations General*, 1689–1780, together with three volumes of indexes, this great source for American colonial history, relating as it does to all the British colonies in America, fully justified Stone's comment that the work of transcribing was "without doubt one of the most important that has ever been undertaken by any historical society in this country."—Ed.
Johns Hopkins and Yale, Osgood at Columbia, and Channing at Harvard. In 1904, after a year spent in the Public Record Office, there appeared Andrews' *Colonial Self-Government* as one of the *American Nation* series; in that year there also appeared Volume I of Osgood's *The American Colonies in the Seventeenth Century* and in 1905 came Volume I of Channing's *History of the United States*. From that time on to their passing away the two latter concentrated their energies, outside of their teaching, mainly upon the series to which each had definitively committed himself. The series in each case reflects the interest and outlook of the writer. Osgood remained throughout his life the colonial historian whose chief concern was in institutions. He sought as a true disciple of Burgess "to interpret early American history in terms of public law," just as Waitz, under whom Burgess had studied, had reinterpreted early German history in terms of public law and custom. His seven substantial volumes are monuments to his industry and erudition and represent a contribution of the first importance to early American history. Whatever defects they now display must be attributed not to any lack of rigidity in approved standards of scholarship but to the fact that perhaps no man is capable of meticulously sifting the vast accumulations of evidence that underlie two hundred years of institutional history—that is, from the days of Elizabeth to the end of the Seven Years' War, the period of immediate concern to Osgood. There has also been in thirty years, since the time of the appearance of his first volume, very naturally a great advance in the study of American colonial institutions. It should also be mentioned that the volumes on the eighteenth century were published posthumously.

As to Channing, his purpose was to write the history of the United States from the earliest period to his own days. He succeeded in so doing and is the only man who can claim that honor who has attempted to deal with American history on a large scale. The scope of this, as stated in the introduction to his first volume, is political, military, institutional, industrial, and social—certainly no unambitious task! After the first three volumes were issued, that is, after 1918, Channing passed beyond the range of colonial history and never returned to it—much, it appears, to his regret in later years, if a letter to the writer correctly represents his feelings. His first two interestingly written and challenging volumes cover the period
of Osgood’s sober and methodical seven and it goes without further comment that his success, in spite of great acuteness of intellect, could only be measurable in grappling with the innumerable complexities presented in studying the history of American colonization. In fact his History is rather in the class with the writings of the older historians both in the scope of materials employed and in outlook, in spite of a certain reputation that he possessed for iconoclasm. With all of his desire for historical detachment his conceptions in the main run true to the traditions of his New England background and at times one can almost feel the presence of a Boston selectman as the history of the American colonies is unfolded.

It is of interest that Andrews resisted any impulse for over thirty years to commit himself as did Osgood and Channing to an extensive plan for a colonial history. He was more interested then, as he is now, to present the colonies in their proper historical setting than to write a complete history. He preferred to prepare brief but critical essays which appeared in various publications. He also engaged in numerous co-operative enterprises which permitted him to handle with exacting care the materials germane to the particular study that he had in hand; such for example, are his contributions to Essays in Anglo-American Legal History and to Volume I of The Cambridge History of the British Empire. His caution as a scholar is also evidenced by his early insistence that one of the prime needs of American scholarship before any great advance could take place was to have available adequate aids that would make clear to students of American colonial history the full scope of materials in this country and abroad. It is, therefore, not surprising that he agreed to engage in the laborious enterprise of preparing guides to the manuscript materials relating to American colonial history in the British Museum and the Public Record Office, and in the latter instance of surveying in prefaces and introductions the entire range of British governmental administration. The Guide to the former prepared with the cooperation of Miss Davenport was published in 1908; that to the latter under his sole direction appeared in two volumes in 1912 and 1914. He now felt free to give greater attention to the writing of history. Already in 1912 there appeared his Colonial Period of American History, also one of a general series, which presented the history of this period from a new angle and is still
the best brief handbook upon it that is available. In 1917 came his 
British Merchants and the Non-Importation Movement; in 1919 
two volumes in the Chronicles of America series entitled Fathers 
of New England and Colonial Folkways; in 1924, his very im-
portant The Colonial Background of the American Revolution, 
which indicates his matured views as to the proper approach to 
colonial history; and in 1933, Our Earliest Colonial Settlements. 
At last, after prolonged study of manuscript materials in England 
and Scotland, in the various American depositories along the At-
lantic seaboard, and at Ann Arbor, San Marino, and elsewhere, 
together with a reëxamination of the printed works of early con-
temporary writers; also, after the stimulation that comes with ex-
tensive travel and sojourning in the places which have been the 
chief objects of his specialized interest, there appeared in 1934 
Volume I of The Colonial Period of American History under the 
subtitle of The Settlements and here we have the beginning of a 
great Andrews history in a field which the author has laboriously 
cultivated and enriched for over thirty years.

Before turning to an analysis of this work it may be pointed out 
that as a professor at Bryn Mawr, at Johns Hopkins, and at Yale 
Professor Andrews' labors were unusually fruitful in other ways 
than in writing. His abilities were easily discernible to his graduate 
students and he succeeded in winning their confidence and esteem to 
a remarkable degree. The Essays in Colonial History presented to 
him by his former students in 1931 is but one evidence of this. He 
achieved these results in spite of his utter impatience with careless 
and shuffling types of performance. In fact, it took some degree of 
moral earnestness and purpose as well as educational background 
to qualify a student to submit to the rigid mental discipline that pre-
vailed in one of his seminars. On the other hand, he was quick in 
discerning promise in a student and was prepared to give generously 
of his time to those adequately prepared to profit by his guidance. He 
was not only an inspiring teacher but a very busy editor. During the 
period of his editorship of historical publications at Yale some fifty 
volumes, many of these the doctoral theses of his own students, came 
under his careful scrutiny before passing on to the printer. More-
over, previous to retirement from his professorship in 1931 to devote 
his efforts to writing, his labors in numerous organizations for the
promotion of historical research and publication were also noteworthy, especially in the American Historical Association in connection with which he served on its public archives commission, on the executive council and as vice-president and as president. In alliance with Dean Cross, now governor of Connecticut, he helped for fifteen years to build up the Graduate School of Yale University, serving for many years as the chairman of two of its most important standing committees.

In turning now to a consideration of *The Colonial Period of American History: The Settlements*, one may ask, what is it that sets this work apart from that of his former co-workers in the field, Osgood and Channing? In the first place Professor Andrews has not given himself to the task "of adding another account to the existing histories of the thirteen colonies," rather he is seeking "to place the colonies in their rightful historical setting and so to discover what our colonial history is all about." He, therefore, gives notice that he will only emphasize those aspects of colonial history that are pertinent to the fulfillment of his purpose. Again, in his manner of approach he finds it necessary to view the colonies "not from within . . . but from without . . . disregarding all preconceptions based on later events." What concerns him is the overseas expansion of England. Further, his plans call for the consideration of all of that country's colonial possessions both continental and insular founded in the course of the seventeenth century irrespective of the destiny that awaited them in the eighteenth. In other words, in analyzing the process of American colonization he is concerned with English history, not merely the setting for later United States history. Herein, therefore, lie some of the striking divergencies with the work not only of the writers referred to above but with that of all other American historians such as Bancroft and Hildreth who sought to deal broadly with the American colonial scene. It may be further pointed out that no comprehensive work hitherto issued in this field embodies so acute an appraisal of the value of original and secondary authorities as is to be found in the footnotes that illuminate the text. The book is indeed an impressive testimony to the progress of American historical scholarship during the past thirty years.

Just as Turner was interested in the frontier in American history so Andrews is concerned with the frontier, the trans-Atlantic frontier,
in English history of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. After sketching in a broad manner the opening up of the New World in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, he turns to England’s commercial activities as the key to the first successful colonization movement and gives by all odds the most discriminating account in brief compass of English trade expansion down to 1640 that the writer of this article has found. The same thing may be said for the chapter that follows in which an analysis is made of those factors influencing English colonization in the seventeenth century. With this foundation laid he proceeds to describe what he calls the preliminaries of settlement including the early activities on the Kennebec of the Plymouth Company of Virginia under the patent of 1606 and then launches into a description of conditions underlying the settlement of Virginia. In this connection he indicates the importance of the process of the liberalization of the government of Virginia under the charters of 1609 and 1612 as bearing upon the adoption of a popular form of government for that colony and eventually for all of the royal colonies in America. John Smith is also rescued from the obscurity assigned to him by Channing and other historians, Argall is defended, and the plans for the Pilgrim settlement in Virginia are presented in a new light. Then follow two suggestive chapters on the tobacco contract and the downfall of the Virginia Company. In these James I’s attitude and that of the Privy Council toward the Company during its last years are shown to be much more sympathetic than earlier writers have been willing to concede; Sandys’ work is treated fairly but somewhat critically and Thomas Smith’s is praised. It may surprise many to learn, as is here made clear, that a source of difficulty confronting the colony as late as the ’20s was that it “suffered from a population that was always in excess of its means of subsistence”—a conclusion also independently arrived at by Dr. Craven in his Dissolution of the Virginia Company—and, further, that in the downfall of the Company “the political issue was inconspicuous as compared with the business issue.”

In discussing the first legislative assembly in America the liberal franchise basis is stressed and the conclusion is reached that both indentured servants and youths of seventeen and upwards enjoyed this

\[\text{Citation: W. Frank Craven, } \text{Dissolution of the Virginia Company; the Failure of a Colonial Experiment} \text{ (New York: Oxford University Press, 1932).}\]
privilege of voting; the attitude of the settlers toward the Company control and that by the Crown after 1624 is also given discriminating treatment as is also the liberal attitude of Charles I toward representative government in Virginia in contrast to his dislike of this form as applied to England. However, it is made clear that the Virginians themselves were largely responsible for the establishment of self-government in the now royal colony. At the time of the outbreak of the Great Rebellion in England, where the narrative terminates, the large "particular plantations" Professor Andrews finds had disappeared in Virginia leaving a colony now made up of small landowners and indentured servants with little evidence of wealth or aristocracy. While in general agreeing with the conclusions of Professor Wertenbaker as to the small planter domination he feels that the latter has exaggerated the political importance of the indentured servant.

Now turning from Virginia, the colonization of Bermuda is next considered. This is logical in light of the fact that from 1612 to 1615 the latter was among the Virginia Company possessions before embarking on an independent career under a royal charter. Parallels are found between the two colonies both with respect to a period of rigid discipline and to the granting of a popular form of government. Thomas Smith and Warwick, controlling the Bermuda Company, are shown to be as friendly to the latter idea as was Sandys within the Virginia Company. When in this connection Professor Andrews says that in two respects the Bermuda assembly fell short of both the English and the Virginia practices in that it had no speaker and all members sat together as a single house, one is led to wonder if he has in mind the composition of the Virginia assembly during the earlier part of the seventeenth century. The intimate relations between Bermuda and Massachusetts Bay, rather than with Virginia, are stressed as is also the existence in the former of strong Puritan sentiments. We are informed incidentally at this juncture, rather surprisingly, that there "were no Puritans in Virginia until 1642 and then but few" which would seem to indicate that to Professor Andrews the Puritan migration out of Virginia into Maryland from 1642 to 1649 during Berkeley's governorship was a matter of much less significance than is usually so considered. The conditions under
which the Bermuda Company survived sixty years after the fall of the parent Virginia Company are thereupon effectively described.

Then follow two interesting chapters dealing with the establishment of the Pilgrims in the New World. In a finely descriptive passage Professor Andrews states the problem of this people in 1619:

No enterprise in overseas settlement thus far undertaken can compare with this desperate project of the Leyden Separatists. Without adequate resources, either of supplies or of transportation, without supporters, patrons, or friends at court, without royal permit or patent, this band of wanderers, believing their calling lawful and urgent, their ends good and honorable, and their guide God himself, looked toward the New World and debated long and earnestly the best course to follow.

As to the Mayflower Compact, which they signed before settling at Plymouth, we are told that it possessed no legal validity, even, we are to assume, at common law as Professor Channing insisted.

Under title of "The Lure of Newfoundland and Nova Scotia" we are given a history of failures in colonization in the northern parts by company and individual patentees, which is followed by a provocative chapter on Gorges and his New England projects under the New England Council. This brings us to the last six chapters which are concerned with the establishment and early years of the Massachusetts Bay Colony. In taking up for consideration the founding of Massachusetts Bay, Professor Andrews makes clear that one is confronted by certain perplexing questions. The so-called grant to the New England Company of 1628 is shrouded in mystery as were the exact boundaries of it although the reader is helped to find a partial solution in Warwick's strategic position at the time both as President of the Council and as a grantee under the 1622 division by that body. However, no answer is suggested to the question that Professor Andrews himself raises in attempting to account for the fact that so soon after the dissolution of the Virginia Company the Crown was led to issue a royal patent in favor of another New World trading company. But might not a partial answer perhaps be found in the hostilities then existing between England and France and the very natural solicitude consequent thereto, on the part of Charles' advisers, that an end be made to mere paper enterprises in the settlement of New England so that the region might not in time fall a prey to a rival power—just as Quebec the preceding year fell under Kirke's blows and Acadia was temporarily swallowed up by Alex-
ander's Nova Scotia enterprise? Is it not more than likely that the Crown looked with distinct favor at this juncture upon the application of a body of substantial merchants with adequate resources for a successful colonization of this valuable English possession, especially since the King was quite unable for more than one reason to finance such a movement and the individual grantees of the lands by the Council were manifestly unequal to the task?

Now the Pilgrims, it appears, willingly recognized the authority of the King but sought to set up a separatist church whereas we are told that "the Puritans, wishing to erect a state without a King, repudiated, as far as they dared, the authority of the English Crown, though they recognized the Church of England as their dear mother in all things spiritual"—in spite of their repudiation of its Book of Common Prayer and its sacraments. That they came as the result of persecution is flatly denied. In tracing the processes that led finally to the setting up of an independent New England church Professor Andrews agrees with Perry Miller that this was not the result of contact with the Plymouth separatists but followed as a logical consequence those conceptions inherent in the Puritan movement. He further makes clear that as the charter was in no way designed as the instrument of government of a commonwealth "the Puritan plan could be successfully carried out only by a constant and persistent violation of its terms." The account that thereupon follows of the growth of Massachusetts Bay to 1652 when she "declared herself an independent commonwealth" is of absorbing interest. He comes to the defence of Winthrop in connection with the latter's doctrine of government by godly men; he denies that the government was a theocracy as many writers have insisted and in analyzing the groups to be found in the colony comes to the conclusion that the majority of the people while neither freemen nor church members were in accord with the general purpose and aims of the colony, which challenges the conclusions of James Truslow Adams. In describing the controversy that led in 1644 to the separation of the Court into two chambers, the assertion that thereby the negative voice was actually eliminated will doubtless be questioned in light of the motion that prevailed to the effect that "what the one agreed on they should send to the other, and if both agreed then to pass..." and the subsequent relations thus established between the two bodies.
As to the body of law adopted within the colony, in referring to the Laws and Liberties which was neither a code nor even a digest, the point is stressed that, with the exception of the capital laws which were derived from the Old Testament, the acts as a rule were based upon English precedent. “The English common law was the only available source for Englishmen of the seventeenth century, whether Puritan or otherwise, who were engaged in setting up a legislative and judicial system in a new world.”

In passing to his analysis of the religious and political difficulties facing the commonwealth, Professor Andrews, in referring to Roger Williams, draws a careful distinction when he declares that the latter while in Massachusetts was no advocate of toleration although upholding the idea of religious liberty. His exposition of Anne Hutchinson’s ideas is remarkably lucid although one is puzzled to determine whether he is expressing the views of the elders and magistrates or his own when the statement is made that the Antinomian teaching “took away the obligation to lead a moral life, to exercise moral self-control, . . .”—a tenet that doubtless the Rev. Mr. Wheelwright as well as Anne Hutchinson would have indignantly repudiated. The effect of the prolonged struggle for religious uniformity between 1635 and 1660 ending “with the almost merciless treatment of the invading Quakers” is described as a victory that led to “a kind of intellectual and spiritual apathy and stagnation,” which in turn brought on the Great Awakening.

In the final chapter among other things the Puritan mind is studied. The conclusion is reached that it “lived and labored in a world of its own and in all that concerned man’s relations with God was lost in abstraction and unreality.” Professor Andrews agrees with Eggleston that it showed the characteristic of the medieval mind. Yet one does not forget that if the Puritans believed in signs and portents so did Shakespeare and most of the other supposedly enlightened Englishmen whose lives extended into the seventeenth century. The somber history of seventeenth century witchcraft trials in England testifies to this. And it may be, therefore, that the Puritans were but the children of the age in which they lived.

One may say in conclusion that, while America has produced writers who surpass Professor Andrews in brilliancy of presentation, it may be seriously questioned if a finer piece of historical exposition
has issued from an American study than Volume I of *The Colonial Period of American History*. The book is true to the announced purpose of approaching the history of the colonies from without rather than from within and it does so with a degree of vividness, discrimination, and wealth of detail on points subject to controversy never before attained by any other treatise concerned with the larger theme of early English overseas expansion. In fact, it will be an act of sheer temerity on the part of those who have a professional interest in the field of colonial history to neglect a work the appearance of which, as was previously suggested, really marks an epoch in American historiography.
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