

BOOK REVIEWS

The Colonial Period of American History: The Settlements, II. By CHARLES M. ANDREWS. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936. 407 p. \$4.00.)

Nineteenth-century historians dreamed of writing absolute history. Today we recognize this scientific ideal as unattainable. Never can we recover all of the facts, nor can we divest ourselves as historians of the preconceptions that are part and parcel of us as people. No account can tell us of the past *wie es eigentlich gewesen*. Yet this is not to question the value of the historian's perennial search for completeness and accuracy in his facts and for objectivity in his interpretation. Thus it is an event of some importance when Charles M. Andrews produces another volume from his endless quest for the facts of our colonial history. We have come to know that his conclusions are based upon an unrivalled knowledge, and that no writer dealing with colonial history has been more successful in sublimating his bias while yet retaining the individuality and warmth that a forceful personality should bring to a literary exercise. The work of Professor Andrews is a lasting tribute to the ideal of "scientific history."

The second volume of *The Colonial Period of American History* contains a view of the author's future plans. "The colonial expansion of England, of which our first three volumes treat, must be dealt with in all its parts and the colonial policy of the mother country, to be dealt with in volume four, must be adequately understood before we are ready to trace the growth of those ideas and institutions that we call American and that led, in their slow and painful development, out of an ever growing variety of obstacles, to the establishment of a new order of civilization—our national heritage." It is clear, then, that a third volume will complete the chronological treatment of the "Settlements," and that a fourth will consider British colonial policy from a topical standpoint.

In some respects the reader will find volume two more interesting than its predecessor, since Professor Andrews here deals with newer materials, several less studied topics, and, in certain cases, more controversial matters. The first two chapters treat the founding and early development of Rhode Island, and are followed by three on the beginnings of Connecticut and New Haven, which complete the discussion of New England. Then the emphasis shifts to an analysis of proprietary governments in general and the examination of two of them, Barbados and Maryland, in the final three chapters.

The section on Rhode Island is decidedly the best yet written; particularly noteworthy is the judicious handling of the "Island of Error's" violently contrasting personalities. The picture painted is a group, not a portrait, with Williams, Harris, Gorton, Coddington, and Clark so posed as to balance the composition. Too long has the strong light of Roger Williams forced his con-

temporaries into a shadowy background. Less felicitous are the author's remarks on social questions, wherein a careful distinction should be made between the mainland and Rhode Island. "The tendency to disorder" at Providence and Warwick does not seem to hold for conservative Newport. Andrews presents the traditional view, based upon indubitable evidence and stated with great fairness. But one cannot refrain from feeling that it is a one-sided account. The paucity of materials seriously restricts a judgment, but possibly the absence of a variety of social legislation may be explained, at least in the case of Newport, by the fact that the Quakers who early formed a majority of the population exerted there a social discipline through the meeting as in Pennsylvania. The assertion that "during the first thirty years neither the colony nor the towns made any attempt to promote . . . education," and that "there was no public education in the colony until after 1670" (31), is not strictly true. In August, 1640, in addition to a grant of land to Robert Lenthall, schoolmaster, Newport "also voted that one hundred acres should be laid forth, and appropriated for a school for the encouragement of the poorer sort to train up their youth in learning." This first American endowment for education did not lapse even though the master departed in 1642. The loss of the town records deprives us of further knowledge of the school until 1663, when the lands were sold and the proceeds placed in a school fund (*Newport Mercury*, Dec. 4, 1875). There is, in the absence of records positive or negative, a strong presumption in favor of a continuing interest in education at Newport. In any event there seems to be a definite need for a reassessment of the social and cultural affairs of early Rhode Island.

In his account of Connecticut Professor Andrews follows the course charted in his *River Towns*, and he accepts Miss Calder's version of the history of the New Haven Colony. Most illuminating is the analysis of the Connecticut patent and the early government, as is also the treatment of Hooker's famous sermon. There is also an excellent, though brief, summary of social life at New Haven, and one notes with satisfaction the dictum that no New England government was a Bible commonwealth. The absence of an extended treatment of the New England Confederation is startling, but this topic may have been reserved for a later volume. These chapters conclude the early history of New England; Professor Andrews then proceeds to the portions of colonial history that have for so many years occupied his attention.

In the introductory chapter to his discussion of the proprietary governments Andrews answers the criticisms of those readers distressed by the omission from volume one of any allusion to the English squirearchy and its connection with overseas expansion. This significant chapter blazes a trail through unfamiliar and most important materials. Here we have a brilliant exposition of the landed, agricultural, Anglican ideal of colonization as contrasted with the earlier commercial and religious impulses. Here, too, are set forth the anachronistic medieval concepts of the proprietary groups which made for those forces of conservatism that the author described in his Harvard Tercentenary address. His researches into the nature of the English squirearchy demonstrate

that the proprietary and manorial ideal remained dominant well into the eighteenth century. "Possession of the soil was still the hallmark of quality," and the "gentry were far more important than were the mercantile and trading classes." Genteel land hunger "was as keen as the desire for office or for profit from investments," and the gentry scented tempting prospects in island or continental America. Their efforts in this direction give a meaning to the proprietary experiments that they never had before, and serve to explain the profound influence of the proprietors on British policy.

In Barbados, the first colony to be established by an unincorporated company for the sole purpose of gain, we see how conflicting proprietary, mercantile, and popular forces were finally resolved by the institution of royal control. In the light of the English background much is added to Harlow's treatment of the political institutions of the island.

But it was in the Maryland charter that the feudal proprietary development reached its apogee. The aristocratic social ideal of Maryland is shown to be unique, and the ecclesiastical aspect pungently termed "an hazardous act of religious knight errantry." The authority of the proprietor and council was virtually regal, and the Baltimores, gorged with a diet of Filmer's *Patriarcha*, utterly failed to fathom popular opposition to their out-moded political system. It was this in the last analysis that led to the revolution of 1689 in Maryland. On the other hand, the much mooted act concerning toleration represented on the proprietor's part "no trimming of sails to meet an on-coming storm, for the policy of toleration for all Trinitarians had prevailed in the colony from the beginning," and the sorry fate awaiting non-Trinitarians was added by the Assembly to parallel similar action by the Long Parliament. The myth of the erection of log cabins by Englishmen in the early seventeenth century persists in this volume (288) and the statement cannot be verified by the reference given; the same is true of the cabin at York, Maine, mentioned on page 425 of volume one. Far more regrettable, especially in the treatment of the West Indies and Maryland, is the absence of maps in a work which will be standard for years to come.

In viewing the earliest colonies as a whole, Andrews properly emphasizes the differences between settlements, variations in climate and conditions, and above all contrasting political institutions. Diversity is the dominant theme of his work. To be sure, he does not ignore undertones of similarity. But was colonial life as diversified as he suggests? Here is institutional history on a grand scale. An almost bewildering mass of detail is presented clearly with consummate skill. The work is fresh, independent (as we expect), sharply critical, and realistic. Many hitherto unsettled problems are resolved with finality. And above all, the British Empire is seen to grow in the comparative treatment of these pages.

This undertaking is important as a summary of and contribution to existing knowledge of colonial history. But perhaps it is even more valuable for the guideposts it erects for future students. Professors Andrews and Osgood have between them furnished a virtually complete analysis of colonial institutions.

The prime necessity of future study in our colonial history is intelligent investigation of the social, economic, and cultural life of the colonists, and of their English sires and contemporaries. This must be intensively carried on first from the local point of view, for there is much in M. Dorothy George's remark that "social history is local history." In these fields there are questions which Professor Andrews does not answer. We must know more of social composition, of racial intermixtures, of the actual processes of gaining a living, of folkways, of religious and cultural tendencies. And we need to know more of individuals—limned against their backgrounds. Most of all an examination of the relative effect of the tug of the frontier and the restraining force of an ever-increasing overseas influence on the colonists is called for. Like the empire, like colonial political institutions, colonial economic and social life was dynamic. Nor was the colonial mind static. As Professor Andrews says: (198) "The separation from the mother country was more than a revolutionary warfare for eight years. It was a century-long process without dates and boundaries, where, little by little, features of English law, constituted authority and precedent, land tenure, and *other conditions* ingrained in the minds and habits of the Englishmen at home, were one by one altered, reduced or eliminated altogether." Henceforth, then, the emphasis must be on these *other conditions*, both in England and America. Now we have only half of the story, and that half admirably told. Until we know how and why the colonists outgrew their institutions, and how day by day they drew apart from their contemporaries in the mother country, the story of our colonial period will be incomplete. We can only hope that time will bring us another Andrews to weave these two strands into a single completed fabric.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

CARL BRIDENBAUGH

Military Affairs in North America, 1748-1765. Edited by STANLEY M. PARGELLIS. (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, for The American Historical Association, 1936. 514 p. Illustrations. \$8.00.)

Within the covers of this volume Mr. Pargellis has made available to the historian and to the general reader some 150 documents dealing with military affairs on the North American continent. The earliest is dated 1741, the latest, 1765, but the great majority of the letters and manuscripts fall within the period between 1754 and 1760 during which the major battles of the French and Indian War were fought.

These documents have been selected from the private papers of William Augustus, Duke of Cumberland (1721-1765), the second son of George II. As captain general of the British army from 1745 to 1757, Cumberland was the highest ranking officer in the military hierarchy. He dealt with everything which concerned the running of the army, from the selection and promotion of its officers to coordinating the boards and agencies which equipped, paid, supplied, transported, and quartered the troops. When he died he left a great mass of reports, memoranda, and letters in his files. Among these papers, now

among the Royal Archives at Windsor Castle, Mr. Pargellis found some 400 which dealt with American affairs. Less than 100 of these had been printed elsewhere; about 100, he remarks, "would seem to be unique." From this collection Mr. Pargellis has carefully selected those which seemed worth printing in full.

A compilation of this sort is manifestly of immense value to the historian. Mr. Pargellis has put at the disposal of scholars a large amount of source material that has hitherto been relatively inaccessible. But the casual reader, as well, will find much to interest him, for many of the documents contain stirring narrative and vivid description.

The papers fall roughly into several broad categories. A large group bears on Braddock's expedition to Fort DuQuesne in the spring and summer of 1755. Another substantial section covers military activities in northern New York during the first half of 1756. A third and extensive group of documents includes much of the correspondence between Cumberland and General Loudoun and covers the period from August, 1756, until November, 1757, while the latter was in command of the British forces in America. Following this is a fourth and slighter batch of papers dealing with the capture of Quebec and the final years of the war. The remainder of the material, scattered through the volume, is miscellaneous in character, ranging from letters of colonial merchants urging bounties on American products to discussions of the problems offered by colonial currencies and exchange.

The wealth of information which the collection contains on certain subjects of broad interest is indicated by the wide variety of documents dealing with Braddock's ill-fated expedition. Here one finds memoranda sketching tentative plans for the campaign, private instructions to Braddock before he sailed, and instructions to Admiral Keppel prescribing the assistance the fleet was expected to give. Letters from Sir John St. Clair, deputy quartermaster general, to Robert Napier, Cumberland's secretary for military affairs, tell of the preparations made for Braddock's arrival, the difficulties of provisioning the troops, and the character of the country over which the expedition planned to pass. Braddock's own letters to Napier follow the progress of the campaign well into June. And the battle itself and the rout that followed are described by the pens of several men: St. Clair; Sir Robert Orme, Braddock's aide de camp; Harry Gordon, an engineer; Colonel Thomas Dunbar, who ordered the misguided retreat; and finally an anonymous critic. A number of maps showing the route of the expedition and the course of the battle also appear.

Documents of no less value bear on subsequent campaigns. The journal which Patrick MacKellar kept of the activities at Oswego between May 16 and August 14, 1756, is a mine of information in itself. The same can be said of the Loudoun-Cumberland correspondence dealing with every phase of the military problem in America while Loudoun was in command.

Fairly numerous references to Pennsylvania are scattered through the documents. Thus Braddock comments in a letter to Napier that "Mr. Franklin undertook and perform'd his Engagements (to supply the expedition with

wagons) with the greatest readiness and punctuality." The people of Pennsylvania, he had noted a moment earlier, "tho' they will contribute very little to the Expedition are exact in their Dealings, and much more industrious than the others." A letter from Franklin is included giving his opinions on the enlistment of indented servants. There is also a brief correspondence between Cumberland and Thomas Penn.

In his introduction Mr. Pargellis has contributed an illuminating analysis of the military problems involved in the war. The French, he says, "were condemned by their position to fighting a defensive war. . . . If, then, there was to be war in America, the British had to wage it. Theirs was the strategy of offense, the conducting of a siege of Canada." "It is notorious," he adds, "that Great Britain undertook an offensive war for which she was utterly unprepared and which she did not understand. It is equally notorious that it took an unusually long time to win." Weighing the evidence, drawn partly from the sources in this volume, Mr. Pargellis goes on to evaluate the strategy of the various ministers and commanders and to explain wherein each succeeded or failed.

Not a little is contributed to the value of the book by Mr. Pargellis's excellent index, the calendar of additional documents which he felt were not of sufficient importance to be printed in full, and the voluminous footnotes he supplies on the authors and recipients of the various documents.

Wilmington, Delaware

CHARLES L. REESE, JR.

The Journal and Biography of Nicholas Collin, 1746-1831. The Journal Translated from the original Swedish manuscript. By AMANDUS JOHNSON. With an Introduction by FRANK H. STEWART. (Philadelphia: The New Jersey Society of Pennsylvania, 1936. 368 p. Illustrated. \$5.00.)

Nicholas Collin was the last link between Sweden and the Swedish American colonists on the lower Delaware. Born near Upsala in 1746, the son of a parson, he studied at the University of Upsala, took holy orders, and came out to America in 1770 as assistant pastor in the Swedish Mission on the Delaware. His first post was at Raccoon (now Swedesboro), New Jersey, where he served for sixteen years. Although he suffered greatly from homesickness and felt keenly the lack of amenities in Swedesboro, he eventually grew reconciled and acclimatized. He stood by his post through the Revolution, amid numerous hardships. After the war he thought seriously of returning to Sweden, but his plans were cut short by the work of building a new church at Swedesboro (1784-86). Shortly after this he became rector of Old Swedes Church in Philadelphia, and his removal to the American metropolis put him in close touch with the leading men of the day. His friendship with Franklin was particularly close, and he was supposed to have been with Franklin when he died. Collin manfully carried on his labors in the terrible Plague Year of 1793, suffering himself from the distemper, and losing his wife in the second recurrence of yellow fever in 1797.

Born and brought up in the Sweden of Linnaeus, Collin became a dis-

tinguished amateur scientist. His researches in botany, particularly, were extensive and valuable; he repeatedly sent specimens home to Sweden, and he corresponded with various learned societies on American flora. The yellow fever interested him deeply; he had his own ideas on its cure and prevention, and set them forth at length. And like the true dilettante of the 18th century his interests ran the whole gamut of science—from the invention of a "Safety Elevator" to reading a paper on the natural history of the rattlesnake. Throughout the book one is constantly reminded of Gilbert White; the two men were obviously very much of the same stamp, and our kindly Swedish American would no doubt have felt entirely at home with the sage of Selborne.

Collin was apparently the last Swedish parson sent out from the home country to America. The Revolution, the gradual mergence of the Swedish people with the rest of the population, apathy of the Swedish Church, and other reasons all combined to cut the Swedish parishes on the lower Delaware loose from the mother country. But to the end of his long life Collin looked upon himself as a savant of the Crown of Sweden, and as such he spans the gap between the colonists of the 1630's and the Philadelphia of George Dallas and Nicholas Biddle.

His diary covers the years 1770-86, in other words from his arrival in America until his removal to Philadelphia. It is a simple unvarnished document, dealing with the day to day life of the parish, the baptisms, marriages, and burials. Aside from a few interesting passages about the Revolution (in which, the behavior of the American troops was not highly creditable), there is little of conventional history, while as a picture of the time the diary is rather disappointing. It is our loss that Collin did not keep it for another decade, when he could have included the yellow fever of 1793 and his interesting tour of New England in 1794. Then would we have had a Philadelphia Gilbert White, whose contribution to knowledge was by no means negligible. In the last forty odd pages is a parish register of names, 1786, which should be of service to genealogists.

Mr. Johnson has done a scholarly piece of work. His own text, p. 17-201, is most interesting, while there are copious footnotes, a good bibliography, and a thorough index. While the photographs are adequate, the physical appearance of the volume as a whole is disappointing.

Philadelphia

BOIES PENROSE

Friend Anthony Benezet. By GEORGE S. BROOKES. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1937. xiv, 516 p. Illustrations, index. \$5.00.)

Since the appearance of Elkinton's life of the Quaker philanthropist about forty years ago, no book has been published in English on Benezet until now, so that Mr. Brookes' volume should be welcomed by all interested in the social history of America.

Benezet was born of Huguenot parentage at St. Quentin in 1713. Due to persecution the family moved to England two years later, and eventually

crossed the Atlantic to Philadelphia in 1731. After a brief career as a printer, young Anthony became a schoolmaster, an employment which he must have found particularly congenial to his altruistic and humanitarian feelings. His life in the main was uneventful, but useful to a degree. He not only became a Quaker, but a model Quaker as well, while his zeal for the oppressed of all races was only equalled by his magnanimity and faith in humanity. Never did man have more of the milk of human kindness than Benezet; he was filled with a love of mankind and a desire to save his fellows such as few men have had. Like a true Gaul he had a certain sophisticated urbanity, and like a true son of the 18th century he had the liberal spirit of inquiry and versatility of interests which characterized the age of Franklin and Frederick the Great. That the usefulness of his long life was fully appreciated by his contemporaries is shown by the universal lamentation that followed his death in 1784. The *Pennsylvania Packet* well said: "His catholicism in religion; his universal philanthropy; his unwearied acts of benevolence, endeared him to all who knew him;—he was kind without reserve, courteous without deceit, and charitable without ostentation."

Of Mr. Brookes' volume the first 175 pages are given to the biography; this is followed by a complete and exhaustive bibliography; and the last 300 pages are devoted to letters from and to Benezet. There is an adequate index.

The Benezet correspondence is perhaps more for the special student than the general reader, but these letters unquestionably give a vivid picture of the man and his times. Among the chief correspondents were John Smith, George Dillwyn, and Samuel Allison, all Quakers, of Burlington, N.J. We also have letters of Benjamin Franklin, Abbé Raynal, Moses Brown, and Dr. Fothergill, the great Quaker surgeon, while Benezet's interest in the abolition of slavery and in the future of the Negro gave rise to an extensive correspondence with Granville Sharp. Mr. Brookes has shown great care in collecting the letters, which must number several hundred, and which come from many sources, the chief of which are Haverford College and the Ridgway Library.

A serious defect in this work is the amount of quotation in the biographical section. While excerpts from contemporary writings often do add a charm and a flavor which modern paraphrasing cannot approach, quotations—like alcohol—should be used in moderation, or else they tend to slow up the interest and to distract the attention of the reader. In the present work the ratio of quotation to the rest of the text is roughly one to two, and in the event of a second edition the author would do well to paraphrase a good many quotations or else relegate them to the footnotes. Nevertheless, Mr. Brookes has produced a thorough and scholarly volume, which bids fair to be definitive.

The excellence of the presswork, paper and illustrations—as is the case of all University of Pennsylvania Press work—goes without saying.

Philadelphia

BOIES PENROSE

Bayard Taylor: Laureate of the Gilded Age. By RICHMOND CROOM BEATTY.
(Newman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1936. xv, 379 p.
Illustrated. \$3.00.)

This reviewer's interest in Bayard Taylor has two sources. First, as a loyal and even devoted resident of Chester County, I have always been interested in my county's most distinguished literary man. Second, long study of and admiration for Goethe's *Faust* has led me to an interest in the life and personality of that classic's best translator.

Taylor has long been neglected by local literary scholars, and so it is not surprising that this definitive appraisal of his work should come from a member of the faculty of the University of Alabama and should be published in an attractive and carefully designed format under the auspices of the University of Oklahoma.

Professor Beatty's book is at once a biography of Taylor, a summary and appraisal of his books, and a study of the effect on him of his age. Although the first two aims are admirably accomplished, both the nature of the material itself and Professor Beatty's own major interest and intention subordinates them to the study of the effect on him of his environment. A specific period, thinks Professor Beatty, is reflected more clearly in its minor figures, who are more completely dominated by it, than in a genius, who is by very definition atypical, and who inevitably towers over or moves beyond his age. Thus, this book is of the same penetrating and pessimistic school of sociological literary criticism as Van Wyck Brooks' studies of Mark Twain and Henry James, and the major purpose of Professor Beatty's work becomes the justification and explanation of his sub-title. The question is squarely posed whether Taylor was irretrievably a second-rate artist or a great artist frustrated by the then current American way of life. Acknowledging that Taylor's once widely esteemed writings are now almost completely forgotten, the task Professor Beatty sets himself is to find the answers to the questions, "What was the nature of his work, that it was able to arrest so remarkably the imagination of his countrymen? Wherein has that imagination changed since? What conclusion can be reached about the intrinsic value of what the man did, regardless of its present popularity? What is there in it which at least deserves attention still?"

The trouble with poor Taylor was that he wished to be both a great romantic poet and a conventional American citizen and respected man of affairs of the era of railroad building and business expansion following the Civil War. He attained the latter ambitions, but he ruined a magnificent physique. He built himself a splendid country estate and showed the yokels of his native Quaker hamlet that a poet could make more money than a farmer, but he built no lasting literary fame. Universally respected, he died at his post as Ambassador to Germany, but no one reads his verses. Now, Keats and Shelley built no Cedarcrofts, nor would any government appoint Byron or Swinburne Ambassador to Germany. "Taylor sought compromise. He would serve his age in all save poetry. There he must be free, as Shelley had been. What he blinded himself to was the cardinal fact that a sane and conventional romantic poet is an absurdity, and that the man who respects the moral values of a generation such as that which flourished in the mid-nineteenth century and who at the same time writes romantic verse inevitably seems foolish. A con-

ventional Shelley is inconceivable, as is a conventional Burns. The adjective and noun are contradictory and neutralize each other."

Professor Beatty admirably summarizes the economic-spiritual dilemma by which Taylor was defeated, a dilemma which does not exist for genius. "One could pay homage to Mammon without forgetting, even for an instant, that this homage was enforced, and in a later spring could be directed again skyward, toward poetry or, at any rate, toward something not really earthy at all. It was a point of view remarkable in a great many ways—remarkable and astonishingly modern. For what it meant was that man is a creature without moorings, without tradition, without roots. He can turn as readily to one thing as to another: He can work with desperate energy, acquiring wealth and position, until the age of, say, sixty; then he can retire and seek culture, with an almost equally desperate resolve."

Besides his career as a romantic poet, which did not in his life-time appear to be nearly so great a failure as it has since become, Taylor distinguished himself as journalist, traveller, lecturer, novelist, scholar, and diplomat. His life-long association with the old *Tribune* formed one of the three major sources of his income. His greatest fame, even in his life-time, was as traveller and writer on travel, and as a lecturer who gained his material from his travels. His trip to Europe, when he was twenty, lasted two years. He spent but five hundred dollars, all of which he earned by published accounts of his travels. His book *Views Afoot*, based on this trip, was the first and most celebrated of his eleven volumes on travel. In it he is the prototype of all the hordes of young American students, fresh, eager, and poor, who have been seeking culture and adventure in Europe ever since. Bitterly, Taylor writes of this book, "I am known to the public not as a poet, the only title I covet, but as one who succeeded in seeing Europe with little money; and the chief merits accorded to me are not passion or imagination, but strong legs and economical habits."

The course of his travels took him with Commodore Perry to Japan, then the Orient—all over the world, from California's gold-rush days in 1848 to Ethiopia in 1853, to Iceland in 1874. Some of these journeys were made in weariness of body and spirit and all but the first were made chiefly for money, to gather material for his lectures and books. Taylor brought to these journeys an eager and inquiring mind, but he moved too fast and wrote too fast for them to be anything more than the work of a gifted tourist who kept a diary.

His lectures were his financial main-stay. Taylor writes of his translation of *Faust*, over which he labored long and lovingly and which constituted probably the most disinterested work of his life, that it yielded him about half as much as a fortnight's lecturing. In the course of his lectures, he followed gruelling routes and programmes, which were never congenial to a romantic poet. The contents of his discourses portrayed his political and social views. These manly and sensible views were admirably buttressed by his world-wide observations. "He endorsed the civil service, an educated citizenry capable of intelligent voting, and most emphatically, a strong central government possessed of approximately dictatorial powers over corporations and commonwealths alike.

Negatively, he decried wealth as a measure of one's social prominence, the exploitation of the public by big business, the philosophy of acquisitiveness, the rise of the city, the waning influence of the home, and the southern way of life."

In the course of research, incidentally, Professor Beatty has gone through the manuscripts of fourteen hitherto neglected lectures, preserved in the West Chester Public Library. A brief summary of some was published by Robert Warnock in *American Literature* for May, 1933. Oddly enough, the first of his lectures was on "Animal Man," in which he boldly asserted that too much emphasis was being placed currently on spirit, and not enough on the body, and then proceeded with a general environmental doctrine of history, the sort of sound commonsense which slumbered from Tacitus to Montesquieu and then again until Buckle and was no doubt very new to the inhabitants of small American cities in the 'sixties and 'seventies.

Taylor wrote four novels, the style and contents of which Professor Beatty admirably summarizes. Whereas in his poetry his themes were all too exotic, in these novels Taylor sticks close to his beloved Chester County. All of them are worthy representatives of the then current local-color school. The *Story of Kennett* is this reviewer's favorite, and is acknowledged to be the best, but its fame, too, was evanescent. Then there were three long lyrical dramas, *The Prophet*, *Lars* and *Deukalion*, now unread and unreadable.

His Germanic studies were far from the least successful of Taylor's many activities. A generation later than Carlyle, he performed, in general, the same function in this country that Carlyle had in England, of introducing the general public to the great early nineteenth-century German romantic poets and thinkers. His *Faust* is one of the finest translations of a difficult classic ever made, ranking with Urquhart's *Rabelais* and A. W. Schlegel's translation of Shakespeare, and surpassing, in this reviewer's judgment, any poetical translations of Homer or Dante that we have.

In following out a hobby of my own, I have collected fourteen English translations of *Faust*, and it is only necessary to compare all of these line for line with Taylor's and with the original, to realize the greatness of this work. Translating line for line in the original metres, he accomplished the great task magnificently, a task which Professor Beatty thinks should never have been attempted, but I heartily dissent. In the midst of his duties as ambassador, and yet faithful to the last to his ideal of combining the literary life with the world of affairs, he was composing a life of Goethe when he died.

Philadelphia

JOHN FREDERICK LEWIS, JR.

The Founding of Harvard College. By SAMUEL ELIOT MORISON. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1935. xxvi, 472 p. Illustrated. \$5.00.)

The first in a series of volumes intended to carry the history of Harvard University from its origins to 1936, the present study covers some fourteen years—from the founding in 1636 to the Charter of 1650—in considerable detail.

The reviewer is left with the impression that the most significant contribution to knowledge contained in this work lies in the emphasis placed upon the European background of American universities. Chapters upon "The Origin of Universities" and "The Medieval University at Work and Play" carry the reader back to Paris in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries—to the golden days when Abelard lectured at Ste. Geneviève. Quite properly much more detail is accorded to the English universities—particularly to Cambridge, upon which Harvard drew both for ideas and men. The importance of this intellectual *rapprochement* cannot be overestimated. John Harvard—whose benefaction to a new institution won him an immortal name—graduated from Emmanuel College in 1631. Henry Dunster, "our first, youngest, and one of our greatest presidents" (p. 110), was a scholar of no special distinction at Magdalene from which he graduated in 1634. Five of the first twelve overseers of Harvard were graduates of Trinity, as was Charles Chauncy, the second president (p. 87). Many other instances could be adduced to illustrate the intimate connection between Cambridge on the Cam and Cambridge on the Charles: it is felt that such illustrations would be superfluous.

Oxford University failed to exercise so profound an influence as Cambridge, either upon New England in general or Harvard in particular. This might well be expected in view of the fact that Laud was vice-chancellor in 1630, and that the university was strongly royalist during the Civil War. Magdalen Hall alone remained puritan, and from Magdalen Hall went Benjamin Woodbridge, to become the first Harvard graduate (1642).

A chapter upon the founding of New England serves as an introduction to the history of Harvard from 1636 to 1650. That story is well told, although the mass of detail necessarily bulks large. The maladministration and arrant thievery of Nathaniel Eaton (1638-39)—which brought the college to the verge of bankruptcy—are contrasted with the wise policies of Henry Dunster. Indeed, Dunster's administration may be regarded as a labor of love, as the work of a man of vision. He found Harvard in a disorganized and almost prostrate condition. He left it an excellent liberal arts college, the core around which the great university of today has been built.

Most interesting is the account of the founding and nature of the library. Some four hundred volumes that had belonged to John Harvard formed the nucleus around which it grew. Subsequent donations by Peter Bulkeley, Governor Winthrop, Thomas Graves, and others increased the number of books to nine hundred by 1655 (p. 268), at which time it was quite the equal of the smaller college libraries in Europe. Although many theological works were to be found in its collection, it was by no means devoted exclusively to that subject. A number of books upon widely varying topics—*e.g.*, Grotius' *de Jure Belli ac Pacis*, Sir William Vaughan's *Directions for Health*, and Munster's *Cosmography*—gave evidence of considerable diversity of interests.

The history of Harvard's early financial struggles is most instructive. "The Country's Gift"—the £400 with which the General Court of Massachusetts Bay founded the college in 1636—was not given in a lump sum, but was

drawn upon from time to time as need arose. The bulk of this money went toward building the "Old College." The Charlestown ferry rent was the most important source of income during the early years, and continued until 1785. Other sources of income—*e.g.*, the "College Corn"—were of a more temporary and less lucrative nature.

Such, in most brief outline, is the ground covered by Dr. Morison. A Bostonian and a Harvard man, the author has enjoyed the benefit of wide international experience—as a student at Paris, a member of the Peace Commission of 1919, and Harmsworth Professor of American History at Oxford from 1922 to 1925. Since returning to Harvard in the latter year he has devoted much of his time to the history of his alma mater. The mature results of his labors show a sureness of touch and a familiarity with source materials that gives an authoritative stamp to the entire volume. Numerous footnotes, five appendices, and an index add to the usefulness and scope of a work that must long remain a valuable contribution to one phase of American cultural history.

Library of The American Philosophical Society ALBAN W. HOOPES

Pittsburgh's Post-Gazette. The First Newspaper West of the Alleghenies.

By J. CUTLER ANDREWS (Boston, Mount Vernon Press, 1936, vii, 324 p. Illustrated.)

This study of Pennsylvania's oldest existing newspaper is a striking reminder that the historian finds one of his most fertile fields in the files of old newspapers. The author has done more than tell the story of a newspaper. He has recorded the development of a wilderness settlement into the tenth largest city of the United States; he has given us an understanding of the life of Pittsburgh during the last century and a half, a conception that can be secured from no more reliable source than the files of the city's leading newspaper and the private papers of its editors. The student of Pittsburgh history will find this book extremely valuable.

When the first number of the *Pittsburgh Gazette*, as it was originally called, was issued on July 29, 1786, Pittsburgh was a small town of about fifteen hundred people. The young publishers, John Scull and Joseph Hall, probably had little idea that the paper they were establishing was destined to outlive all its Philadelphia contemporaries and grow into the outstanding newspaper of a Pittsburgh of nearly seven hundred thousand population. In the able hands of Mr. Andrews, the story of this growth is a fascinating recital.

John Scull as first editor of the *Gazette* guided its policy in advocating all things that meant progress for Pittsburgh. For thirty years he supported various public causes, and then retired in 1816, hoping that the work would be carried on by his son-successor. For the next few years, however, the paper was not particularly effective. It was not until 1829 that the paper returned to his high standard.

When Neville B. Craig became editor in that year, new vigor was immediately manifest. Craig was a forceful, even a violent writer, and under his powerful pen the paper assumed an important position as moulder of opinion

throughout Western Pennsylvania and a good part of the Ohio Valley. Originally the *Gazette* was a weekly newspaper, but as Pittsburgh grew, the frequency of publication was stepped up, until on July 30, 1833, Craig made the paper an afternoon daily. Later, during the editorship of David N. White, another change took place, the paper being issued in the morning instead of the afternoon.

White succeeded to the editorship in 1841, and continued the struggle for canals and railroads, which had been inaugurated and ably supported by his predecessor. For several years after White's retirement in 1856, the *Gazette* played a less conspicuous part in the life of Pittsburgh.

Then, in 1866, Nelson P. Reed took over the sheet, and his influence lasted until 1900, although Reed himself died in 1891. Reed's control was marked by a great expansion of the newspaper and its policies, so that when George T. Oliver and his family purchased it in 1900, it was a strong metropolitan daily. The Olivers strengthened the paper in various ways; including the introduction of a Sunday edition. They purchased the *Pittsburgh Times*, an old rival of the *Gazette*, and merged the two papers under the *Gazette's* title. This was only one of a series of mergers in the history of the paper, the last one being in 1927 when Paul Block obtained control. Then, in a general reshuffling of Pittsburgh's newspapers, the *Gazette* and its Democratic rival since 1842, the *Pittsburgh Post*, were combined under the title of the *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*. The paper retains the same title and control today.

Such a brief sketch of Mr. Andrews' book cannot, of course, do more than merely indicate the extensive ground covered by the author. He has thoroughly investigated all available sources and his observations and conclusions have been conservatively made. Mr. Andrews is to be congratulated upon this pioneer work in a hitherto neglected field of Pennsylvania history. His book may well serve as a model for those who contemplate similar studies.

J. HARCOURT GIVENS

The Historical Society of Pennsylvania

The New Haven Colony. By ISABEL MACBEATH CALDER. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1934. Yale Historical Publications. Miscellany, 28. vi, 301 p. Map. \$3.50.)

Miss Calder treats of the foundation, the organization and fall of the colony of New Haven. Her story starts in England with the difficulties between John Davenport and the authorities of the Church of England; it follows him to Holland; it tells of his gathering a company to migrate with him to America, of the company's stop in Massachusetts and subsequent removal to New Haven. A fourth of the book is concerned with the foundation of the government and church of New Haven, of the settlement of other towns about New Haven and their ultimate adherence to the federal government of the jurisdiction of New Haven. Chapters are devoted to description of the colony's economic and social life, to a narration of its relations with its Puritan neighbors to the north and its Dutch neighbors to the west. The book ends with an account

of the contest between New Haven and Connecticut over Connecticut's charter of 1662, a struggle which New Haven lost and so disappeared as a separate colony.

Certain sections of the book are very good. Miss Calder gives a valuable and interesting account of the efforts of Davenport and his associates, while still in England, to purchase ecclesiastical revenues controlled by laymen and to appoint to these parishes clerics acceptable to the Puritan party. The sections on the formation of the New England confederation and its policy toward the Dutch are clear and reliable. The story of the granting of the Connecticut charter is capably done, though the account of New Haven's effort to resist Connecticut's claims perhaps does not stress sufficiently the lack of loyalty of the New Haveners to their own government. Miss Calder gives some valuable figures for voting in Guilford, but apparently fails to realize that the proportion of the enfranchised to the unenfranchised seems to have been higher than has been commonly assumed.

Unfortunately other sections of the book seem to me to be of less value. I disagree with the author's interpretation of the development of the New Haven fundamental agreement of 1643 and her argument in favor of the adoption of a code of statutory law in 1638. It is Miss Calder's contention that in 1638 New Haven adopted the Cotton code, prepared for Massachusetts in 1636 and commonly known as "Moses his judicials." She argues that by accepting this code, New Haven adopted its frame of government in 1638, and not in 1643. Further, it was her contention that the acceptance of the Cotton code meant that New Haven's first body of statutory law was adopted in 1638 and not in 1655, and thus the Bible was never used as the basic law of the commonwealth. In defense of her argument that the Cotton code was adopted *in toto* in 1638, Miss Calder presents arguments which lack of space forbids analysis, but which I believe are vulnerable to attack. Indeed, it appears to me that the development of a system of government and the formulation of a code of law came at different times and from different sources, and I therefore shall consider each separately.

In regard to rules for governmental procedure, it must be pointed out that the Cotton scheme provided for a frame of government far too complex for a little village, and its adoption in 1638 could only be for the purpose of a future application—certainly manifest destiny with a vengeance. Further, the New Haven documents never refer to a frame of federal government adopted in 1638. They quote an agreement of 1638 which provided that all rules of law and government should follow the provisions of the scripture, but in 1639 this agreement was ratified formally, and later in that year there were voted provisions for a very rudimentary government. Thereafter all citations in the records were to the very simple resolutions of 1639. In 1640 the first provisions for some sort of federal government appear to have been made. For in that year the settlement of Branford was contemplated by Samuel Eaton, and there was drawn up a document prescribing some form of government uniting the projected town with the government of New Haven. Unfortunately

this agreement was not written into the records of the New Haven court, and apparently has been lost. Eaton gave up his colonizing plans, but in November, 1640, the settlement of Stamford was undertaken upon a contract which, in its governmental provisions, duplicated the Eaton-New Haven contract. Perhaps this compact was later modified—certainly there was a slow development of the federal government, but the redaction of ordinances of 1645 clearly recites that the original basis of the fundamental agreement of 1643 was the Eaton-New Haven agreement, later accepted by Stamford and finally “perfected” in 1643. I agree with Miss Calder that the fundamental agreement of 1643 shows some textual influence of the Cotton code of 1636, but, so far as I can see, we have no knowledge of the time when the New Haven leaders turned to Cotton’s work for inspiration.

In regard to the adoption of a code of statutory law in 1638, the New Haven records state that rules of government and for civil and criminal law the colonists in 1638 agreed to “be ordered by those rules wch the scripture holds forth to vs.” From this statement, Miss Calder draws the conclusion, “To the New England Puritan of 1638, fresh from Massachusetts Bay, this statement could mean only the adoption of the frame of government and code of laws drafted by John Cotton, at the moment under consideration in the Bay.” (p. 51) Now in the records of the colony the phrases “word of God” and “laws of God” are used as the equivalent of the word “scripture.” Thus despite changes in phraseology, there is no change in the basic law from 1638 to 1655. And it happens that in 1638, in both Massachusetts and Connecticut, the word of God or the law of God was appealed to as a code of law. There is no evidence that either of these two colonies had adopted the Cotton code, and in Massachusetts the phrase “lawe of God” certainly meant the Bible. Furthermore, it must be pointed out that when codification of the New Haven laws was undertaken in 1655, Theophilus Eaton was requested by the New Haven court to consider not only the edicts of the New Haven court but also the Massachusetts code of 1648 and a code printed in London in 1655 “said to be Mr. Cottons.” In this court sat men who had participated in the very foundation of the colony and who had held various governmental offices for many years. Certainly these men would have known if the Cotton code had been used since 1638 as statutory law in New Haven, and would neither have been so uncertain about the authorship of the London code of 1655 nor would have suggested that their governor amend an existing code by comparing it with an exact copy. Therefore it seems to me impossible to argue that the Cotton code was recognized as the statutes of New Haven from 1638 to 1655. Indeed, in the trial records there is no reference to any code of statutory law, and there is no record of copies of a code of law being sent to the several towns, a procedure adopted in the instance of other legal documents. I, therefore, can only conclude that the New Haveners meant the Bible in citing as their legal guide the word of God or the scriptures. Certainly such a practice was not novel to New England Puritans of 1638, and in 1642

the New Haven court cited sections of Leviticus as prescribing the proper penalty for the case at trial.

I am also unconvinced by Miss Calder's discussion of the authorship of the pamphlet *A Discourse About Civil Government in a New Plantation Whose Design is Religion*. This pamphlet was published in Cambridge in 1663, and on its titlepage it was asserted to have been long since written by John Cotton. Cotton Mather later wrote that the pamphlet actually had been written by John Davenport, and that Cotton's name had been inserted by error—whose error he did not say. Miss Calder waves aside Mather's statement on the grounds that Mather was born in 1663 and so could not have had first-hand information on the point. She then argues that by this pamphlet, written in 1637, Cotton converted Davenport to the Massachusetts plan of the limitation of franchise to church members. Two objections may be raised to this argument. In the first place, Miss Calder fails to give any documentary verification for her account of the authorship or the circumstances attendant upon the writing of the pamphlet. In the second place, since her refusal to accept Mather's testimony is a mere hypothesis, it is valid only if she can prove that Mather had no reliable source of information available. And it happens that Samuel Green, one of the printers of the pamphlet, did not die until 1702, and since Green was in business in Cambridge when Mather went to Harvard, and since many of Mather's pamphlets of the 1680s and 1690s were published by various members of the Green family, the chances are very good that Mather did know Samuel Green. Thus, while it is true that Mather may have erred in attributing the pamphlet to Davenport, Miss Calder has not disproved his statement.

Miss Calder's work also falters in some of the simplest mechanical problems. Her footnotes are repeatedly incorrect; the syntax of her sentences is in many instances unfortunate; her work is cluttered with detail, unrelieved by generalizations. Finally, the greatest confusion is created by a prodigious number of names of unimportant people—material which will bring joy to the genealogist, but weariness to the historian.

Stanford University

BEVERLY McANEAR