Mr. Mason's clear matter will know best how valuable, how indispensable it is.

WOODROW WILSON.

Princeton.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL HISTORY OF NEW ENGLAND, 1620-1789. By WILLIAM B. WEEDEN. Two volumes; pp. 964. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1890.

THE work of a path-breaker in a new field will always be honorable, whatever we may think of the method employed. Mr. Weeden has opened to our notice a new outlook for historical investigation, and has shown to thoughtful readers, at least, the necessity of an examination into subjects which have been generally relegated to the attention of local writers and antiquarians. This is the great merit of the volumes before us. The antiquarian or the curious reader may be satisfied with this first rough draft; we cannot be thus satisfied, nor can we join with many of the reviewers in seeking to show what is apparent to any reader, that it is but a rough draft. The whole period of the economic history of New England must be rewritten, first in monographs, then in more comprehensive works. For this purpose the volumes before us are the preparation, a preparation for which every student will be thankful. From these can be selected a host of subjects, attractive even in the disconnected account here given. It is only indicative of the change which has come over historical writing and writers that such have scarcely been touched before. Until a sounder examination of economic causes and conditions is made, we will remain dissatisfied with the explanations given for many of the facts of the colonial period. This economic influence can be distinctly seen in the breaking-down of colonial isolation, in the developing and changing the character of the colonists themselves, in the broadening of the horizon of their interests by bringing them into contact with the great centres of trade, both in the Old

World and the New, and in preparing the way for political independence. The economic and political movements were reciprocally influential—with the one often at its height, the other sluggish and uninteresting; as in the era of Walpole trade was brisk, political movement slow; or as at the Revolution trade was dying while political action was intensely vigorous.

Take the question of intercommunication. The importance of roads is examined: this is a problem of no slight philosophical value, though it is not easy to measure the evident effect of such means of communication upon the expansion and extension of trade, the exchange of ideas, and the tendency toward colonial union. King's highways and local roads were as necessary to such union as were Indian attacks or Parliamentary measures. Note further the work of the coast trade as preceding and often more than supplementing the work of the post-roads. Little attention has been called by historians to these skipping trips, this coasting by ketch and shallop, which nourished and carried the colonial life from port to port; and thus began the work of bringing colonial interests together. Indeed, all the shipping and maritime affairs are of first importance. To our mind, the chapters treating of these phases contain more new matter than is to be found elsewhere. Many suggestive thoughts arise as we go over the collection—disconnected though it be—of valuable evidence. These thoughts brought to a focus force the conviction that, were these maritime interests, especially privateering, examined with thoroughness and with a full knowledge of European political and industrial conditions, it would show how largely, even in the period before 1700, and, of course, afterward, our colonial development was diverted, or strengthened, or retarded by the intercontinental difficulties. This would bring our early history into much closer connection with the history of the Old World than our writers—not excepting Mr. Doyle—have been inclined to do. Foreigners, reading what

histories of the colonies we can furnish, justly complain of the narrowness of treatment; and though our own writers say that too much time has been spent on colonial, too little on national, history, it is nevertheless true that the lucid, broad-minded history of the colonies has yet to be written.

Mr. Weeden's chapter on privateering is a striking commentary on the doubtful political morality of the last quarter of the seventeenth century. Even later, representative merchants like Faneuil could ship foreign brandy in false New England rum-casks and smuggle Barcelona handkerchiefs "as coolly as they took snuff in the streets of Boston." This illegal traffic was the offspring of a train of causes, which culminated in the definite resistance of 1765. One notices, in relation to the Navigation Acts of Cromwell and Charles II., the attempts to check the home-spun industry at the turn of the century, and the manufacture of hats a little later; the embargoes and paper blockades, particularly in the period of the Spanish and French wars; and the Sugar Act of 1733—that the colonists were already independent, and did as they pleased in all economic matters. They broke the Navigation Acts, they spun wool, and to a large extent sympathized with the semi-piratical and largely illegal commerce with the Indies and other trading points. This easy-going home administration, this "wise neglect" on the part of the home government, make clearer the intensity of the opposition roused by the tightening measures of the Grenville ministry. To trace the outbreak of the independent spirit to the Writs of Assistance is a careless error; to trace it to the influence of political agitators is equally false. The Navigation and Sugar Acts, and the Stamp Act, and Boston Port Bill, are links in one chain.

The chapter on the slave trade and New England's relation thereto would give to the student of Puritan ethics many curious reflections, if he had not already fortified himself with the consciousness that modern standards are

inapplicable. There are a good many knotty problems for the student of finance, and suggestions—unfortunately only suggestions—of the survival of English life and custom. Sheep-rearing and guilds are specially noted.

For the sake of the interest which these subjects excite we must regret that Mr. Weeden has attempted to examine the social side—the side of morals and manners—with such fulness. He has added but little to our knowledge on this point, while he has added vastly to our knowledge of the purely economic side. From the point of view of the change in the character of the settlers, the decay in moral and religious principles—the fathers giving way to children with a less lofty sense of their mission, who lack much of the austerity of the elders, and are more prone to go astray—this social phase is fundamentally important. But the study of fashions, of periwigs and knee-breeches, even of houses and home life, might better have been made quite secondary. The influence of sea life upon home life, of financial depreciation upon fashions, of soil cultivation upon kitchen-economy is marked, but the latter subjects do not, therefore, require separate and exclusive treatment to explain this influence. For this reason much that Mr. Weeden has printed lacks point, and the reader drifts aimlessly on without a very definite idea of what is the importance of the facts he is so rapidly absorbing.

Accepting thus negatively the method which Mr. Weeden has employed, there is room for a few words of criticism. His historical knowledge of Massachusetts and Rhode Island is more complete than of Connecticut. He is certainly fully aware of the distinction between the Connecticut and New Haven colonies, and yet he seems at times to be ignorant of it or careless of calling attention to it. On page 69 we read that "the franchise depended on connection with the church in Massachusetts and Connecticut." This, of course, was not true. A footnote, however, shows that New Haven should be read

instead of Connecticut. An explanatory comment does not clear up the confusion. It reads: "While the suffrage was not absolutely restricted to church members, the result was practically the same." If this is supposed to apply to New Haven it is quite wrong; if to Connecticut it is not wholly right. The broadened franchise in the latter colony made the greatest difference in the political strength of that colony. The weaknesses and dangers of the theocratic limitation were never prominent in Connecticut history. A similar confusion of the two colonies is to be seen on page 137 in the reference to Milford, and again on page 223 in relation to the Blue Laws, which Mr. Weedon does not seem to know have long ago gone to the limbo of historical mythology. The authorities for New Haven are Atwater, a history referred to without author (Lambert?) and the collections of the Historical Society. Levermore and the New Haven colonial records do not seem to have been known to the writer.

In the discussion of the agrarian side of his subject, Mr. Weedon is less happy than in the maritime, industrial, and financial sides. The study of village economy and the land relations is far from complete, and the lack of arrangement is peculiarly disastrous here. We are not satisfied with the use of the word communal. Technically speaking, it is wrongly used in relation to the New England towns. That which is for the common good, for the preservation of common interests is not necessarily communal. The New England town life was essentially individual; moral, social, and political individuality predominated, yet such individuals sought and were expected to seek the common good. The New England town was often too close a corporation, employing all its energy and means to further its own security and economic development. But this does not make these interests communal. This difficulty may have led to the misstatement that town meetings evolved themselves from proprietor's meetings (page 514). The latter sometimes—not always—pre-

ceded the former, but continued to exist side by side with the other as long as undivided lands remained. In origin they represent practically one and the same body, but in later development they are quite distinct, a land community as distinguished from a political community. The proprietors were not legally recognized until the beginning of the eighteenth century. This will explain the action of Colchester, which Mr. Weeden considers a retrograde measure. The power was vested in the proprietors because the court so ordered, and similar actions could be found in the records of the majority of towns.

It would be surprising, indeed, if in a work of this kind, so full of facts and references, errors of one kind or another should not be found. What does Mr. Weeden mean—and this is neither a fact nor a reference—by calling perambulation a “time-honored Aryan custom” (p. 314), and again, herding “the old Aryan custom” (p. 67)? The word Aryan here is meaningless.

Before closing we should like to call attention to one serious omission. There are valuable appendices and a good index, but there is no bibliography. In case of another edition there should be added a carefully prepared list of the books with full titles. Such a bibliography should contain both printed and manuscript sources, with a few words indicating editions, and in case of specially rare books the libraries where they can be found. This will greatly increase the value of the work in the very direction where its greatest value will be felt, among scholars who will use it as a guide for further study.

C. M. ANDREWS.

Bryn Mawr College.

MANUAL TRAINING IN EDUCATION. By C. M. WOODWARD, Ph. D.,
Director of the St. Louis Manual Training School. The Contemporary Science Series. New York: Scribner & Welford, 1890.

PROF. WOODWARD'S name is so intimately associated with the development of manual training in America that