

"In studying these German contracts one is always impressed with a sense of the first-class legal, financial, and technical ability that the city is able to command ; while American contracts always impress one with the unlimited astuteness and ability of the gentlemen representing the private corporations."

Dr. Shaw has given us the most complete account of municipal government in Europe that has yet appeared. He has not only described the French and German systems, but has also devoted chapters to the municipalities of Belgium, Holland, Italy, and Spain. His work is marked throughout by the lucid arrangement and careful scholarship for which he is so well known. A few errors, however, may be noted. The number of departments into which France was divided in 1789 was eighty-three, not eighty-nine. In his treatment of the cantonal divisions of 1795, the author conveys the impression that the cantons were new creations of the legislation of that year. This, however, is not the case. The cantons were a part of the legislation of 1789-1790. But there they were merely electoral districts of little importance. What the constitution of 1795 did for them was to increase their importance by conferring upon them the functions of the districts which were abolished. But the most serious deficiency of this volume — and the same may be said of its predecessor — is the total absence of bibliographical data. Perhaps in subsequent editions Dr. Shaw will see fit to remedy this defect.

CARL EVANS BOYD.

*Economic History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century. An Inquiry into the Material Condition of the People, based upon Original and Contemporaneous Records.* By PHILIP ALEXANDER BRUCE. (New York and London: Macmillan and Co. 1896. Two vols., pp. xix, 634, 647.)

A LARGE portion of this work relates to the economic history of Virginia in the seventeenth century, in which particular field it is, I believe, unique and its value unquestioned. About one-third of the book is devoted to the period of the Virginia Companies (1606-1624). This was an important period, especially after 1609 ; but beginnings are always interesting, and the comparatively large space given to this brief period should not be criticised. Mr. Bruce regards Captain John Smith as "the real founder of the community," and much of this space is given up, directly or indirectly, to supporting this view ; that is, to taking Captain Smith's side of the issue which it pleased him and his writers to make with the founders of Virginia. So many of the author's ideas have been derived from the misleading statements in Smith's works, which are unfair criticisms of the managers of the first colony of Virginia (1606-1609) and of the Virginia Company of London from 1609 to 1624, that Mr. Bruce (whose honesty of purpose and of opinion I do not question) has failed to convey a fair idea of that company, its purposes and accomplishments, or to deal fairly with those who really succeeded in planting and estab-

lishing the colony. Hence, many of the references during the period 1606-1624 must be received with caution; for there is ample room for an honest difference of opinion, at least, as to many of them, and some of them are certainly errors. But after Mr. Bruce has cleared these meshes I find little room for adverse criticism.

The frontispiece to Vol. I. is a reduced fac-simile of Hermann's map of Virginia and Maryland. The work is outlined in a preface of five pages. The long list of authorities from which the volumes have been compiled occupies the same number of pages.

The work itself is divided into several subdivisions, namely:—I. "Reasons for the Colonization of Virginia." One chapter of 70 pages is given to this division. A good deal of this chapter is devoted to Smith, and there may be differences of opinion as to other views expressed therein; but in order to find out correct history it is necessary to consider all sides, and however I may differ with Mr. Bruce on certain points, I do not hesitate to say that the whole of his work deserves to be carefully read by all historians. II. "Aboriginal Virginia." To this two chapters are given, one on its physical character (65 pages), the other, on Indian economy (45 pages). Each of these subjects is here more fully treated than in any other work; even to give the names and titles of the very numerous items considered or mentioned in the various subdivisions would require more space than I have at my command. III. "Agricultural Development"; four chapters: 1607-1624 (87 pages); 1624-1650 (69 pages); 1650-1685 (79 pages); and 1685-1700 (63 pages). This is an especially interesting and important subdivision, and Mr. Bruce is especially well equipped for treating it fully. The most important item is tobacco, and the history of its development is given from the beginning, as well as of the numerous other things especially pertaining to agriculture—wheat, corn, implements, stock, farmers, tenants, wine, silk, land, its cultivation, fences, cotton, flax, hemp, free trade, freights, prices, duties, highways, bridges, ferries, overseers, etc., etc. IV. "Acquisition of Title to Land—the Patent." One chapter of 85 pages gives a full history of the subject in all of its phases, beginning with the Indians, and ending with the recording of conveyances and acknowledgment of deeds. V. "System of Labor." This is again divided into "The Servant" and "The Slave." To the first are given two chapters (119 pages), to the second one chapter (74 pages). Both classes are exhaustively treated. The "servants" were generally white, though some were Indians and negroes. The "slaves" were generally negroes, but some of them were Indians. This subject is in line with some of Mr. Bruce's previous literary labors, and his views thereof are of peculiar interest. He explains the meaning of the words "servant" and "transportation"; the condition of the English laborer at this time, his wages and opportunities; the indentures of servants, their terms of service, etc.; and similarly of the slave. Of course, many of Mr. Bruce's statements may be questioned; but this is really the fault of his authorities rather than of himself; his own untram-

melled views are generally broad enough to overshadow adverse criticism. VI. "Domestic Economy of the Planter" is well considered in two chapters (111 pages). Bricks are among the numerous things treated of. That they were made here from the first is certain, that they were ever imported is doubtful; but the story of the house built with brick imported from England is as dear to the minds of many as Smith's story is to the minds of others. Neither is at all creditable, but old traditions and ideas are almost ineradicable. An old friend was telling me some years ago of "a house built [by one of his ancestors] before the Revolution in Amherst County, Virginia, of bricks imported from England." I showed him that the price for making brick at the time in that county was three shillings (Virginia money) per thousand, and that they would have cost to buy, import, and haul up from tide-water, about a penny apiece; but I did not shake his faith in the old story, although it amounted to believing that his ancestor was devoid of common understanding. VII. The relative value of estates is briefly but quite exhaustively treated. Manufactured supplies, foreign and domestic, are fully considered from the beginning. The dearth in the colony immediately following the revocation of the charter in England is shown. The imports, trade, and shipping, the exports, manufactures, craftsmen, etc., are treated. Mr. Bruce then considers the monetary system and towns, covering the ground in each instance quite completely. He then devotes 14 pages to his "conclusion," and ends his valuable work with an excellent comprehensive index.

In reviewing these volumes I have frequently felt like giving extracts from them here and there, but extracts really cannot convey a fair idea of the whole. To obtain such an idea of a book which goes into so many details, it is peculiarly necessary to obtain the book itself, and read it carefully. The value of the work in its particular field, especially for the period from 1625 to 1700, can scarcely be overestimated. At the same time I must say that to my mind it is incomplete as it is. The economic history of Virginia in the seventeenth century is interesting and valuable; but its character is introductory, and in order to give it completeness, Mr. Bruce should continue it down at least to the end of the colonial era, if not to the beginning of "our late unpleasantness." It must be hoped that he will.

It is of the first importance in reviewing a work to give due consideration to the various evidence—its impartiality and accuracy, or the contrary—on which the work has been based; but in this instance such a mass of evidence of such various kinds has been made use of, that it can only be done in a general way. No evidence of a contentious character can be relied on safely; controversy is not history. Contemporary publications are apt to have been published for some other motive than stating the unvarnished facts fully and fairly on all points. It is not in the nature of man to write contemporary history; and in the case of an action surrounded by difficulties of almost all sorts, hampered by critics and dissensions within and enemies without, it is an impossibility. "Time, the nurse

and breeder of all good," has to smooth out partisan influences of all sorts. Such contemporary histories have always been obliged to yield to the authentic records, to the truth brought to light by time. Smith's history of Virginia, on which so much of Mr. Bruce's work has been based, is not an exception to the rule. It pretends to show that the factions and misfortunes in Virginia (1607-1609) were not owing to the form of government designed by James I., as had been claimed by the managers, but to their own bad management. It contends that James I. ought not to have granted the Virginia Company of London its charters in the first instance. It criticises that company, and justifies the annulling of the charters in 1624. It opposes, ignores, or traduces every idea which made the planting of Virginia the genesis of the United States; catering to James I., and to those who wished his royal government to be resumed in the colony, and the popular government of the Virginia Company abolished. This was in line with the opinion of many at the time, and must then have given Smith's position great strength. Save for the fact that Charles I., who came to the throne so soon after, was a friend to Sir Edwin Sandys, it is doubtful if any of the free institutions originated under the company would have been permitted to survive, as it is known that James I. was bitterly opposed to Sir Edwin Sandys and his idea of civil and religious liberty in the New World. Of course there are truths in Smith's book, but its motive is personal and controversial rather than historical, and no one can write the true history of the movement without impeaching Smith repeatedly. (Mr. Bruce has done this several times.) No event in modern history has been more ungenerously considered than the beginning of this nation; no men more unjustly treated in our histories than those who really accomplished that task; and no book is more to blame for this than Smith's history of Virginia. The fact that so many of the official records of Virginia were for so long unavailable caused a greater reliance on partial evidence than it deserved. The situation has tended to make early Virginian history an especially difficult and disagreeable field. The student has been hindered, rather than encouraged, in searching after the truth which is essential to history. Mr. Bruce has done little towards ameliorating these particular conditions for the earliest period. He is sometimes disposed to contend for old opinions at all hazards; but all things considered, he has covered the ground as fairly as he could well do with the evidences before him. And when he confines himself strictly to his subject — the economic history of Virginia — his work is without an equal.

ALEXANDER BROWN.

*The Pilgrim Fathers of New England and their Puritan Successors.* By JOHN BROWN, D.D. (New York, Chicago, and Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1895. Pp. v, 368.)

THE author of this volume is favorably known in historical literature by his elaborate memoir of Bunyan, published in 1885; and although the