

the officers of the crown. It is, moreover, quite erroneous and improper to say and reiterate that the old and perennial quarrel of captains and friars over mission guards raised in California the question, "Was State Sacerdotal to control State Secular, or to be by it controlled".

FREDERICK J. TEGGART.

The Public Life of Joseph Dudley: a Study of the Colonial Policy of the Stuarts in New England, 1660-1715. By EVERETT KIMBALL, Ph.D., Associate Professor of History in Smith College. [Harvard Historical Studies, vol. XV.] (New York and London: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1911. Pp. viii, 239.)

THE public life of Dudley coincided practically with the period of his manhood. Born in 1647 and graduated at Harvard College in 1665, he was in 1673 elected as representative to the General Court. In 1676 he was elected an assistant and from 1677 to 1681 he held the office of commissioner for the United Colonies. He was also sent to London as agent of the colony.

Up to this time Dudley's public life had been colored only by local politics. The independent commonwealth, founded upon a mercantile charter, having an elective governor, an elective assembly, and an elective judiciary, had survived all the attacks which had been made upon it. Opposition to the crown in Massachusetts during the days of the colony had been practically an opposition of the colony itself. Loyalists were only to be found in the minority party, which is termed by the author the "moderate" party.

The succession of appointive offices held by Dudley after the annulment of the charter, identifies him with the court party and had the natural effect of making him unpopular with his fellow citizens, the majority of whom at this period of the life of the province still clung to the tradition of the elective government in which their fathers had participated. His constant official life, now on the one side of the Atlantic, now on the other, was in itself a testimony to Dudley's influence at court and to his capacity to make use of the power which he controlled. He held successively the offices of president of the council of New England, chief justice of the superior court under Andros, member of the council of New York, deputy governor of the Isle of Wight, member of Parliament, and governor of Massachusetts.

During the days of the colony Randolph tells us that the loyalists were tongue-tied. They did not dare openly to assert themselves. Under the provincial government, with all the appointive offices under control of a royal governor, the band of office-holders were in themselves a power, and the dispensation of patronage, together with the accumulation of wealth in the hands of favored families, created a party which had to be considered in local affairs, but which had not reached the height of its power in the days of Dudley.

By some curious chance, in the performance of one of his official acts Dudley inadvertently and unconsciously did more to build up the power of his adversaries than was accomplished by anyone among themselves. While the far-reaching results of this insignificant act were mainly posthumous and thus do not come within the lines of the exhaustive study laid out for himself by the industrious and painstaking author of this work, still the unwitting contribution to the growth and power of his opponents, by so consistent a loyalist as Dudley, will perhaps excuse a reference to it, even though it should carry us beyond the life of Dudley for the development of its effects.

The event occurred in 1715. The house of representatives was according to our author at this time controlled by "the country party which reflected the old idea". The various points upon which collision took place between Dudley and the house of representatives are set forth in this work with sufficient detail for their comprehension. The noise of these battles did not, however, extend much beyond the walls of the old state house, and their influence must have been largely confined to those who participated in them and to those who could hear about them at the dinner tables and bar-rooms of Boston. There were no newspapers at that time whose columns were open to the dissemination of such news. Wearied with his repeated failures to secure certain legislation, Dudley, on June 20, 1715, prorogued the court, saying to the house in substance, that the members were not earning their pay and that it would be better for the province that they should go home. In order to refute this charge, which they considered a slander, the members of the house at once voted to publish their journal. This policy once inaugurated was thereafter continued and the distribution of copies of the house journal among the small towns brought the knowledge of what was going on in the political world in Boston, for the first time, within reach of the groups gathered in winter round the open fires in the country taverns, and for the first time their discussions could deal with the actual, existing politics, which from session to session controlled their representatives. Thus was established a means of communication with a people not otherwise in touch with current politics; thus was created an active interest in such matters throughout the province, thus was suggested how the same people could be reached when at a later date organized correspondence was desired. Thus also is explained the phenomenal interest in politics which came to be developed in Massachusetts.

The period covered by Dudley's career, apart from the dramatic incidents connected with the overthrow of the Andros government, was full of historical interest. A people who for half a century had maintained an independent government were stripped of their privileges and subordinated to the control of a power whose first thought was of its own aggrandizement. Acquiescence in this transition was never thoroughly accomplished and the collisions with Dudley depicted by the

author show how difficult the situation was. It is with this peculiarly interesting period of political upheaval that our author deals while nominally furnishing details concerning the life and character of a participant. Letters, speeches, official documents, contemporary publications, records in England and in America, furnish the facts which, strung upon a thread of narrative, portray the circumstances of the times, the character of the man, and the extent of his service. The story is told with evident attempt to throw off prejudice and do full justice to a man whose career made him the object of animadversion on the part of many of his contemporaries.

Professor Kimball several times in his narrative draws inferences from the fact that the council was elected by the representatives. The charter required the election of the council by the General Court. The difference was slight and the same inferences would probably be justified by changing "house of representatives" to "General Court" in these references. The assertion on page 89 that Elisha Cooke never sat in the council during Dudley's administration ought to be modified. Dudley relented, and in the fall of 1715 Cooke's name is to be found in the roll of councillors. The statement, page 193, that the charter "directed that in case of the absence or the death of the governor, the administration should devolve upon the lieutenant-governor, or in case of his incapacity, upon the eldest councillor", is not strictly correct; "entire council" should be substituted for "eldest councillor". The affairs of the province were administered several times by the executive council.

Such errors as these are insignificant in a work whose every page indicates patient industry. The author is to be congratulated on having set forth the history of an interesting period, and the friends of Dudley cannot say that he has not done the best he could to make out a case for the governor. The whole subject is opened up to the student by an excellent index.

ANDREW M. F. DAVIS.

France in the American Revolution. By JAMES BRECK PERKINS.
(Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1911.
Pp. xix, 544.)

A SPECIAL interest is attached to this book from the fact that it is the last in a series of notable studies in French history which constitute the writer's title to a place among American historians.

The present volume, published more than a year after the author's death, has been prepared for the press under the supervision of Mrs. Perkins with the valuable aid of Professor Van Tyne of the University of Michigan—a sufficient assurance that we have before us the result of careful editing.

A further tribute to the labors of Mr. Perkins is paid in the introduction to the book written by the French ambassador at Washington.