

bare-foot and bare-legged along", making their way over the mountains, into the new states (p. 167). He travelled six thousand miles a year, and kept a journal.

Chapters IX. and X. give an admirable summary of the frontier type of Methodist preaching, while chapter XI. is an estimate of Asbury as a superintendent. Like his great spiritual father, Wesley, Asbury was primarily an organizer; "He had a face like flint against disorder and irregularity", and it was through his tact and strict adherence to regularity, and his skill as an ecclesiastic, that the Methodist Church was spared any serious schism during its early years.

W. W. SWEET.

*Jeffersonian Democracy in New England.* By WILLIAM A. ROBINSON, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Political Science in Washington University. (New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1916. Pp. vi, 190.)

DR. ROBINSON has found a new subject, and handled it exceedingly well. The history of New England between 1790 and 1815 has, quite naturally, been written largely from a Federalist viewpoint. Federalism there was more than a party, bound up as it was with the dominant church, interests, personalities, and press, well rooted in the structure of New England society. Yet the section was never politically "solid". As soon as the personal factions of the eighties died down, Jeffersonian Democracy arose to dispute the supremacy of the "wise and good and rich". Dr. Robinson has carefully traced this development, keenly analyzed the party basis and structure, and given the party of Jefferson its due place in New England history. His principal materials were contemporary newspapers and pamphlets. He was hampered by lack of printed and manuscript party correspondence, the great abundance of which on the Federalist side so enlivens the annals of that party. The diaries of William Bentley and Nathaniel Ames partially fill this gap.

In 1792 New England was practically a unit behind Washington and Hamilton. The Republican party arose from within, through various groups separating from dominant Federalism partly on local issues, partly on foreign policy, and finding their natural place under the Jeffersonian standard. In New Hampshire, for instance, Republicanism began when the Langdon family connection was refused a bank charter. Even Connecticut, the most completely Federalized state in the Union, had to admit the thin end of a Jeffersonian wedge before 1800.

The most informing chapters in this monograph of consistent excellence are those on the Party Basis, and Religious Liberty. Outside the Maine district of Massachusetts, where the landlord-and-tenant relations between the settlers and leading Boston Federalists were the basis of opposition, the rise of Republicanism in New England cannot be ex-

plained by the favorite formulae of sectionalism and economic interest. Dr. Robinson's maps show that the Connecticut River, in general, watered Federalist territory. But the conservative belt includes most of the hill country on either side (except in Vermont), while some of the most fertile parts of the valley itself were Democratic. Of the mercantile centres, Portsmouth was Democratic, and Salem evenly divided. Old Middlesex County, near Boston, was more staunchly Democratic than any interior or frontier county in New England, while Washington, the newest county, in Maine, remained faithful to Federalism. In general, the Yankee Democracy seems to have been a dissenting and lower-class movement, deriving its earliest strength from Baptists, Methodists, and those whom the Federalists were pleased to term the "dregs of society". The principal local issue of the opposition was that of religious liberty: the destruction of Congregational privilege. A Baptist town was usually a Democratic town. John Leland, Baptist minister of Cheshire, Mass., promoter of the famous mammoth cheese, was a pamphleteer for religious liberty, democracy, and an elective judiciary.

After 1800 Republicanism increased rapidly. Otherwise-minded Rhode Island went Democratic in 1801, for which the Boston *Centinel* called her a "wart on the body of New England". But Vermont quickly followed, and by 1807 the despised Jacobins had captured New Hampshire and Massachusetts. Then came reaction. Jefferson's embargo gave the Federalists a new lease of life, the ground so hardly won was gradually lost, and the function of Jeffersonian Democracy in New England became that of a nationalist check to the separatist tendencies of Federalism. During the war, its vote never fell below forty per cent. of the total cast in the three northern states. As Dr. Robinson concludes, this well-organized minority, "preaching loyalty and nationalism throughout the fourteen years when the opposing party was steadily tending in the opposite direction, was an important factor in the national life".

S. E. MORISON.

*Andrew Johnson, Military Governor of Tennessee.* By CLIFTON R. HALL, Ph.D., Assistant Professor in History and Politics in Princeton University. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1916. Pp. 234.)

PROFESSOR HALL's book shows the author to be a somewhat daring person. He deliberately chooses to write on a narrow subject that has already received pretty full treatment in Fertig's monograph on *The Secession and Reconstruction of Tennessee*; and he deliberately chooses to make his theme the "personality" of a politician when we all know that personality as an element of history has no longer any significance except so far as it can be discerned in a man's bank account, investments, and other paraphernalia of the fashionable economic interpretation. Professor Hall does not tell us anything of consequence about Andrew