

# ANNUAL REPORT

OF THE

## AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

FOR

THE YEAR 1905.

---

IN TWO VOLUMES.

Vol. I.

---

WASHINGTON:  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.  
1906.

## LETTER OF SUBMITTAL.

---

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION,  
*Washington, D. C., May 14, 1906.*

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with the act of incorporation of the American Historical Association approved January 4, 1889, I have the honor to submit to Congress the annual report of the Association for the year 1905.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

RICHARD RATHBUN,  
*Acting Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.*

HON. CHARLES W. FAIRBANKS,  
*Vice-President of the United States.*

## ACT OF INCORPORATION.

---

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Andrew D. White, of Ithaca, in the State of New York; George Bancroft, of Washington, in the District of Columbia; Justin Winsor, of Cambridge, in the State of Massachusetts; William F. Poole, of Chicago, in the State of Illinois; Herbert B. Adams, of Baltimore, in the State of Maryland; Clarence W. Bowen, of Brooklyn, in the State of New York; their associates and successors, are hereby created, in the District of Columbia, a body corporate and politic, by the name of the American Historical Association, for the promotion of historical studies, the collection and preservation of historical manuscripts, and for kindred purposes in the interest of American history and of history in America. Said Association is authorized to hold real and personal estate in the District of Columbia so far only as may be necessary to its lawful ends to an amount not exceeding five hundred thousand dollars, to adopt a constitution, and to make by-laws not inconsistent with law. Said Association shall have its principal office at Washington, in the District of Columbia, and may hold its annual meetings in such places as the said incorporators shall determine. Said Association shall report annually to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution concerning its proceedings and the condition of historical study in America. Said Secretary shall communicate to Congress the whole of such reports, or such portions thereof as he shall see fit. The Regents of the Smithsonian Institution are authorized to permit said Association to deposit its collections, manuscripts, books, pamphlets, and other material for history in the Smithsonian Institution or in the National Museum, at their discretion, upon such conditions and under such rules as they shall prescribe.*

[Approved, January 4, 1889.]

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL.

---

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ASSOCIATION,  
*Washington, D. C., May 12, 1906.*

SIR: In accordance with the act of incorporation of the American Historical Association, approved January 4, 1889, I have the honor to transmit herewith the annual report of the Association for the year 1905. The manuscript includes a report by the Public Archives Commission and a complete bibliography of American historical societies.

Very respectfully,

A. HOWARD CLARK,  
*Secretary.*

MR. RICHARD RATHBUN,  
*Acting Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution,*  
*Washington, D. C.*



## CONSTITUTION.

---

### I.

The name of this society shall be The American Historical Association.

### II.

Its object shall be the promotion of historical studies.

### III.

Any person approved by the executive council may become a member by paying \$3, and after the first year may continue a member by paying an annual fee of \$3. On payment of \$50 any person may become a life member, exempt from fees. Persons not resident in the United States may be elected as honorary or corresponding members, and be exempt from the payment of fees.

### IV.

The officers shall be a president, two vice-presidents, a secretary, a corresponding secretary, a curator, a treasurer, and an executive council consisting of the foregoing officers and six other members elected by the Association, with the ex-presidents of the Association. These officers shall be elected by ballot at each regular annual meeting of the Association.

### V.

The executive council shall have charge of the general interests of the Association, including the election of members, the calling of meetings, the selection of papers to be read, and the determination of what papers shall be published.

### VI.

This constitution may be amended at any annual meeting, notice of such amendment having been given at the previous annual meeting, or the proposed amendment having received the approval of the executive council.

# AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.

Organized at Saratoga, N. Y., September 10, 1884. Incorporated by Congress  
January 4, 1889.

---

## OFFICERS ELECTED DECEMBER 28, 1905.

---

### PRESIDENT :

SIMEON E. BALDWIN, LL. D.,  
*Professor in Yale University, Associate Judge of Supreme Court of  
Errors of Connecticut.*

### VICE-PRESIDENTS :

J. FRANKLIN JAMESON, PH. D., LL. D.,  
*Professor in the University of Chicago.*

GEORGE B. ADAMS, PH. D., LITT. D.,  
*Professor in Yale University.*

### SECRETARY AND CURATOR :

A. HOWARD CLARK, A. M.  
*Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C.*

### CORRESPONDING SECRETARY :

CHARLES H. HASKINS, PH. D.,  
*Professor in Harvard University.*

### TREASURER :

CLARENCE WINTHROP BOWEN, PH. D.,  
*130 Fulton street, New York.*

### EXECUTIVE COUNCIL :

In addition to above-named officers.

(Ex-Presidents.)

ANDREW DICKSON WHITE, L. H. D., LL. D.,  
*Ithaca, N. Y.*

JAMES SCHOULER, LL. D.,  
*Boston, Mass.*

JAMES BURRILL ANGELL, LL. D.,  
*President of the University of Michigan.*

GEORGE PARK FISHER, D. D., LL. D.,  
*Professor in Yale University.*

HENRY ADAMS, LL. D.,  
*Washington, D. C.*

JAMES FORD RHODES, LL. D.,  
*Boston, Mass.*

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, LL. D.,  
*Boston, Mass.*

ALFRED THAYER MAHAN, D. C. L., LL. D.,  
*New York.*

HENRY CHARLES LEA, LL. D.,  
*Philadelphia.*

GOLDWIN SMITH, LL. D.,  
*Toronto, Canada.*

JOHN BACH McMASTER, PH. D., LITT. D., LL. D.,  
*Professor in the University of Pennsylvania.*

(Elected Councillors.)

EDWARD G. BOURNE, PH. D.,  
*Professor in Yale University.*

ANDREW C. McLAUGHLIN, A. M., LL. B.  
*Professor in the University of Michigan.*

GEORGE P. GARRISON, PH. D.,  
*Professor in the University of Texas.*

REUBEN GOLD THWAITES, LL. D.,  
*State Historical Society of Wisconsin.*

CHARLES M. ANDREWS, PH. D.,  
*Professor in Bryn Mawr College.*

JAMES H. ROBINSON, PH. D.,  
*Professor in Columbia University, New York.*

## TERMS OF OFFICE.

(Deceased officers are marked thus †.)

### EX-PRESIDENTS.

ANDREW DICKSON WHITE, L. H. D., LL. D., 1884-85.  
† GEORGE BANCROFT, LL. D., 1885-86.  
† JUSTIN WINSOR, LL. D., 1886-87.  
† WILLIAM FREDERICK POOLE, LL. D., 1887-88.  
† CHARLES KENDALL ADAMS, LL. D., 1888-89.  
† JOHN JAY, LL. D., 1889-90.  
† WILLIAM WIRT HENRY, LL. D., 1890-91.  
JAMES BURRILL ANGELL, LL. D., 1891-1893.  
HENRY ADAMS, LL. D., 1893-94.  
† GEORGE FRISBIE HOAR, LL. D., 1894-95.  
† RICHARD SALTER STORRS, D. D., LL. D., 1895-96.  
JAMES SCHOUER, LL. D., 1896-97.  
GEORGE PARK FISHER, D. D., LL. D., 1897-98.  
JAMES FORD RHODES, LL. D., 1898-99.  
† EDWARD EGGLESTON, L. H. D., 1899-1900.  
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, LL. D., 1900-1901.  
ALFRED THAYER MAHAN, D. C. L., LL. D., 1901-2.  
HENRY CHARLES LEA, LL. D., 1902-3.  
GOLDWIN SMITH, LL. D., 1903-4.  
JOHN BACH McMASTER, PH. D., LITT. D., LL. D., 1904-5.

### EX-VICE-PRESIDENTS.

† JUSTIN WINSOR, LL. D., 1884-1886.  
† CHARLES KENDALL ADAMS, LL. D., 1884-1888.  
† WILLIAM FREDERICK POOLE, LL. D., 1886-87.  
† JOHN JAY, LL. D., 1887-1889.  
† WILLIAM WIRT HENRY, LL. D., 1888-1890.  
JAMES BURRILL ANGELL, LL. D., 1889-1891.  
HENRY ADAMS, LL. D., 1890-1893.  
† EDWARD GAY MASON, A. M., 1891-1893.  
† GEORGE FRISBIE HOAR, LL. D., 1893-94.  
† RICHARD SALTER STORRS, D. D., LL. D., 1894-95.  
JAMES SCHOUER, LL. D., 1894-1896.  
GEORGE PARK FISHER, D. D., LL. D., 1896-97.  
JAMES FORD RHODES, LL. D., 1896-1898.  
† EDWARD EGGLESTON, L. H. D., 1898-99.  
† MOSES COIT TYLER, L. H. D., LL. D., 1897-1900.  
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, LL. D., 1899-1900.  
† HERBERT BAXTER ADAMS, PH. D., LL. D., 1900-1901.  
ALFRED THAYER MAHAN, D. C. L., LL. D., 1900-1901.  
HENRY CHARLES LEA, LL. D., 1901-2.  
GOLDWIN SMITH, D. C. L., LL. D., 1901-1903.  
† EDWARD McCRADY, LL. D., 1902-3.  
JOHN BACH McMASTER, LL. D., 1903-4.  
SIMEON E. BALDWIN, LL. D., 1904-5.

### SECRETARIES.

† HERBERT BAXTER ADAMS, PH. D., LL. D., 1884-1899.  
A. HOWARD CLARK, A. M., 1889—  
CHARLES H. HASKINS, PH. D., 1900—



## TREASURER.

CLARENCE WINTHROP BOWEN, PH. D., 1884—

## EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

WILLIAM BABCOCK WEEDEN, A. M., 1884-1886.  
 † CHARLES DEANE, LL. D., 1884-1887.  
 † MOSES COIT TYLER, L. H. D., LL. D., 1884-85.  
 EPHRAIM EMERTON, PH. D., 1884-85.  
 FRANKLIN BOWDITCH DEXTER, A. M., 1885-1887.  
 † WILLIAM FRANCIS ALLEN, A. M., 1885-1887.  
 † WILLIAM WIRT HENRY, LL. D., 1886-1888.  
 † RUTHERFORD BIRCHARD HAYES, LL. D., 1887-88.  
 JOHN W. BURGESS, LL. D., 1887-1891.  
 ARTHUR MARTIN WHEELER, A. M., 1887-1889.  
 GEORGE PARK FISHER, D. D., LL. D., 1888-1891.  
 † GEORGE BROWN GOODE, LL. D., 1889-1896.  
 JOHN GEORGE BOURINOT, C. M. G., D. C. L., LL. D., 1889-1894.  
 JOHN BACH McMASTER, LL. D., 1891-1894.  
 GEORGE BURTON ADAMS, PH. D., 1891-1897; 1898-1901.  
 THEODORE ROOSEVELT, LL. D., 1894-95.  
 † JABEZ LAMAR MONROE CURRY, LL. D., 1894-95.  
 HENRY MORSE STEPHENS, A. M., 1895-1899.  
 FREDERICK JACKSON TURNER, PH. D., 1895-1899; 1901-1904.  
 EDWARD MINER GALLAUDET, PH. D., LL. D., 1896-97.  
 MELVILLE WESTON FULLER, LL. D., 1897-1900.  
 ALBERT BUSHNELL HART, PH. D., LL. D., 1897-1900.  
 ANDREW C. McLAUGHLIN, A. M., LL. B., 1898-1901; 1903—  
 WILLIAM A. DUNNING, PH. D., LL. D., 1899-1902.  
 PETER WHITE, A. M., 1899-1902.  
 J. FRANKLIN JAMESON, PH. D., LL. D., 1900-1903.  
 A. LAWRENCE LOWELL, A. B., LL. B., 1900-1903.  
 HERBERT PUTNAM, Litt. D., LL. D., 1901-1904.  
 GEORGE L. BURR, LL. D., 1902-1905.  
 EDWARD P. CHEYNEY, A. M., 1902-1905.  
 EDWARD G. BOURNE, PH. D., 1903—  
 GEORGE P. GARRISON, PH. D., 1904—  
 REUBEN GOLD THWAITES, LL. D., 1904—  
 CHARLES M. ANDREWS, PH. D., 1905—  
 JAMES H. ROBINSON, PH. D., 1905—

## CONTENTS.

### VOLUME I.

	Page.
I. Report of Proceedings of the Twenty-first Meeting at Baltimore and Washington, December 26-29, 1905, by Charles H. Haskins, corresponding secretary .....	17
II. Old Standards of Public Morals, by John Bach Master .....	55
III. Virginia and the English Commercial System, 1730-1733, by St. George L. Sioussat .....	71
IV. Why North Carolina at First Refused to Ratify the Federal Constitution, by Charles Lee Raper .....	99
V. The First Lord Baltimore and His Colonial Projects, by Bernard C. Steiner .....	109
VI. The Authorship of the Monroe Doctrine, by James Schouler .....	123
VII. Report of Conference on Teaching of History in Elementary Schools, by J. A. James .....	133
VIII. Report of Conference on First Year of College Work in History, by Charles H. Haskins .....	147
IX. Second Report of Conference of State and Local Historical Societies, by F. H. Severance .....	175
X. Report of Proceedings of Second Annual Meeting of Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association, by C. A. Duniway .....	219
XI. Origin of the National Land System under the Confederation, by P. J. Treat .....	237
XII. Slavery in California after 1848, by C. A. Duniway .....	241
XIII. Report on Methods of Organization and Work of State and Local Historical Societies, by Thwaites, Shambaugh, and Riley .....	249
XIV. Report of the Public Archives Commission .....	327

### VOLUME II.

Bibliography of American Historical Societies, by A. P. C. Griffin.

---

I.—REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE TWENTY-FIRST ANNUAL  
MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.

---

BALTIMORE AND WASHINGTON, DECEMBER 26, 27, 28, 29, 1905.

---

By CHARLES H. HASKINS,  
*Corresponding Secretary.*

## REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE TWENTY-FIRST ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.<sup>a</sup>

---

By CHARLES H. HASKINS, Corresponding Secretary.

---

It is the established practice of the American Historical Association to hold its annual meeting one year in an eastern city, one year in a western city, and the third year in Washington, which, according to the charter, is the official headquarters. The twenty-first annual meeting was held in Baltimore December 26 to 28, 1905, with a supplementary session in Washington on December 29. The American Economic Association, the American Political Science Association, instituted two years ago, and the still newer Bibliographical Society of America also held their annual meetings in Baltimore at the same time.

Nearly all the sessions for the reading of papers were held at the Johns Hopkins University, and chiefly in McCoy Hall, the business session being held in the rooms of the Maryland Historical Society on Thursday afternoon. On Friday morning a special train conveyed the members to Washington by way of Annapolis, where Governor Warfield received them in the historic senate chamber of the old statehouse, and where the United States Naval Academy was also visited. The number of registrations was 276, a number even greater than at the Chicago meeting, and it may be presumed that in respect to attendance of members the twenty-first annual meeting was the most successful ever held.

The four round-table conferences awakened a keen interest on the part of the members. These conferences were organized on much the same plan which was so successful last year at Chicago, but it was an improvement that only two were held at the same time. Actual joint sessions with the American Economic Association were not attempted. The first evening (Tuesday, December 26) was devoted to a joint session of the American Historical and the American Political Science Associations.

---

<sup>a</sup> This general account of the Baltimore-Washington meeting of the Association is reproduced, with some modifications, from the report prepared for the American Historical Review (April, 1906) by the managing editor of the Review, Dr. J. Franklin Jameson.



On this occasion, after an address of welcome by President Ira Remsen of the Johns Hopkins University, presidential addresses were delivered by Prof. Frank J. Goodnow, of Columbia University, president of the American Political Science Association, and by Prof. John B. McMaster, of the University of Pennsylvania, president of the American Historical Association. Professor Goodnow's subject was *The Growth of Executive Discretion*. The theme of Professor McMaster's presidential address was "*Old Standards of Public Morals*." The paper is printed in full in the present volume.

Wednesday morning's session was devoted to the reading of papers in American history. Prof. St. George L. Sioussat, of the University of the South, read the first paper, entitled "*Virginia and the English Colonial System, 1730-1735*," which is printed in full in the present volume.

Prof. Charles Lee Raper, of the University of North Carolina, read a brief address on the subject, "*Why North Carolina at First Refused to Ratify the Federal Constitution*," which is printed herein.

The third paper of the session was by Prof. W. A. Dunning, of Columbia University: "*The Second Birth of the Republican Party*." Despite the popular conception the serious student can not agree that the Republican party has had an unbroken existence of fifty years. When in 1860 the Republican party won its first great national victory, it was heterogeneous, agreed only on slavery. Party lines, at first broken up by the war, reappeared after a year of fighting and the employment of war powers by the administration. The supporters of the administration avoided resort to the name and traditions of the Republican party, while its opponents called themselves Democrats. It became necessary to form a new party, whose platform should be the maintenance of the Union. The Union party, formed at the Baltimore convention of 1864, had no continuity with the old Republican party. It was composed of all parties, but was more than a temporary fusion; it was distinctly a new party. The Democrats, however, resenting the appropriation of the name Union by their opponents, insisted on calling them Republicans, and in some local organizations the old title was retained. These connections were merely nominal, however. It was the Union party that was victorious in 1864, and secured the successful conclusion of the war and the abolition of slavery by constitutional amendment. Unprepared for reconstruction, however, the new party soon developed a line of cleavage, and appeared divided into conservatives and radicals; the latter, at first in the minority, profited by Johnson's lack of tact, and by 1866 controlled the party machinery. Adopting negro suffrage as a national issue, the radical element won a striking victory in the elections, and the movement to nationalize the Union party along conservative lines failed. The conservatives went into the

Democratic party, or joined the radicals, thus modifying somewhat their extreme tendencies. The term Republican came again into use; in 1868 the title National Union Republican party was adopted; in 1872 the word Union was dropped and a continuity of existence from 1860 was claimed.

The final paper, by Prof. R. C. H. Catterall, of Cornell University, "A French Diplomat and the Treaty with Spain, 1819," was a study of the part played by Hyde de Neuville, minister of France at Washington, in securing a peaceful settlement of the disputed issues between the United States and Spain. It is well known that such a solution was not expected by John Quincy Adams. The Spanish-American revolt, the determination of the United States to secure Florida, and the deadlock over the Louisiana boundary all combined to make a resort to arms most probable. Hyde de Neuville was instructed to use his efforts to maintain peace. He realized that his course was to persuade Spain to yield the Floridas for what she could get in the settlement of the Louisiana boundary. His first opportunity to prevent war came in the fall of 1817, when he supported Adams in his opposition to Monroe's desire to recognize Buenos Ayres. When, in January of the next year, Great Britain's offer of her services in negotiating the cession of Florida was declined by the United States, Hyde took the matter up with the Spanish minister. Finding that Spain was willing to cede the Floridas, he urged an accommodation of the Louisiana boundary. Jackson's seizure of Pensacola gave him an opportunity of direct intervention. Adams refused to disavow Jackson's act, and desired the French minister to secure a proposal from Spain. This he did, and then, acting as mediator, continued the negotiation until a compromise had been effected. It is safe to say that without the services of Hyde de Neuville the treaty of 1819 could not have been secured.

The afternoon of Wednesday (there was no session in the evening) was given up to conferences and sessions of committees. Of the two conferences, the more numerously attended was that on History in Elementary Schools, while the other was occupied with topics in Church History. In the former the proceedings consisted of the reading of a preliminary and partial report of the Committee of Eight, appointed a year ago to consider a course of history for elementary schools, and of a discussion based upon the report. Both report and discussion were limited to a consideration of the work of the last four years of the grammar grades.

The chairman of the meeting, Prof. James A. James, of Northwestern University, chairman of the Committee of Eight, traced the steps leading to the appointment of that committee, noting the reports on history in elementary schools presented in the Madison Conference of 1892, and Miss Salmon's report on the same subject in the appen-

dix to the Report of the Committee of Seven. The programmes of historical courses in elementary schools presented in these two reports are the only ones hitherto drawn up by national organizations.

In presenting the formal report for the committee, Prof. Henry E. Bourne, of Western Reserve University, said that historical instruction in the grammar grades should bear exclusively upon American history. The subject-matter should be subdivided into periods and treated in chronological order. Our conception of the scope of American history is by no means to be confined to the period after 1492 and the territory west of the Atlantic and east of the Pacific. It as truly includes a history of European events as does that of any European people. This is true not only of the period of origins but also of the later periods. In brief, the problem of the teacher is to explain the American world, not to tell merely what has happened in America. The chronological order should be followed, since facts lose none of their value by this arrangement, and the present rests upon the past. The fifth grade should be taught the place of exploration and discoveries in the world as a whole; the sixth grade the story of settlement and growth to 1763; the seventh grade the period of revolution until the Spanish colonies won their freedom and both North and South America were politically independent; the eighth grade the period from about 1820 to 1906.

The work of the fifth grade presents serious but not insuperable problems. In his work in geography and language the child receives ideas of the world. History should strengthen the impressions thus gained; but it has not always done this. Thus in his study of literature he is taught to look upon England as a country to which we owe a great debt, whereas from history he generally receives a different impression. Professor Bourne then showed in detail how the plan might be carried out. By means of stories, for instance, the children can be given an idea of the various countries of Europe, the characteristic features of their civilization, and their relative importance.

Miss Mabel Hill, of the Lowell Normal School, approved the plan both psychologically and pedagogically. The chronological order is to be commended. The proposed syllabus has a logical sequence and presents a view of history that is without narrowness or prejudice. It is desirable that children should be taught the story not only of the Reformation but of the Counter-Reformation and the work of the Jesuits; the contributions of pagan nations to civilization; the influences, other than human, which have affected the history of the race; and other countries, both geographically and historically, as well as our own.

Mr. Henry Johnson, of the State Normal School of Charleston, Ill., believed the suggested plan to be practicable, and was

pleased by the enlarged conception of American history. But he questioned whether the field should be limited to American history; whether the capacity of the children in the grammar grades was fully understood; and whether there was not an impression that history could not be presented to the children as history. The problem is what kind of history can be brought within the cultivated intelligence of children. As early as the fourth grade, it is possible to arouse an interest in history proper and in questions of historical evidence. The fifth grade can read such documents as the Rule of St. Benedict and Einhard's Life of Charlemagne. The sixth grade had voted Petrarch more interesting than Froissart; the seventh grade can read enough of colonial charters to correct statements in the text-books. Whatever the period and the countries selected by the committee, the report should establish a definite relation between history in schools and history in histories.

Doctor Tolson, of Baltimore, while in general agreement with the report, considered the outline for the fifth grade too comprehensive to be entirely satisfactory, and thought that the course was overcrowded.

In the discussion that followed a number of speakers took part. Dr. James Sullivan, of New York City, and President Ward, of the Western Maryland State Normal School, spoke in favor of the report. The chief adverse criticisms were that the course as presented was overcrowded; that it lacked real historical unity; and that teachers, in some sections of the country at least, were not sufficiently well equipped to make its adoption practicable. Other speakers especially commended the division of the subject-matter. Professor Fling, of Nebraska, believed that it is customary to underestimate what grammar and high-school pupils can do in weighing historical evidence.

Professor Bourne indorsed story-work because in it English and history go together. History should be fastened to stories already familiar and to geography. As to overcrowding, the proposed course sounded more crowded than it was, but the intention was to give plenty of material for selection.

At the Church History Conference, of which Prof. Williston Walker, of New Haven, was chairman, there was an attendance of about thirty, mainly composed of theological instructors and visiting clergymen. The conference opened with a paper by Prof. A. C. McGiffert, of Union Theological Seminary, on the "Rise of the Modern Conception of Divine Immanence." Although a few of the hearers were tempted to discuss the bearing of the conception on certain doctrines of the church, the address was a purely historical exposition of the influences cooperating to give dominance to the idea of divine immanence. The factors in the process were presented as



Pietism, the growth of the idea of evolution since Leibnitz, Herder's reconception of Spinoza's monism, and the influence of the romantic movement.

The second contribution to the conference was a plea by Dr. J. C. Ayer, jr., of the Philadelphia Divinity School, for a source-book to aid in the teaching of church history.

Dr. Ernest C. Richardson, librarian of Princeton University, brought before the conference for discussion a statement on the publication of materials for American church history, suggested by the remarks of Prof. Shailer Mathews in the conference of the preceding year. Doctor Richardson based his opening remarks on a search, which did not pretend to be exhaustive but was certainly suggestive in its results, for instances in the last five years of the publication of manuscripts of the sort which formed the theme of his paper. He showed that there had been, in books and journals, a not inconsiderable amount of documentary publication; that the Protestant theological seminaries had had very little hand in this, and as for systematic attention to the matter had been doing practically nothing; and that a greater amount of good work, in the way of publication of materials for American church history, was being done by the Catholics and the Jews than by all the Protestant denominations put together. Without attempting to enumerate the materials awaiting publication, he specified their leading classes and by instances exhibited their interest. Next he addressed himself to the question what could be done. Obviously the theological seminaries are in a better position to do work of this sort than any other existing agencies. They can work through their graduates to gather materials, can sometimes utilize their postgraduate students for editing, can in some cases use their journals as organs of publication, and through their financial agents can easily secure funds for so plainly appropriate a line of endeavor. Taking up the question how the seminaries shall be stirred up to this task, and how induced to persevere in it, the speaker laid the responsibility on the American Historical Association, as heir of the American Society of Church History; and suggested organic provisions in its system whereby it could accomplish the work. It may be mentioned that, pending such action, the Department of Historical Research of the Carnegie Institution has undertaken, in a manner described on a later page, to lay the necessary foundation for such activity in documentary publication, by whatever agency attempted. It is hoped that it will thereby afford a strong stimulus toward its inception.

The exercises of Thursday morning, like those of Wednesday afternoon, consisted of two conferences, in this case occupied, respectively, with History in the College Curriculum and with the Problems of

State and Local Historical Societies. In opening the former, its chairman, Prof. Charles H. Haskins, of Harvard University, said that, of all the questions that concern the college teacher of history, none is of greater importance than that of the first year of college work. Its importance is recent; for when history was introduced into the college curriculum twenty or twenty-five years ago, it came in at the top and slowly worked down into the sophomore and freshman years. With this change in the position of history in the curriculum new problems arise; the younger student has to be taught college methods of work, college teaching is brought into relation with the teaching of history in schools, and the problem of handling larger classes has also to be met. Various conditions in the different colleges give rise to different problems. Since the matter is still largely in the experimental stage, it has seemed desirable that teachers representing different types of colleges and of methods should come together to exchange experiences.

At Harvard the introductory course in history is taken mainly by freshmen; it deals with the middle ages and primarily with the continent. The lectures aim at explaining, connecting, enlarging, and vitalizing the facts gained from the prescribed reading. The reading is in weekly installments of from 75 to 100 pages, selected from manuals, sources, and narrative histories, and is tested in the weekly meetings of the sections, where there are written tests, map exercises, and discussions. Students are also required to do additional reading, which is discussed in individual conferences with the assistants. These conferences also serve for talking over the work of the course in general and for bringing about closer acquaintance between student and assistant.

Prof. O. H. Richardson described the introductory course at Yale, which gives a general survey of continental European history from the fall of Rome to 1870. The class is divided into sections of less than forty. A syllabus forms the basis of the work, and there are daily quizzes, short written tests at least once a week, and examinations of students' notebooks. An important and successful feature of the work is the training in knowledge of books which comes through bibliographical exercises, directed through personal interviews. Collateral reading in compendiums and standard works is carried on throughout the year; the majority of the instructors believe that the source method is available to only a small extent in a course of this kind.

In the absence of Miss Salmon, the paper that she had prepared was read by Miss Ellery, of Vassar College. The purpose of the first year's work in history at Vassar is to teach the technique of the subject by giving students a knowledge of books on the mechanical

side and showing them how to get at historical material and present it; to teach them how to think historically by giving them a bird's-eye view of the history of western Europe from the fall of Rome, and an idea of historical perspective and of the unity of history; and to arouse an interest in the subject. There are personal conferences and illustrated lectures. The class is divided into sections of 25 students each. Formal lectures and formal essays are avoided. The effort is to make the student independent and to create a basis for the later elective work.

Prof. Frank M. Anderson, of the University of Minnesota, brought out the point that the character of the first year's course should be determined by the preparation of the students, and that there ought to be two or more courses to meet different needs, so that preparatory work would receive the recognition that it ought to receive. At Minnesota two courses are offered: One (13 B. C.-1500 A. D.) for those who have previously had one year of history or less; the other on English constitutional history for those who have had two years or more. No broader field should be traversed. The day of the old general course in history is ended in the high schools and should be ended in the colleges. All or a large part of the work should be done in small classes. In the first course strong emphasis should be laid on training and preparation for more advanced courses, and documents should be critically studied as evidence.

Mr. Hiram Bingham explained how the preceptorial system recently introduced into the junior and senior grades at Princeton had been applied to the teaching of history. The plan, which required an increase of one-half in the teaching force, aims to bring the student into sympathetic personal contact with the preceptor. Each course is conducted by a professor who lectures twice a week; and in addition there are small conferences held two or three times weekly, at which four or five men meet with and report to their preceptor. What the average undergraduate needs is more reading, and to be kept at work by a live discussion of what is read. The relations with the preceptor are those of friendship. The preceptor can debar any man from taking an examination, but gives no mark. The system is flexible and adaptable. The preceptor is not a coach nor a quiz-master. He should see that the student has been working, but chiefly he should make it his endeavor to arouse and establish a strong and healthy interest in intellectual matters.

Professor Fling, of the University of Nebraska, spoke of the distinguishing characteristics of the work there, especially in the department of European history. Much emphasis is laid on method work. In the first year the attempt is made to teach the method by which historical truth is arrived at, since the man is not a scholar who knows results but does not know how the knowledge is obtained.

Prof. Morse Stephens deprecated the attack on the formal lecture; its excellence or lack of it depends on the lecturer. The more formal and careful the lecture is the better. Perhaps the most important work is with the freshmen, and the most experienced professors should have charge of this work. The attack upon the system of having all the men together in one class was also deprecated. In the large courses students come to know their classmates; they can be taught a point of view—not facts. A stimulation comes from being in a crowd. Clergymen do not divide their congregations into sections. But section work may be used as a supplement. English history is perhaps the best to begin with, although the students do not learn much about English history. They deal with various kinds of historical material and learn to know the documents and the different sources of authority. What we have to do with the freshman mainly is to expel the schoolboy and give the freshman the nature of the thinking man. It matters little what subject is taught; the end is the same.

Professor Farrand, of Leland Stanford University, said that students at that institution are given a practical library course; combined with this is work on simple problems of historical criticism, which is at first confined to text-books. Professor Fay, of Dartmouth College, spoke in favor of the syllabus as an aid in keeping the various sections together in their work. Professor Trenholme, of the University of Missouri, believed in the formal lecture if the lecturer were worth hearing. If the lecture did not prove attractive, class discussion might well take its place. There is danger of making the teacher of history too mechanical through the elaboration of machinery. Other speakers were Doctor Fite, of Harvard; Mrs. Abbe, of New York; Doctor Sullivan, of the New York Commercial High School; Professor Brown, of New York University; and Doctor Shepherd, of Baltimore.

In summing up the results of the conference, Professor Haskins called attention to the very slight emphasis that had been placed upon the subject studied. The matter of greater interest was that pupils should learn something about studying history. But the subject chosen must neither be too large nor too small. As to how students should be introduced to the subject, the speakers were not in agreement. Students vary greatly in preparation and ability, and the course must be adaptable so that it will hit all, and so that the better students may be encouraged to do more than the others. The net result of the conference is that we must get the interest of the students and teach them how to study.

The fourth of the conferences, which occurred at the same time with the one last mentioned, was devoted to the Problems of State and Local Historical Societies. Professor Benjamin F. Shambaugh,



of the State University of Iowa, presided; Mr. Frank H. Severance, of the Buffalo Historical Society, acted as secretary. Problems of cooperation were first considered. Mr. William O. Scroggs, of Cambridge, Mass., read a paper on the relation of the college chair or department of American history to the work of historical societies. He had sent out systematic inquiries as to these relations, intended to collect information from the societies as to the aid which they rendered to the work of instruction in the neighboring colleges, as to contributions by professors and college students to the proceedings of the societies, as to assistance by them in the editing of publications, and as to definite efforts to recruit the membership of the societies from among the collegians. The result of the inquiries was to show the existence of little more than relations of general friendliness, though these took a wide variety of forms. The speaker urged the maintenance of a broader view on the part of the societies and more serious efforts to enlist the members of colleges and universities in their work.

Another phase of cooperative activity was illustrated in a paper on the Pennsylvania Federation of Historical Societies by Mr. S. P. Heilman, of Heilman Dale, secretary of the federation. There are 36 historical societies in the State. An act of the legislature allows the county commissioners of each county to appropriate \$200 to the county historical society, but hardly a third of the counties in the State have such organizations. The Pennsylvania Federation of Historical Societies was formed at Harrisburg on January 5, 1905, with a view to encouraging the formation of local historical societies, to promoting research into Pennsylvania history, to the preparation of check lists for a complete bibliography of the Commonwealth by a combination of local or county bibliographies, to mutual communication of information as to what each society is doing, and to the keeping of lists of historical workers. The federation began with 13 of the historical societies of the State, but now embraces 23. Two counties, Lancaster and Tioga, have made lists of all publications printed within their territory. The meeting of January 4, 1906, will better define the possible scope of such a federation; and obviously in the extension of such a system to other States regard would need to be paid to the great variety exhibited in the organization of American historical societies and particularly in their relations to the State governments.

On behalf of a subcommittee of the General Committee, appointed a year ago to make a systematic report on the organization and methods of work appropriate to or employed by State and local historical societies—a subcommittee consisting of Dr. Reuben G. Thwaites, of Wisconsin, Professor Shambaugh, of Iowa, and Prof. Franklin L. Riley, of the University of Mississippi—Doctor Thwaites

presented parts of their report, the whole of which is printed in the present volume. The questionnaires which were sent out by the subcommittee asked the societies to report as to their date of organization, the number of their members, the value of their buildings, the amount of their income and of their endowments, and the number of volumes contained in their libraries. It proved difficult to obtain information from some of the societies, especially in the East. Replies had, however, been received from 19 national, 8 sectional, 62 State, and 106 local societies. (It is understood that there are somewhat more than 400 historical societies in the United States.) The inquiries extended to societies privately endowed or sustained by the dues of members, to State historical departments and commissions, to the relations of these to the societies, and to the various forms of organization prevalent in both sorts of institutions.

Doctor Thwaites discussed to some extent the relative merits of the Alabama plan; of the plan followed in Wisconsin, resting on a State society; and of the compromise adopted in Iowa, which combines features of the departmental and of the societary régime. His report also entered into the relations of the societies to the State universities, and the functions of the former with respect to publication and research. In the latter particular he urged better printing and especially better editing. It was mentioned that the State Historical Society of Wisconsin expected to have ready in about a month an index to its manuscript materials, and that this publication would embrace information regarding historical manuscript material to be found elsewhere in the Upper Mississippi Basin.

Dr. U. B. Phillips, of the University of Wisconsin, spoke briefly on documentary collections in the old States of the South. He went over in general terms the material possessed by the Georgia Historical Society and various private holders in Georgia, that possessed by the State of South Carolina at Columbia, and the rich colonial material at Charleston, instancing particularly the remarkable set of newspapers at the Charleston Library, the interesting plantation records of St. John's Berkeley, and the numerous collections of pamphlets within the State. He dealt similarly with the chief repositories in Virginia, and dwelt on some of the encouraging features in the present situation with respect to historical material in the South. He especially urged the paying of proper attention to the collection and preservation of first-hand material for the industrial history of that section.

Mr. Dunbar Rowland, archivist of Mississippi, described the Spanish archives of the Natchez district. These are the records of the Spanish occupation, covering the years 1781-1798. They are bound in forty-one volumes and consist of royal orders and decrees, proclamations, papers emanating from the governor-general at New

Orleans and the local governor and military commander, legal papers, such as court proceedings, depositions, wills, deeds, etc., and a quantity of letters. They were recently rediscovered in the office of the chancery clerk of Adams County, where they had remained for nearly a century, and have been temporarily transferred to the Department of Archives and History at Jackson, where they are being copied.

The discussion which followed these papers was participated in by the chairman of the meeting, by Mr. J. Alston Cabell, of Richmond, Va., speaking on behalf of such organizations as the Virginia Society for the Preservation of Antiquities, and by Dr. J. Franklin Jameson, director of the Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institute of Washington. The latter dwelt especially on the desire of his department to be useful to State and local historical societies and to promote cooperation among them. As one step in this direction, it has undertaken the preparation of lists of documents from European archives relating to American history, which have been printed or of which transcripts exist in the United States. These, especially in the case of the French and Spanish documents, will help to keep societies, especially those of the West, from duplicating each other's work in the printing of material or the procuring of transcripts.

The business meeting of the Association, held on Thursday afternoon, was preceded by the reading of a paper on Avalon and the Colonial Projects of George Calvert, printed herein. The paper was read in the rooms of the Maryland Historical Society, which made it possible to enhance its interest by the exhibition of original documents illustrating the story. The writer, Dr. Bernard C. Steiner, of Johns Hopkins University, related Calvert's early history, described the purchase of Avalon, narrated the subsequent history of the unfortunate experiment, and set forth the relation it bore to Calvert's greater and more fruitful endeavors in the foundation of the province of Maryland.

The fifth session was held on Thursday evening and was devoted to European history. Prof. E. P. Cheyney read a paper on the England of our Earliest American Forefathers, treating of the lacunae in our knowledge of the period and of the opportunities for further investigation. The period of English history that is of most significance to Americans is the period from 1580 to 1660, which covered the adult life of the whole body of early emigrants, the transplanted to America of English institutions. No detailed history of England covers this period, or if any, it is to deal mainly with its contentions. But when the dissatisfied element left England they left these disputes behind them and took with them the practical capacity to govern. It is the regular forms of regular government

that we need to know about, and especially the forms of local government. Again, neither the organization and personnel of the Church of England nor the social history of the time has been dealt with adequately. The existence or non-existence of historical works depends upon the documents available. The history of local political institutions could be studied from material already in print, though much of it is widely scattered. The fine body of national records in the public record office is mostly classified, and full calendars of the state papers to the number of some 300 volumes are in print. Yet three or four volumes for the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries are issued for one volume of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; pressure should be brought to bear upon the authorities of the record office to print the calendars for these later centuries.

Col. W. R. Livermore explained his project of a new historical atlas of Europe, and exhibited a considerable number of his maps. The main peculiarity of this atlas is that, except in the ancient period, it presents a map for every decade.

The third topic treated at this session was Recent Tendencies in the Study of the French Revolution. Prof. J. H. Robinson, of Columbia University, read the paper,<sup>a</sup> which was afterwards discussed by Prof. H. Morse Stephens and Prof. F. M. Fling. Frenchmen, said Professor Robinson, still love or hate the Revolution, and partisanship must still be reckoned with. Although the effort to collect and print documentary material began with the Revolution itself, and has been actively continued, yet even the great mass of material on hand is not enough to enable students to settle the most fundamental questions. Two years ago Jaurès urged that the economic history of the Revolution should be more thoroughly studied, and much material is being collected for that end. The Reign of Terror has been relegated to its proper place and proportions. The picturesque, gruesome, and anecdotal are falling into the background, and the study of development in important lines is coming to the front. Among the really living issues three may be distinguished—the religious or ecclesiastical, the educational, and the economic. What we most need is a history of the Revolution regarded as a reformation, an account of how the reformers realized their ideas. Steps have already been taken in this direction, as by Gomel and Sagnac. We must bring the history of France for fifty years before 1789 into organic relation with its later history.

Prof. H. Morse Stephens said that in times past he had exaggerated enormously the importance of the French Revolution, which closed an old epoch rather than opened a new. Napoleon was the last in the series of the enlightened despots of the eighteenth century. If

---

<sup>a</sup> Printed in full in *The American Historical Review* for April, 1906.



Europe be studied as a whole, as it should be, the French Revolution is seen to be an episode in which some things were done in France that had already been done in other countries by great rulers. There was not a single completed reform of the period of the French Revolution which was not completed in some other country first.

Professor Fling, while believing that much that Professor Stephens had said was true, thought that it was not the whole truth, and that the French Revolution was not a simple imitation. The work of the last fifteen or twenty years marks an era in the study of the French Revolution. Aulard and others realized that the foundation for the study of the French Revolution was not laid. Thorough monographic work must be done, and this is just being begun. The old school did not know what thorough investigation means. Aulard is on the dividing line. Young men of the new school are now doing monographic work like that done in the history of Greece and Rome and the Middle Ages. The revolutionary movement in the provinces is being related to the rest of the movement.

The papers of the last session, held on Friday afternoon at Washington, were read in one of the rooms of the Library of Congress. In a neighboring room Mr. Worthington C. Ford, chief of the Division of Manuscripts, had arranged a most interesting exhibition of historical documents, of great variety and often of the utmost individual significance, selected from the rich stores which are now in his custody and to which he is making such striking and numerous additions.

Before the reading of formal papers Prof. Morse Stephens gave an interesting account of the H. H. Bancroft Library of printed and manuscript material, of its acquisition by the University of California, and of the value which it will have for the State and the university.

Dr. James Schouler's paper on the Authorship of the Monroe Doctrine was a defense of President Monroe personally against recent disparaging statements which ascribe the true authorship and inspiration to John Quincy Adams, Monroe's Secretary of State. The paper is printed in the present volume.

Mr. William R. Thayer, of Cambridge, Mass., read a paper entitled "American Holidays in their Relation to American History." Adverting to the importance which holidays may have as emphasizing events of structural importance, and to the use that may be made of them in stimulating enlightened patriotism, he suggested a more systematic series than is now employed by most States. Liberty, independence, and union ought all alike to be commemorated, not independence alone. April 19, now celebrated in Massachusetts, should be called Liberty Day. May 30 should be the holiday of Union, our feast of patriotism February 22. October 12 should be added as

Columbus Day. Ascribing to the Pilgrims the establishment of religious freedom and tolerance, Mr. Thayer advocated the use of Thanksgiving to commemorate those blessings, while the *entente cordiale* of the English and American nations might be symbolized by making a holiday of February 12, the birthday, in 1809, of both Lincoln and Darwin.

Dr. James K. Hosmer's paper on the Theatre and the Combatants of the Civil War was a summary of the conditions under which the war was waged, and a brief statement of the relative strength, qualitative as well as quantitative, of the two sides. He defined the area of the war, described its relations to the Appalachians, and showed how the unusually diversified character of the territory involved gave opportunity for every possible kind of warfare and taxed the resources of commanders to their utmost. The differences in number of population, degree of homogeneity, and industrial character were next adverted upon; then the relations of slave labor to military resources in the South, and the compensating of its smaller numbers by greater initial military efficiency.

Finally, Mr. William Garrott Brown read a paper on Personal Force in American History. Passing in review the great names of our last hundred and thirty years, he showed how widely in many instances the popular estimate of them differs from that put forward by the closet historian. Though there is a large illogical element in the remembrance which the mass entertains for its great men, so that the one is taken and the other left, he urged that at least one element in greatness is the power to seize upon the affections of living men and to impress their imaginations. The abiding multitude repeats largely the estimates formed by the shifting multitude of the day. While there may be no principle or formula to explain the wide divergence of popular fame from historical repute among the intellectual, yet we may be warranted in suspecting that popular fame should be more fully taken into account, and that from it suggestions may be derived which shall help toward broader estimates of the great and toward more catholic standards of greatness.

No member could have sat through the business meeting of Thursday afternoon without being deeply impressed by the multifold activities of the society, the energy and fidelity with which they are being prosecuted, and the great amount which the Association is accomplishing for the cause of history. The first document read was the report of the Executive Council. It appeared that appropriations of about the usual amount had been made to the work of the various agencies of the Association. The Council also reported that it approved of the continuance of the conference on the work of State and local historical societies and had appointed as its chairman and sec-

retary for the ensuing year Professor Shambaugh and Mr. Severance, respectively.

The treasurer, Dr. Clarence W. Bowen, was unable to be present, this being the first meeting that he has missed since the organization of the Association in 1884. His report showed the usual increase in material prosperity. The receipts for the year were rather more than \$8,000; the expenditures somewhat less than \$7,300. The assets of the society have increased by \$757, and now stand at the handsome figure of \$23,235. The secretary reported the total enrolled membership as 2,394, and that 125 other persons had been duly nominated and elected, but not yet qualified.

Prof. Edward G. Bourne, chairman of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, reported that the expected volume of the Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas, to be edited by Prof. George P. Garrison, would hardly be ready for insertion in the Annual Report for 1905. It may be expected that these papers will appear in the next report—that for 1906. In response to various requests for some sort of code of rules, or suggestions for the printing of manuscript materials for American history, which might help inexperienced editors and aid in producing a greater degree of uniformity, the Commission presented (and has since printed for separate distribution) a body of simple rules of this sort. Professor Bourne feeling unable to continue as chairman of this Commission, a reorganization was effected. The chairmanship passes to Professor Jameson, who held it during the first four years of the Commission's existence. Such work as it has done in the way of collecting information respecting manuscript historical materials in private hands can now be appropriately carried on, indeed is being continuously carried on, by the Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution, especially by Mr. Waldo G. Leland. In respect to documentary publication the Commission's activity will hereafter (after the issue of the Texan volume) be confined to dealing with materials, of national, not local, scope, which are in private hands, are unlikely to be transferred to well-appointed public repositories, and are therefore subjected to the chance of destruction. Thus it takes to itself a definite field, not occupied by other existing agencies of publication.

The Public Archives Commission reported that their report (printed herein) would include accounts of the archives of Michigan and Wisconsin, on the French archives of Illinois, supplementary information on the local records of Georgia, and something on the State archive commissions. The Commission will probably hereafter print an annual bibliographical list of record publications. Investigations of the archives of Arkansas, Florida, Minnesota, Missouri, South Carolina, Tennessee, Washington, and West Virginia are underway. A subcommittee, consisting of Profs. C. M. Andrews and H. L.

Osgood, has been intrusted by the Librarian of Congress with the function of advising with respect to the transcripts from English archives which are being made for the Library of Congress. Some twenty-three volumes have already been copied in whole or in part thus far from the British Museum and the Bodleian Library.

The committee on the Justin Winsor prize reported that no essay submitted for the competition this year was of sufficient excellence to justify the award of the prize. The committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams prize (now first awarded, for an essay in European history) reported that the prize had been awarded to Mr. David S. Muzzey for his essay on the Spiritual Franciscans, with honorable mention of the essay of Miss Eloise Ellery on Jean Pierre Brissot.

The chairman of the Board of Editors of the American Historical Review reported that Prof. H. Morse Stephens, a member of the Board from the foundation of the journal, whose term now expired, declined reelection. His services to the journal were spoken of with appreciation. It was announced that the Council had elected as his successor Prof. George L. Burr, of Cornell University. Professor Adams also reported that the index volume to Volumes I-X would be ready this spring, and that arrangements had been made with the publishers of the Review by which the cost per member to the Association had been reduced from \$2 to \$1.60 per annum.

For the Committee on Bibliography, Prof. E. C. Richardson reported as ready for publication a reissue of Mr. A. P. C. Griffin's Bibliography of American Historical Societies, brought down to date. This work forms the second volume of the present report. The committee has made large progress in the preparation of its list of source publications and the libraries where they are to be found. The General Committee reported an effort to extend membership among libraries, and the preparation of a report on the special lines of research in which individual members are interested. The subcommittee charged with the making of a report on the work of state and local historical societies reported briefly through its chairman. Professor Stephens reported for the Pacific Coast Branch, describing its recent annual meeting, and announcing another to take place next Thanksgiving at Portland. Mr. Jameson, editor of the series of Original Narratives of Early American History, explained in some detail the plan of the reprints and the arrangements already made for the opening volumes.

The Committee of Eight on History in Elementary Schools, Prof. J. A. James, of Northwestern University, chairman, reported briefly on its meetings and work during the past year, its organization into subcommittees, and its plans for continuing the preparation of its report, and for securing discussion of its recommendations by the various associations of teachers of history throughout the country.



The committee on nominations, Profs. G. L. Burr, C. D. Hazen, and J. H. Latané, proposed a list of officers, all of whom were chosen by the Association. Judge Simeon E. Baldwin was elected president, Dr. J. Franklin Jameson first vice-president, and Prof. George B. Adams second vice-president. Mr. A. Howard Clark, Prof. C. H. Haskins, and Dr. Clarence W. Bowen were reelected to their former positions. In the place of Professors Burr and Cheyney, who had been thrice elected to the Executive Council, Profs. Charles M. Andrews and James H. Robinson were chosen. The place of meeting for December, 1906, is Providence.

*Report of Clarence W. Bowen, treasurer of the American Historical Association.*

RECEIPTS.

1904.		
Dec. 21.	Balance cash on hand-----	\$2, 293. 24
1905.		
Dec. 16.	Receipts as follows:	
	2,335 annual dues, at \$3-----	\$7, 005. 00
	One annual dues-----	3. 02
	One annual dues-----	3. 05
	Twelve annual dues, at \$3.10-----	37. 20
	One annual dues-----	3. 25
	Two life memberships-----	100. 00
	Sales of publications-----	72. 10
	Royalty on "The Study of History in Schools"-----	16. 40
	Interest on bond and mortgage-----	800. 00
		8, 040. 02
	Loan from bank-----	750. 00
		11, 083. 26

DISBURSEMENTS.

1905.		
Dec. 16.	Treasurer's clerk hire, etc., vouchers 1, 5, 40, 58, 78, 97, 130, 143-----	\$212. 80
	Secretary's clerk hire, etc., vouchers 25, 48, 63, 69, 83, 90, 120, 131-----	385. 80
	Corresponding secretary's expenses, vouchers 4, 15, 28, 52, 80, 105, 117, 118, 122, 128, 129-----	89. 24
	Expenses Pacific Coast Branch, voucher 16-----	51. 54
	Postage and stationery, treasurer and secretary, vouchers 2, 12, 13, 19, 20, 30, 36, 46, 47, 73, 89, 94, 100, 106, 121, 127-----	226. 52
	American Historical Review, vouchers 11, 22, 31, 43, 56, 60, 62, 65, 70, 77, 79, 81, 82, 86, 88, 92, 98, 99, 103, 123, 136, 139-----	4, 689. 00
	Public Archives Commission, vouchers 8, 9, 10, 33, 39, 44, 68, 71, 72, 115, 116-----	200. 55
	Historical Manuscripts Commission, vouchers 6, 7, 17, 26, 27, 38, 50, 51, 132, 133-----	254. 80
	Justin Winsor prize committee, vouchers 14, 41-----	125. 71
	Herbert B. Adams prize committee, voucher 42-----	12. 75
	General Committee, vouchers 53, 54, 101, 102-----	68. 35
	Subcommittee of the General Committee in preparing a report upon the work of State and local historical societies, vouchers 35, 55, 67, 74, 75, 76-----	103. 55
	Committee of eight upon the study of history in elementary schools, vouchers 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114-----	250. 80
	Account annual report 1903, vouchers 24, 37, 49, 119-----	45. 90
	Account annual report 1904, vouchers 3, 66, 95, 96, 104-----	115. 10
	Printing 1905 catalogue, vouchers 29, 59, 61, 64-----	209. 92
	Expenses twentieth annual meeting, voucher 32-----	40. 39
	Expenses twenty-first annual meeting, vouchers 124, 125, 135-----	30. 00
	Expenses Executive Council, vouchers 131, 134, 137, 138, 140, 141-----	110. 87
	Engraving certificates, vouchers 57, 84-----	1. 50
	Bank collection charges, vouchers 21, 45, 85, 93, 126, 142-----	8. 10
	Interest, voucher 87-----	6. 25
	Printing publications, voucher 34-----	16. 80
	Auditing treasurer's account 1904, voucher 18-----	15. 00
		7, 271. 24
	Loan repaid to bank, voucher 91-----	750. 00
	Balance cash on hand in National Park Bank-----	3, 062. 02
		11, 083. 26

Net receipts 1905 -----	\$8, 040. 02
Net disbursements 1905 -----	7, 271. 24
Excess of receipts over disbursements -----	<u>768. 78</u>

The assets of the Association are:

Bond and mortgage on real estate at No. 24 East Ninety-fifth street, New York -----	\$20, 000. 00
Accrued interest from September 29, 1905, to date -----	173. 33
Cash on hand in National Park Bank -----	3, 062. 02
	<u>\$23, 235. 35</u>
An increase during the year of -----	757. 66

Respectfully submitted.

CLARENCE W. BOWEN, *Treasurer.*

NEW YORK, December 16, 1905.

CLARENCE W. BOWEN, Esq.,  
*Treasurer American Historical Association,  
130 Fulton street, New York City.*

DEAR SIR: Agreeably to your request, we have examined the cash records of the American Historical Association for the year ending December 16, 1905.

The results of this examination are presented, attached hereto, in the exhibit termed "Statement of cash receipts and disbursements for the year ended December 16, 1905."

We found that all receipts shown by the books had been accounted for, vouched the disbursements for the period, and reconciled the resulting balance as of December 16, 1905, which was in the form of a check, certified by the National Park Bank.

We found also that the mortgage for \$20,000 on real estate situated at 24 East Ninety-fifth street, New York City, and the papers relating thereto, were in the possession of the Society, and in order.

We suggest that the officials of the Association, disbursing its funds, attach to the vouchers the receipts from payees.

Very truly yours,

THE AUDIT COMPANY OF NEW YORK.

*General Manager.*

BALTIMORE, December 28, 1905.

*To the American Historical Association:*

The committee to which was referred the report of the treasurer, and papers accompanying the same, respectfully reports that it has examined the papers referred to it, and finds that the accounts of the treasurer for the past year have been duly audited by the Audit Company of New York, a certified public accountant, and that the same are reported by that corporation as being correct, and that the balance of cash in hand as shown by the treasurer's report is evidenced by a check duly certified by the National Park Bank of New York.

MENDES COHEN,  
HENRY STOCKBRIDGE,  
*Committee.*

#### PRESENT ACTIVITIES OF THE ASSOCIATION.

The following list enumerates the present leading activities of the American Historical Association:

(1) The annual meeting of the Association held during the Christmas holidays in the East or the West or the District of Columbia in triennial succession.

(2) The annual report of the secretary of the Association concerning the annual meeting and its proceedings, with the papers, bibliographies, and other historical materials submitted through the secretary of the Smithsonian Institution for publication by Congress.

(3) The preservation of historical exchanges, books, pamphlets, reports, and papers of the Association in the National Museum, at Washington, D. C., in the keeping of Mr. A. Howard Clark, secretary of the Association and curator of its historical collections.

(4) The Historical Manuscripts Commission of six members, established in 1895, and now receiving from the Association a subsidy of \$500 a year for the collection and editing of important manuscripts; Dr. J. Franklin Jameson, of the Carnegie Institution, chairman.

(5) The Public Archives Commission, established in 1899, for investigating the public archives of the several States and of the United States, and now receiving a subsidy of \$500 a year for the expenses incident to preparing its reports; Prof. Herman V. Ames, of the University of Pennsylvania, chairman.

(6) The Committee on Publications, to pass upon papers and monographs submitted to the Association for publication; Prof. Earle W. Dow, of the University of Michigan, chairman.

(7) The Committee on Bibliography, to advise the executive council and to cooperate with the American Library Association upon matters of bibliographical interest; Dr. Ernest C. Richardson, of Princeton University, chairman.

(8) The General Committee, representing the local interests of the Association and its relations with State and local historical societies; Prof. Henry E. Bourne, of Western Reserve University, chairman.

(9) The "Justin Winsor prize" of \$100 for the best unpublished monographic work based upon original investigation in American history; Prof. Charles H. Hull, of Cornell University, chairman of the committee.

(10) The American Historical Review, published quarterly, and subsidized by the American Historical Association, whose executive council elects the board of editors; Dr. J. F. Jameson, of the Carnegie Institution, managing editor.

(11) A series of reprints of the chief original narratives of early American history, published by authority of the Association; Dr. J. Franklin Jameson, of the Carnegie Institution, general editor.

(12) The "Herbert Baxter Adams prize" of \$200, awarded biennially for the best unpublished monograph based upon original investigation in European history; Prof. Charles Gross, of Harvard University, chairman of the committee.

(13) The Committee of Eight on history in elementary schools; Prof. J. A. James, of Northwestern University, chairman.

MINUTES OF THE BUSINESS MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION, HELD IN THE BUILDING OF THE MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY, BALTIMORE, AT 4.30 P. M., DECEMBER 28, 1905.

President McMaster in the chair.

On behalf of the Council the corresponding secretary reported that the Council had held a meeting in New York, December 1, 1905, and two meetings in Baltimore, December 27 and 28, 1905, and that at these meetings reports had been received and considered from the various committees and commissions of the Association, and the usual appropriations made for the continuation of their work during the coming year. The Council also reported that it approved of the continuance of the conference on the work of State and local historical societies, and had appointed as chairman of the conference for the coming year Prof. B. F. Shambaugh, of the State Historical Society of Iowa, and as secretary Mr. Frank H. Severance, of the Buffalo Historical Society.

The report of the treasurer and auditing committee was received and accepted.

The secretary reported that the total enrolled membership of the Association was 2,394, and that 125 persons had been duly nominated and elected, but had not yet qualified by payment of the annual fee.

On behalf of the Pacific Coast Branch Prof. H. Morse Stephens made a brief report regarding the work of the past year.

Brief reports were received from the Historical Manuscripts Commission and from the Public Archives Commission, and likewise from Prof. Charles M. Andrews, chairman of the subcommittee of the Public Archives Commission charged with securing copies of documents in England for the Library of Congress.

The Committee on the Justin-Winsor prize reported that the two essays submitted for the competition this year were not of sufficient excellence to justify the award of the prize. The Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams prize reported that the prize had been conferred upon Mr. David Savile Muzzey for his essay on "The Spiritual Franciscans," with honorable mention of the essay of Miss Eloise Ellery on "Jean Pierre Brissot."

Prof. George B. Adams reported on behalf of the Board of Editors of the American Historical Review that arrangements had been made with the publishers of the Review by which the cost per member to the Association had been reduced from \$2 to \$1.60, on condition that the Association hold itself responsible for 2,300 subscriptions.

Brief reports were received from the Committee on Bibliography, the Committee on Publications, and the General Committee. The subcommittee of the General Committee charged with preparing a report upon the work of State and local historical societies reported briefly through its chairman, Mr. R. G. Thwaites.

The editor of the Original Narratives of Early American History explained in some detail the plan of the reprints and the arrangements already made for the earlier numbers.



The Committee of Eight on History in Elementary Schools presented a brief report of the committee's meetings and work throughout the past year, and its plans for continuing the preparation of the report and for securing discussion of its recommendations by the various teachers' associations throughout the country.

The committee on nominations, consisting of Messrs. George L. Burr, Charles D. Hazen, and James H. Latané, proposed the following list of officers for the ensuing year, for which the secretary was instructed to cast the ballot of the Association: President, Simeon E. Baldwin, LL. D., New Haven, Conn.; first vice-president, J. Franklin Jameson, LL. D., Washington, D. C.; second vice-president, George B. Adams, Lit. D., New Haven, Conn.; secretary, A. Howard Clark, Washington, D. C.; corresponding secretary, Charles H. Haskins, Ph. D., Cambridge, Mass.; treasurer, Clarence W. Bowen, Ph. D., New York City.

Executive Council (in addition to the above-named officers and the ex-presidents of the Association): Edward G. Bourne, Ph. D., New Haven, Conn.; Andrew C. McLaughlin, A. M., Ann Arbor, Mich.; George P. Garrison, Ph. D., Austin, Tex.; Reuben G. Thwaites, LL. D., Madison, Wis.; Charles M. Andrews, Ph. D., Bryn Mawr, Pa.; James Harvey Robinson, Ph. D., New York City.

The following resolutions, proposed by a committee consisting of Messrs. Frederick W. Moore and Norman M. Trenholme and Miss Emma G. Sebring, were unanimously adopted by the Association:

*"Be it resolved*, That the American Historical Association tenders its hearty thanks to the many individuals and organizations who have contributed their efforts to making this meeting so successful and who have extended to the members of the Association so many social courtesies; in particular to President Remsen and the faculty of Johns Hopkins University for their hospitality and generous entertainment; to the General Committee on Arrangements, Mr. Theodore Marburg, chairman of the Baltimore section, and Prof. J. F. Jameson, chairman of the Washington section; to the Honorary Committee of Ladies, Mrs. A. L. Sioussat, chairman, who have rendered such efficient service; to Mrs. Charles J. Bonaparte, Mr. Theodore Marburg, Right Rev. William Paret and Mrs. Paret, the Maryland Society of the Colonial Dames of America, and Mrs. William L. Ellicott for social courtesies extended to members of the Association; to the Maryland Historical Society, the University and the Arundell clubs of Baltimore; to Governor Edwin Warfield, of Maryland, Admiral J. H. Sands, of the United States Naval Academy, at Annapolis; to the Cosmos Club, of Washington, the officers of the Library of Congress, and the Washington members of the Association for the cordial manner in which they have extended their welcome and entertainment."

On behalf of the Council the corresponding secretary announced the appointment of the following committees:

#### ANNUAL COMMITTEES.

*Committee on Programme for the Twenty-second Annual Meeting* (Providence, 1906).—Charles H. Haskins, William E. Dodd, Max Farrand, William MacDonald, Williston Walker, and George P. Winship.

*Joint Local Committee of Arrangements for the American Economic Association, the American Political Science Association, and the American Historical Association.*—William B. Weeden, Henry B. Gardner, William MacDonald, George G. Wilson, with power to add members at the discretion of the chairman.

*Committee on the Entertainment of Ladies*, Miss Ida M. Tarbell.

STANDING COMMITTEES, COMMISSIONS, AND BOARDS.

*Editors of the "American Historical Review."*—George B. Adams, J. Franklin Jameson, William M. Sloane, Albert Bushnell Hart, Andrew C. McLaughlin (these five hold over), George L. Burr (elected for term ending January 1, 1912).

*Historical Manuscripts Commission.*—J. Franklin Jameson, Edward G. Bourne, Frederick W. Moore, Reuben G. Thwaites, Worthington C. Ford, Thomas M. Owen.

*Committee on the Justin Winsor Prize.*—Charles H. Hull, E. P. Cheyney, Roger Foster, Williston Walker, Evarts B. Greene.

*Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize.*—Charles Gross, George L. Burr, Victor Coffin, John Martin Vincent, James W. Thompson.

*Public Archives Commission.*—Herman V. Ames, William MacDonald, Herbert L. Osgood, Charles M. Andrews, E. E. Sparks, Dunbar Rowland, Robert T. Swan.

*Committee on Bibliography.*—Ernest C. Richardson, A. P. C. Griffin, William C. Lane, J. N. Larned, W. H. Siebert, Frederick J. Turner.

*Committee on Publications.*—Earle W. Dow, Charles H. Haskins, A. Howard Clark, F. M. Fling, S. M. Jackson, Miss Elizabeth Kendall, A. D. Morse, Charles D. Hazen.

*General Committee.*—Henry E. Bourne, Charles H. Haskins, Miss Lucy M. Salmon, Miss Lillian W. Johnson, John S. Bassett, William MacDonald, F. H. Hodder, F. L. Riley, B. F. Shambaugh, R. G. Thwaites, F. G. Young, with power to add adjunct members.

*Committee of Eight on History in Elementary Schools.*—J. A. James, Henry E. Bourne, E. C. Brooks, Wilbur F. Gordy, Miss Mabel Hill, Julius Sachs, Henry W. Thurston, J. H. Van Sickle.

*Finance Committee.*—J. H. Eckels, Peter White.

The meeting adjourned at 5.30.

CHARLES H. HASKINS,  
*Corresponding Secretary.*

REPORT OF PROF. J. FRANKLIN JAMESON, GENERAL EDITOR OF THE  
"ORIGINAL NARRATIVES OF EARLY AMERICAN HISTORY."

Neither in his former office nor in that which he now holds has it been possible for the General Editor to give more than a small fraction of his time to the preparation of this series. He has with much chagrin to acknowledge that he has made little progress in comparison with the amount of time which has elapsed since his first appointment. He hopes, however, to do somewhat better in the future, and can at least report that according to present indications the first two volumes may be expected to appear during the spring of 1906.

The editor hopes that the members of the Association will not only bear in mind that his main occupations necessarily take nearly all his time, but will understand that the task of preparing the series is not as simple as it may at first appear. This is especially true of the selection of the material. The problem is to embrace in 20 volumes, each containing about 120,000 words of text, the best of the original narrative sources for the history of the United States in the earlier period. It is easy to sketch such a series; easy to name a good number of narratives which should certainly be included. But when one comes to the completing of the list, much balancing of the claims of this and that narrative is necessary, and therefore much reading and thought, for the editor hopes that the series will have a standing not usually accorded to series of reprints, and that it will be of large educational use during a considerable period of future years. Therefore the relative merits of various narratives as sources, their importance, their correctness, their interest, their clearness, their usefulness to young students and the general reader must all be considered with care. It was concluded that the period should be limited to that previous to 1700. But within that field the endeavor must be made to give a due representation to various aspects of American history and to the history of the various parts of the country, not merely because readers in all sections ought to be interested in the use of the series, but because it ought by its very composition to teach lessons of catholicity and proportion. Narratives written in other languages than English should be included as freely as English pieces, if their merits demand it. In the case of translations the adequacy of those existing must be tested, and fresh ones must be made if the present versions are insufficient or if none have been made before. Narratives hitherto unprinted should be included, if their right to a place can be demonstrated. Occasionally it is necessary to regard questions of copyright, though it is hoped that it will seldom or never be necessary on such grounds to print a worse rather than a better text. When all other things are equal, the rarity of one piece will give it a claim to inclusion in preference to another. But other things are seldom equal, and in general it has seemed best to pay no regard, in the case of really important texts, to the question whether they have been recently reprinted. The reason for this judgment is that this series is intended to be a general and comprehensive collection, having permanent value because framed on a rational

system rather than with regard to the accidents of the book trade, and that it would not have been adopted by the American Historical Association if this had not been the design. While in general adhering to a strict definition of the word "narratives," the series will in a few cases admit documents not mainly narrative, but which seem almost necessary toward a proper understanding of the adjoining stories.

Without feeling at all sure that in practice he has succeeded in working out these principles, the General Editor submits to the criticism of his fellow-members of the Association the following list of narratives, extending as far as the scheme has yet been worked out:

Volume I. Narratives of the Northmen and of Columbus:

- A. 1. The Saga in Hauksbok.
- 2. The Saga in Flateyrbok.
- 3. The Passage from Adam of Bremen.
- 4. Extracts from the *Annales Regii* and *Annals of Skalholt*.
- 5. The Letter of Nicholas V.
- 6. The Letter of Alexander VI.
- B. 1. The Capitulation of April 17, 1492.
- 2. The Titulo of April 30, 1492.
- 3. The Journal of the First Voyage of Columbus.
- 4. The Letter to Santangel.
- 5. The Letter of the Sovereigns, March 30, 1493.
- 6. The Letter of Columbus to them, summer 1493.
- 7. The Letter of Dr. Chance.
- 8. The Journal of the Third Voyage, as in *Las Casas*.
- 9. The Letter to the Nurse.
- 10. The Letter to Ferdinand and Isabella, Respecting the Fourth Voyage.
- C. 1. The Cabot Letter of Pasqualigo, August 23, 1497.
- 2. The First Letter of Soncino, August 24, 1497.
- 3. The Second Letter of Soncino, December, 1497.
- 4.

Volume II. The Spanish Explorers in the United States:

- 1. The Relation of Cabeza de Vaca.
- 2. The Relation of the Gentleman of Elvas.
- 3. The Relation of Castañeda.

Volume III. Narratives of Early English Voyages, chiefly out of Hakluyt:

- 1. The Three Voyages of Jacques Cartier.
- 2. The Voyage of Master Hore.
- 3. A Part of the Second Voyage of Master John Hawkins.
- 4. The Third Voyage of Master John Hawkins.
- 5. A Part of "The World Encompassed by Sir Francis Drake."
- 6. Hales, A Report of the Voyage of Sir Humphrey Gilbert.
- 7. Barlow, The First Voyage.
- 8. Lane, Account of the Particularities, etc.
- 9. The Third Voyage at the Charges of Sir Walter Raleigh.
- 10. The Fourth Voyage Made to Virginia.
- 11. The Fifth Voyage of Master John White.
- 12. Brereton, Brief and True Relation.
- 13. Pring, Relation.
- 14. Rosier, True Relation.
- 15. Relation of a Voyage to Sagadahoc.

Volume IV. Champlain's Voyages, 1613, 1619.



## Volume V. Narratives of Early Virginia :

1. Percy, Observations.
2. Smith, True Relation.
3. Smith, Map and Proceedings, 1612.
4. De la Warr, Relation.
5. Letter of Diego de Molina, 1613.
6. Letter of Father Biard to Acquaviva, 1614.
7. Letter of John Rolfe, 1614.
8. Proceedings of the Virginia Assembly, 1619.
9. Letter of John Pory, 1619.
10. Smith, General History, Book IV.
11. The Answer of Divers Planters and Mariners, 1623.
12. The Tragick Relation of the Virginia Assembly, 1624.
13. The Discourse of the Old Company, 1625.

## Volume VI. Bradford's History of Plymouth Plantation.

## Volume VII. Narratives of New Netherland.

## Volumes VIII, IX. Winthrop's Journal.

## Volume X. The Wonder-Working Providence of Sion's Saviour in New England.

## Volume XI. Narratives of Early Maryland, etc.

The editing of the individual volumes is intended to consist of the preparation of brief introductions explaining the writer's position and opportunities for observation, the genesis of his work, and the degree of authority to which it is entitled; and also of such annotation as may be necessary to explain or correct the text. In the choice of editors the aim has been to secure in each case the most competent specialist. Thus, in the first volume the Norse material is edited by Prof. Julius E. Olson, professor of the Scandinavian languages and literatures in the University of Wisconsin; the material respecting Columbus and Cabot by Prof. Edward G. Bourne. In the second volume the narratives of Cabeza de Vaca and Coronado are edited by Mr. F. W. Hodge, of the Bureau of American Ethnology; that of the Gentleman of Elvas by Mr. Theodore H. Lewis, of St. Paul. The Hakluyt volume will be edited by the Rev. Dr. Henry S. Burrage, of Maine. The publishers are Messrs. Charles Scribner's Sons. It is hoped that two or three volumes may come out each spring and two or three each autumn. Each will contain at least one map, either one devised to exhibit the state of things at the time to which the book refers or a reproduction of some contemporary map. In some cases facsimilies of title-pages will be introduced. There will be an additional volume of general index. Suggestions of improvement of plan and method from members interested will be cordially welcomed.

## REPORT OF PROF. E. G. BOURNE, CHAIRMAN OF THE HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS COMMISSION.

It was hoped that the Commission could present for publication in the report for 1905 the Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas, but it has not proved practicable for Professor Garrison, to whom the work of editing this material was intrusted, to complete the task in time to secure publication with the present report.

The quantity of these papers proves to be unexpectedly large, and may perhaps amount to more than it is customary for the Association to print on behalf of the Historical Manuscripts Commission. Efforts will be made to reduce by the omission of whatever is insignificant historically; but the mass as a whole is reported to be of great historical interest and importance. It is to be expected that this material will be presented in connection with the report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission in December, 1906.

About two years ago the Council requested the Commission to prepare a brief list of suggestions or directions recommended to be followed in the publication of manuscript materials for historical purposes, in order to provide helpful guidance for editors in settling the perplexing questions that arise.

It was felt that a careful consideration of this subject by the Commission in consultation with experienced editors would enable them to prepare a brief set of recommendations which would be of much assistance to future editors in informing them as to the best methods of procedure. It was also thought that such a list of suggestions might lead to the establishment of an accepted usage in such work, conformable to a high standard of accuracy.

The Commission, after some general discussion, placed the matter in the hands of a subcommittee, of which Mr. Ford was the efficient chairman. With this subcommittee Professor Jameson was invited to act, and the list of "Suggestions for the Printing of Manuscripts," which is appended to this report, was prepared by this subcommittee and approved by the Commission at its annual meeting in Baltimore in December, 1905, and is hereby recommended for consideration to those who have charge of the publication of historical manuscripts.

### SUGGESTIONS FOR THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS RELATING TO AMERICAN HISTORY.

1. *The heading of individual documents.*—If the document is a letter, the name of the sender and that of the person addressed should be printed in small capitals immediately above its beginning, thus:

GEORGE WASHINGTON TO JOHN ADAMS.

If it is an official letter, addressed to an official as such, the form should be:

GEORGE WASHINGTON TO THE SECRETARY OF WAR

[Timothy Pickering], or

ANDREW JACKSON TO THE GOVERNOR OF VIRGINIA

[William Branch Giles].

If the publication consists of a series of letters written by, or to, one man, a heading of the form TO JOHN ADAMS, or FROM JOHN ADAMS will suffice. If it is not a letter, a very brief description should be placed in the heading, *e. g.*,  
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS,

2. *The description of the manuscript.*—This should be given in the first footnote to the document. The reference mark to this footnote should be placed either against the heading described in the last paragraph or against the date, if the document bears a date as its first words. The description should present, first, a statement whether the document is entirely by the author's hand written by a secretary and signed, etc. For this purpose the usual symbols could be used, namely, A. L. S. (autograph letter signed), A. D. S. (autograph document signed), L. S. (letter signed), D. S. (document signed), A. N. S. (autograph note signed), A. N. (autograph note). Next should follow a statement as to the location of the manuscript, indicating the public institution or private collector in whose possession it is. In the former case the volume, page, or numerical designation by which the institution has catalogued the manuscript should be given. If the main substance of the publication consists of documents of one particular collection, repetition can be avoided in the case of documents drawn from that source by initials placed at the right of the heading: *e. g.*, if the letters of Jackson were being printed and most of them were derived from the collection of Jackson manuscripts in the Library of Congress, the heading could read, in the case of such letters,

TO JOHN SMITH

J. MSS.

Thirdly, if the document whose text is being printed is not an original letter actually sent, but a draft or a copy, the fact should be stated in the first footnote. Where the writer, though he is not the author, is a known person, his name also should be given there. In a typical instance accordingly, the first footnote to the document might have the form, "A. L. S. Historical Society of Pennsylvania, James Wilson MSS., Vol. I, no. 26. Draft, in handwriting of John Rutledge."

3. *The date.*—If the letter or document begins with a date, this should be presented in the form which it bears in the manuscript. But if the date lies between the years 1582 and 1752 it should be repeated in a double form, presenting it in both old style and new style, thus:

"Feb. the 11th, 1731. [February 1 $\frac{1}{2}$  173 $\frac{1}{2}$ ]."

Where it is certain that all the documents which are to be printed in the proposed volume are dated uniformly in new (or in old) style, it may be sufficient to set forth the fact once for all in the preface. If the matter presented does not consist of letters, and presents no dates, or infrequent dates—for instance, in long narratives which are being reprinted—it is often desirable that the date of the transactions referred to upon a given page should be set in the running headlines of that page. If a document is undated, and the date is conjecturally supplied, it should be set in square brackets, with a question mark if there is any doubt. In such cases it is well to scrutinize the watermark of the paper and state the date which it gives, if any.

4. *The text.*—Save for certain exceptions, to be noted hereafter, the manuscripts should be printed as written, with exactness in respect to words, spelling, and punctuation (*verbatim et literatim et punctuatim*). The actual copyist should be given no latitude in the following of this rule. He should be instructed to trace all doubtful writings, especially doubtful proper names. All drawings and sketches in the text should be reproduced by tracing. Unless the editor is conscious of having had long experience and of having published books of documents which have been approved by experts it is perhaps best that he also should make no exception to the rule stated in the first sentence of this paragraph. But as the end to be achieved is the printing of the manuscript in

the form which it would have borne if the author had contemporaneously put it into print, the following exceptions may well be observed:

a. Words which have been repeated, obviously by mistake of the penman, may be omitted.

b. Words which have been omitted, obviously by mistake of the penman, may be supplied in square brackets.

c. In the use of *u* and *v*, respectively, and of *i* and *j*, the modern practice may be substituted for that of the manuscript. Long *s* should never be used.

d. Abbreviations should be expanded, square brackets being used to indicate the letters inserted. With the same precaution, superior letters may be reduced to the level of the rest of the text. If such changes are extremely numerous and are uniform throughout the text, the cases in which they are open to no doubt may be mentioned beforehand in the preface, and the square brackets subsequently avoided in such instances.

e. The sign & should always be represented by *and*; the form &c., by *etc.*; the sign *y*<sup>e</sup> usually by *the*; and so, of *y*<sup>t</sup>, *y*<sup>m</sup>, etc.

f. Obvious slips of the pen, aside from those mentioned in "a" above, may be corrected in the text, the original reading being stated in the footnote. But the spelling of the original when not clearly accidental should be followed, and especial care should be exercised on proper names, as what appears to be a misspelling may be of value in indicating the pronunciation of that day.

g. Passages written in cipher should be transliterated but printed in italics, the preface or footnote indicating that this has been done.

h. Where a gap or illegible passage in the manuscript has been supplied by a reading concerning which there is no doubt, the words or letters supplied should be placed in square brackets. Where the reading is uncertain, the symbol [?] should be added. Where it is surprising but undoubtedly has the form given, the editor may add [*sic*].

i. No attempt should ordinarily be made to reproduce in the printed text any word which the writer has erased. Where the erased word has another substituted for it and offers some indication of the mental process of the writer, it may be given in a note. In a report, or a draft of a document, where the erased parts are important they should be given in a note, or "lined type" should be employed. If the substituted or interlined words are in a different handwriting from the rest of the document, the fact should be mentioned in a footnote.

j. While punctuation should usually follow the writer, yet when his punctuation makes confused readings and there is no chance whatever that a rational or modern punctuation would change his meaning, the latter may be substituted. If the writer habitually ends his sentences with a dash, this should be represented in print by a period.

5. *Capitalization*.—In general, capitals should be printed where the writer has written capitals. If there is doubt, the editor may be governed by the assumption that the writer either intended to follow the modern rules in the matter or to follow the old rule to begin every noun with a capital. A capital should always be used at the beginning of a sentence unless there is special need to exhibit the illiteracy of the writer.

6. *Paragraphs*.—The writer's practice should be followed, except that in printing diaries or journals it is best to follow uniformly the habit of making for each date a fresh paragraph, and printing the date itself in italics.

7. *The formal conclusions and subscriptions of letters*.—These should be reproduced as they stand, but it is usually unnecessary to give them when one is printing a large collection of letters written by the same man. Yet even in



this case there may be instances where the mode in which he ends a letter is significant.

8. *The addresses of letters.*—These should usually be printed. They may be of importance as indicating the location of the person to whom the letter is sent. This is a matter of some importance in a military campaign. Occasionally, also, the form of the address is important (*e. g.*, the famous instance of "George Washington, Esq., etc., etc.") The address may be given at the end of the first footnote to the letter.

9. *Endorsements.*—If there are endorsements upon the letter or document which have any historical significance, such as dates, summaries, or comments, they should be given in a footnote attached to the end of the letter or document.

10. *Order.*—It is usually best that the letters or documents should be printed in a chronological order. A footnote may give a cross reference to enclosures, if they bear a different date.

11. A *list* of the letters or documents should be given in the front pages of the volume. When other documents of the same nature or relating to the same series of transactions have been printed before and are not repeated in the volume in question, it is desirable to prefix to the volume a calendar in which both the documents printed before and those now printed are embraced in one chronological series, with a difference of typography indicating the former and the latter class. In such chronological lists each item should begin with a date, presented in the form: 1789, March 4.

12. *The running headlines* of the pages, or at any rate of the right-hand page, should not preserve one identical reading throughout the volume, but should in each case give some indication of the matter contained on the page below.

13. A page of the manuscript may with advantage be reproduced by some facsimile process to illustrate characteristic methods of the writer.

14. There should always be an *index*.

15. *Octavo* is recommended as the best size for record publications.

PROGRAMME OF EXERCISES AT THE TWENTY-FIRST ANNUAL MEETING  
OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION, HELD IN BALTIMORE,  
AND WASHINGTON, DECEMBER 26, 27, 28, AND 29, 1905.

Persons not members of the Association will be cordially welcomed to the sessions.

Papers in the regular sessions are limited to twenty minutes; in the conferences ten minutes, unless otherwise ordered. Those who read papers or take part in the conferences are requested to furnish the secretary with abstracts of their papers.

FIRST SESSION, TUESDAY, DECEMBER 26, 8 P. M., MCCOY HALL.

[Joint meeting with the American Political Science Association.]

Address of welcome. President Ira Remsen, of the Johns Hopkins University.

Presidential address: "Growth of executive discretion." Prof. Frank J. Goodnow, president of the American Political Science Association.

Presidential address: "Old standards of public morals." Prof. John B. McMaster, president of the American Historical Association.

10 p. m., informal reunion, McCoy Hall.

SECOND SESSION, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 27, 10 A. M., MCCOY HALL.

1. Virginia and the English colonial system, 1730-1735. St. George L. Stous-sat, professor in the University of the South.

2. Why North Carolina at first refused to ratify the Federal Constitution. Charles Lee Raper, professor in the University of North Carolina.

3. Chief Justice Marshall and the Virginia Supreme Court. William E. Dodd, professor in Randolph-Macon College.

4. The Freedmen's Savings Bank. Walter L. Fleming, professor in West Virginia University.

5. A French diplomat and the treaty with Spain, 1819. Ralph C. H. Caterall, professor in Cornell University.

6. The second birth of the Republican Party. William A. Dunning, professor in Columbia University.

1 p. m., luncheon, McCoy Hall.

THIRD SESSION, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 27, 3 P. M.

CONFERENCES AND COMMITTEES.

I. On history in elementary schools, McCoy Hall. Chairman, James A. James, professor in Northwestern University. Discussion by Henry E. Bourne, professor in Western Reserve University; Miss Mabel Hill, Normal School, Lowell, Mass.; Henry Johnson, State Normal School, Charleston, Ill.; William H. Tolson, public schools, Baltimore, Md.

II. On church history, Y. M. C. A., Levering Hall. Chairman, Williston Walker, professor in Yale Divinity School.

- a. Rise of the modern conception of Divine immanence. By A. C. McGiffert, professor in Union Theological Seminary.
- b. A source book in church history. By J. Cullen Ayer, jr., professor in the Divinity School, Philadelphia.
- c. The publication of materials for American Church history. By E. C. Richardson, librarian of Princeton University.
- d. Discussion.

III. Meeting of the executive council, committees, boards, etc.

Wednesday, 4.30 to 5.30 p. m., Mrs. Charles J. Bonaparte, 601 Park avenue, will receive the ladies of the associations.

Wednesday, 8 p. m., address of the president of the American Economic Association.

Wednesday, 9 p. m., reception to the gentlemen of the associations by Mr. Theodore Marburg, 14 Mount Vernon place West.

Reception to the ladies of the associations at the house of the Maryland Society of the Colonial Dames of America, 417 North Charles street, near Franklin.

FOURTH SESSION, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 28, 10 A. M.

#### CONFERENCES.

I. On history in the college curriculum, McCoy Hall. Chairman, Charles H. Haskins, professor in Harvard University.

Topic: The first year of college work in history. Dana C. Munro, professor in the University of Wisconsin; Miss Lucy Salmon, professor in Vassar College; Oliver H. Richardson, professor in Yale University; Frank M. Anderson, professor in the University of Minnesota; Hiram Bingham, preceptor in Princeton University; T. C. Smith, Williams College.

II. On the problems of State and local historical societies, Physical Laboratory. Chairman, Thomas M. Owen, director of the Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, Ala.

##### (1) Cooperation:

- a. Relation of the college chair, or department of American history, to the work of historical societies, by William O. Scroggs, Cambridge, Mass.
- b. The Pennsylvania Federation of Historical Societies, as illustrating a new phase of cooperative activity, by S. P. Heilman, secretary, Heilman Dale, Pa.

##### (2) Publication:

- a. Publishing activities of the historical societies of the Old Northwest, by Reuben G. Thwaites, secretary State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison.
- b. Documentary collections and publications in the old States of the South, by Ulrich B. Phillips, instructor in the University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- c. General discussion of the publication problems of historical societies, by Benjamin F. Shambaugh, State Historical Society of Iowa, Iowa City.

##### (3) Miscellaneous:

- a. Spanish archives of the Natchez district, as illustrative of the importance of preserving local records, by Dunbar Rowland, esq., director of the Department of Archives and History, Jackson, Miss.
- b. New historical movements in Canada, by George Bryce, professor in Manitoba College.

1 p. m., luncheon tendered to the associations by the Right Rev. William Paret and Mrs. Paret at the Episcopal residence, 1110 Madison avenue, near Hoffman.

Visitors will have an opportunity to examine the incunabula and other treasures of the library of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of Maryland.

Thursday, 3.30 p. m., annual meeting of the Association, Maryland Historical Society, East Saratoga street, near Charles.

Prolegomena: Avalon and the colonial projects of George Calvert. Bernard C. Steiner, of the Maryland Historical Society.

1. Report of the Council.
2. Report of the Treasurer and Auditing Committee.
3. Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission.
4. Report of the Public Archives Commission.
5. Report of the Committee on the Justin Winsor Prize.
6. Report of the Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize.
7. Report of the Board of Editors of the American Historical Review.
8. Report of the Committee on Bibliography.
9. Report of the Committee on Publications.
10. Report of the General Committee.
11. Report of the Editor of the Original Narratives of Early American History.
12. Report of the Committee on History in Elementary Schools.
13. Election of Officers.

FIFTH SESSION—THURSDAY, 8 P. M., MCCOY HALL.

1. The England of our earliest American forefathers. Edward P. Cheyney, professor in the University of Pennsylvania.

2. Plans of a new atlas of Europe. William R. Livermore, colonel in the United States Army.

3. Recent tendencies in the study of the French Revolution. James Harvey Robinson, professor in Columbia University.

Discussion by H. Morse Stephens, professor in the University of California; Fred M. Fling, professor in the University of Nebraska, followed by general discussion.

10 p. m., smoker at the Hotel Belyidere.

Reception to ladies by Mrs. William M. Ellicott at the Arundell Club, 1000 North Charles street.

Friday morning, a special train to Annapolis and Washington. Leave Camden Station at 9.05 a. m.; leave Annapolis for Washington 11.30 a. m.

1 p. m., luncheon in the restaurant of the Library of Congress, tendered by the Washington members of the Association.

SIXTH SESSION—MEETING TO BE HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., FRIDAY, 3 P. M.

1. Items from the H. H. Bancroft Library. H. Morse Stephens, University of California.

2. The authorship of the Monroe Doctrine. James Schouler, esq., of Boston.

3. American Holidays in their relation to American History. William R. Thayer, esq., of Cambridge, Mass.

4. The Theater and Combatants of the Civil War. James K. Hosmer, esq., of Washington, D. C.

5. Personal Force in American History. William Garrott Brown, esq. of New York.



## CIRCULAR OF THE JUSTIN WINSOR PRIZE COMMITTEE.

*Committee.*—Charles H. Hull (chairman), Cornell University; Edward P. Cheyney, University of Pennsylvania; Roger Foster, New York; Williston Walker, Yale University; Evarts B. Greene, University of Illinois.

The Justin Winsor prize of \$100, offered by the American Historical Association for the encouragement of historical research, will be awarded for the year 1906 to the best unpublished monograph in the field of American history that shall be submitted to the committee of award on or before October 1, 1906.

I. The prize is intended for writers who have not yet published any considerable work or obtained an established reputation.

II. The monograph must be based upon independent and original investigation in American history, by which is meant the history of any of the British colonies in America to 1776, of other portions of the continent which have since been included in the territory of the United States, and of the United States. It may deal with any aspect of that history—social, political, constitutional, religious, economic, ethnological, military, or biographical, though in the last three instances a treatment exclusively ethnological, military, or biographical would be unfavorably received.

III. The monograph must present subject-matter of more than personal or local interest and must, as regards its conclusions, be a distinct contribution to knowledge. Its statements must be accurate and the author in his treatment of the facts collected must show originality and power of interpretation.

IV. The monograph must conform to the accepted canons of historical research and criticism.

It must be presented in scientific form.

It must contain references to all authorities.

It must be accompanied by a critical bibliography. Should the bibliography be omitted or should it consist only of a list of titles without critical comments and valuations, the monograph will not be admitted to the competition.

V. In length the monograph should not be less than 30,000 words, or about 100 pages of print. It may be more. If possible it should be typewritten, but in any case it should be presented to the committee free from erasures, interlineations, and other evidences of revision, though obvious mistakes of the typewriter should, of course, be corrected. If the work is not typewritten, it must be written carefully and legibly on only one side of the sheet and must be in form ready for publication.

VI. In addition to text, footnotes, and bibliography, the monograph must contain nothing except the name and address of the author, and a short introduction setting forth the character of the material and the purpose of the work. After the award has been made the successful competitor may add such personal allusions as are customary in a printed work.

VII. In making the award the committee will consider not only research, accuracy, and originality, but also clearness of expression, logical arrangement, and especially literary form. The successful monograph must be written in good English. The prize will not be awarded unless the work submitted shall be of a high degree of excellence.

VIII. The successful monograph will be published by the American Historical Association in its annual report. The author will be given twenty-five copies of his work bound separately in paper and twenty-five bound in cloth; but in case he desires additional copies for personal distribution, or to present as part of the requirement for the doctor's degree, he shall pay the cost of striking off the extra copies. Separate copies of the monograph, bound in cloth, may be obtained of the secretary, by any one desiring them, at a cost of 50 cents each.

IX. Under the rules of the Government the successful competitor can purchase copies of his work from the Public Printer, and put them on sale at such price as he may see fit. Any competitor may make such use of his manuscript as he desires, even while it is in the hands of the committee, provided that in case he receive the award he defer its publication by anyone else than the Association until after the appearance of the report of the Association containing the work in question. He must, however, relinquish all right of copyright in his essay, since the copyright of material published by the Government is forbidden by statute.

Address all correspondence to the chairman of the committee, Prof. Charles H. Hull, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

The Justin Winsor prize has been awarded as follows:

In 1896 to Herman V. Ames, for his work entitled *The Proposed Amendments to the Constitution of the United States*.

From 1897 to 1899 the prize was not awarded.

In 1900 to William A. Schaper, for his work entitled *Sectionalism and Representation in South Carolina*; with honorable mention of the work of Miss M. S. Locke on *Anti-Slavery Sentiment before 1808*.

In 1901 to Ulrich B. Phillips, for his work entitled *Georgia and State Rights*; with honorable mention of the work of Miss M. Louise Greene on *The Struggle for Religious Liberty in Connecticut*.

In 1902 to Charles McCarthy, for his work entitled *The Anti-Masonic Party*; with honorable mention of the work of W. Roy Smith on *South Carolina as a Royal Province*.

In 1903 to Louise Phelps Kellogg, for her work entitled *The American Colonial Charter: A Study of its Relation to English Administration, chiefly after 1688*.

In 1904 to William R. Manning, for his work entitled *The Nootka Sound Controversy*; with honorable mention of the work of C. O. Paullin on *The Navy of the American Revolution*.

In 1905 the prize was not awarded.

---

#### CIRCULAR OF THE HERBERT BAXTER ADAMS PRIZE COMMITTEE.

*Committee.*—Charles Gross (chairman), Harvard University; George Lincoln Burr, Cornell University; Victor Coffin, University of Wisconsin; James Westfall Thompson, University of Chicago; John Martin Vincent, Johns Hopkins University.

The Herbert Baxter Adams prize of \$200, offered biennially by the American Historical Association for the encouragement of historical research, will be awarded for the year 1907 to the best unpublished monograph in the field of European history that shall be submitted to the committee of award on or before October 1, 1907.

I. The prize is intended for writers who have not yet published any considerable work or obtained an established reputation.

II. The monograph must be based upon independent and original investigation in European history, by which is meant the history of Europe, continental or insular, or any part thereof. It may deal with any aspect of that history—social, political, constitutional, religious, economic, ethnological, military, or biographical—though in the last three instances a treatment exclusively ethnological, military, or biographical would be unfavorably received.

III. The monograph must present subject-matter of more than personal or local interest and must, as regards its conclusions, be a distinct contribution to knowledge. Its statements must be accurate, and the author in his treatment of the facts collected must show originality and power of interpretation.

IV. The monograph must conform to the accepted canons of historical research and criticism.

It must be presented in scientific form.

It must contain references to all authorities.

It must be accompanied by a critical bibliography. Should the bibliography be omitted or should it consist only of a list of titles without critical comments and valuations, the monograph will not be admitted to the competition.

V. If possible, the monograph should be typewritten, but in any case it should be presented to the committee free from erasures, interlineations, and other evidences of revision, though obvious mistakes of the typewriter should, of course, be corrected. If the work is not typewritten, it must be written carefully and legibly on only one side of the sheet and must be in form ready for publication.

VI. In addition to text, footnotes, and bibliography, the monograph must contain nothing except the name and address of the author and a short introduction setting forth the character of the material and the purpose of the work. After the award has been made, the successful competitor may add such personal allusions as are customary in a printed work.

VII. In making the award the committee will consider not only research, accuracy, and originality, but also clearness of expression, logical arrangement, and especially literary form. The successful monograph must be written in good English. The prize will not be awarded unless the work submitted shall be of a high degree of excellence.

VIII. The successful monograph will be published by the American Historical Association in its annual report. The author will be given 25 copies of his work bound separately in paper and 25 bound in cloth; but in case he desire additional copies for personal distribution or to present as part of the requirement for the doctor's degree, he shall pay the cost of striking off the extra copies. Separate copies of the monograph, bound in cloth, may be obtained of the secretary by anyone desiring them at a cost of 50 cents each.

IX. Under the rules of the Government the successful competitor can purchase copies of his work from the Public Printer and put them on sale at such price as he may see fit. Any competitor may make such use of his manuscript as he desires, even while it is in the hands of the committee, provided that in case he receive the award he defer its publication by anyone else than the association until after the appearance of the report of the association containing the work in question. He must, however, relinquish all right of copyright in his essay, since the copyright of material published by the Government is forbidden by statute.

Address all correspondence to the chairman of the committee, Prof. Charles Gross, 11 Putnam avenue, Cambridge, Mass.

In 1905 the first award of the prize was made to David S. Muzzey, of Yonkers, N. Y., for his monograph on "The Spiritual Franciscans."