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In this enormously erudite and lengthy volume Carl Bridenbaugh investigates the characters, habits, and activities of Englishmen in the half century before war erupted between King and Parliament, and during which "The First Swarming" and "The Puritan Hegira" took place. He has explored the visual remains of an earlier England, consulted a vast number of archives, libraries, and repositories, and scrutinized the evidence afforded by literature, secular and ecclesiastical records, the Statute Book, pamphlets, tracts and sermons. Purely demographical statistics and analysis are not stressed, nor is any attempt made to compare the condition and motivation of English with other colonial peoples, though an occasional note reveals some interest in this. What has been most successfully achieved is a panorama more vivid and extensive than hitherto available, of the island inhabitants on the eve of colonization. The author's easy command of varied material and lively style make this readily and agreeably perceived and understood.

Students of both English and early American history should be grateful for the series of pictures of the people in country and town; their ranks of society, health and disease, daily routine and food, community participation, and their sins against God and man. Three chapters deal with "The Rulers and the Ruled"; "The Faiths of Englishmen"; and "Educated and Cultured English." The chief concern throughout is the portraying of the vexations and troubles besetting the everyday life of ordinary people in the early seventeenth century; purely constitutional, political and ideological controversies appear only inferentially. The privations of the poor are described in more detail than the comforts and preoccupations of the rich. The contrasts between the chills and scarcities of the Old World and the abundance of fuel and food in the New are strikingly depicted.

Professor Bridenbaugh examines "Insecure, Disorderly Englishmen" and finds that human frailty accounts for most of the lapses of the countryside, while the pursuit of profit occasioned much of the wickedness of urban areas. Then as always honest labor and unostentatious virtue were less remarked than crimes like theft and prostitution, yet the cases in quarter sessions courts were surprisingly few in number. Among a perceptive minority recognition of the need for amelioration of the condition of the poor may be found. Much more apparent and most forcefully articulated were lamentations about the morals of the age, and urgent demands for regeneration. But neither glimmerings of humanitarianism nor forebodings about "degenerate times" were peculiar to Stuart England and can be
Emigration as a means of bettering life—in spite of the horrors of the voyage out—began to be increasingly attractive. Mobility, Bridenbaugh points out, was already characteristic of English life, but now the opportunities were greater. Imperial policies and aspirations are not the concern of this volume; in it the author sticks closely to his declared purpose of probing the motivations of the ordinary Englishmen in leaving home. He stresses the astounding vitality and challenge of the age, even though everything seemed to be “out of joint.” After 1620 he maintains the woes of the average man in this apparently ill-faring land mounted every year and reached a climax in the years between 1629 and 1642. Doubts about their country and their own position in it were reinforced by the attractions of westward lands offered in a growing promotional literature. Professor Bridenbaugh judiciously reminds us of the variety of reasons for the exodus. Individuals endured a diversity of miseries and discontents. The puritan families who left out of religious conviction offered a special case of self-induced emigration. There was little paternal guidance by government for any. There seems to have been scarcely perceptible self-consciousness of the daring and portentous achievement they were beginning among the emigrants. They did not realize the historical significance of their emigration in the founding of a new nation.

_Vexed and Troubled Englishmen_ is a book that will help a great many to understand much more about the factors molding early American life. It is a brilliant and provocative work, answering many questions and raising others. Bridenbaugh does much to discover answers to the enquiries raised in the quotation from Cotton Mather with which he ends his prologue: what “those Englishmen were like, and what their land was like, and what happened there to make them abandon that pleasant isle, cross the tempestuous Atlantic and venture their all in the Wilderness.”

**Bryn Mawr College**

**CAROLINE ROBBINS**


Professor Leder is to be congratulated for writing a most useful analysis of the political theories current in British America before 1763. Bernard Bailyn has already given us an exhaustive study of the political ideology prevalent in America on the eve of the struggle for America's independence. A book on the political ferment in British America before 1763 has long been needed, however, and Mr. Leder’s book has met the need admirably.

Articles which appeared in the colonial newspapers have served as Professor Leder's principal sources. Freedom of the press was necessary before there could be a free and meaningful exchange of ideas about governmental problems. Newspaper editors were fighting for freedom of the press at the time of John Peter Zenger's trial; by 1763 their fight had been won and freedom of the press was well established in British America.

Political discussion was inhibited early in the eighteenth century by the
view that government was God's ordinance to man. Critics of government soon turned to a more secular idea of the origins of government as they adopted a Lockean interpretation which removed God from politics. Government could then be discussed freely, and critics who chose to discuss it soon filled the colonial newspapers with letters which expressed their ideas.

It soon became apparent from the letters which appeared in the press that colonial political thinkers could not arrive at a broad agreement upon the nature of their rights and liberties. Men who lived in corporate colonies could and did claim the rights which were secured to them by their charters. Likewise, inhabitants of proprietary colonies could shield themselves from imperial interference by citing the liberties granted in their charters. People living in crown colonies were much more vulnerable to pressures from Whitehall, but they quickly learned to resist imperial controls by claiming for themselves the "fundamental rights of Englishmen."

Exactly what was meant by the "fundamental rights of Englishmen" was not made clear by the colonial political theorists. They shifted ground to suit themselves when they were in conflict with imperial authority. Passages in the Magna Carta were useful to them on some occasions. On others, they turned to the Bill of Rights for protection. Flexibility seemed desirable to them as long as Parliament did not force them into a corner by declaring the colonies to be subordinate to the mother country.

Imperial controls were tightened after 1763, and Parliament asserted its absolute supremacy over the colonies in the Declaratory Act of 1766. Colonial thinkers were then forced to reexamine their positions. Their rights as Englishmen had just been taken from them, as they saw it, and they shifted the ground of their arguments to claim for themselves the natural rights of man. These natural rights were asserted in the Declaration of Independence, and they represented a decisive break from the concepts which British Americans had evolved in their political thinking during the half century or more before 1763.

The reviewer believes that Professor Leder has made a valuable contribution to a better understanding of political theories held by British Americans of the late colonial period. And he has shown clearly that the colonial leaders of the first half of the eighteenth century had not anticipated a rupture with Britain and had not prepared a rationale for a movement for autonomy or independence.

The book is well organized and Mr. Leder has a good style. The layman as well as the scholar will find Liberty and Authority both readable and instructive.

Northern Arizona University

GEORGE W. KYE


The issuance of Volumes V and VI of the Susquehannah Company Papers
brings to the mid-point (twelve volumes exist in typescript) the publication of the primary materials essential to the scholarly analysis of the boundary dispute between Connecticut and Pennsylvania which Claude Van Tyne urged before the American Historical Association some three score years ago. Edited by Dr. Robert J. Taylor of Tufts University under a grant from the National Historical Publications Commission, these volumes move what Dr. Oliver W. Holmes, the Executive Director of the Commission, called a "laudable and unique . . . project . . ." toward its much-desired conclusion.

The Susquehannah Company was a Connecticut land company which was formed in 1753 to extend the boundaries of the original thirteen colonies westward. That extension brought them into conflict with the Wyoming Valley settlers of northeastern Pennsylvania. Whereas the first four volumes carried the account from the company's origins down to the summer of 1772, volumes five and six extend that record to the end of 1775. As such, the recent issues comprise a unit.

Professor Taylor has expanded upon the outstanding work of Julian P. Boyd, the first project director, which received so much scholarly acclaim. Boyd, who edited the first four volumes, was editing the subsequent volumes at the time of the catastrophic 1936 flood which wrought havoc to life and property along the Susquehanna River. The fifth volume of the papers, as well as the supply of the first four volumes, were all lost in that disaster. Fortunately, Dr. Boyd had kept the printer's proof while the typescripts of the other seven volumes remained with the Wyoming Historical and Geological Society. Revised editions of the first four volumes, which appeared in 1962 under the auspices of the Cornell University Press, resumed the vital series.

Although a perfect match of type for the corrections and additions to the original proof was not possible in these two volumes, the end result was excellent. Volume VI seems to be the superior of an outstanding duo. The volume's lighter print gives the impression of more space between the lines and, consequently, greater readability. Furthermore, it contains Provost William Smith's extensive document which examined the Connecticut claim in Pennsylvania, "the wild Chimera of a visionary Brain."

The introduction, index, and six documents, No. 315 through No. 320, were added by Dr. Taylor to the original printer's proof. Taylor also added the Appendix to Volume V, consisting of some 23 items, notably from the Gersham Breed Papers, which shed further light on the nature and conduct of the Susquehannah Company. These papers are now the possession of George O. Pratt of Southport, Connecticut.

The primary issue of these two volumes is the conflict over boundaries between Pennsylvania and Connecticut. Although the resolution of that dispute was delayed for some time by matters of greater import to the British Empire, the Connecticut settlers, some 2,000 strong, took possession of the disputed region in 1774.

In order to function politically, a compact among the Connecticut settlers preserved law and order until the New Englanders' claims were legitimized.
The compact was not in the form of fundamental orders, such as prevailed for the original colony, but more of a working operation such as the Fair Play Tribunal of the Fair Play Men of the West Branch Valley of the Susquehanna River. As Professor Taylor suggests, "The gradual regularization of many aspects of life is the story of the Susquehannah settlements in this period."

The struggle for recognition of the Connecticut claim was met with delaying actions by Governor John Penn and the General Assembly. The Yankees of the North Branch appear to be much more legally oriented than the Fair Play settlers of the West Branch. Furthermore, there was internal conflict comparable to the factionalism which ran rampant in the days of the Grenville and Townshend programs. The assertion of western land claims beyond the Delaware River was the real internal bone of contention. Some feared that the cost in lives and treasure would jeopardize the eastern segment. The Reverend Benjamin Trumbull, kin to the Governor of Connecticut, supported pressing the claim, and his suggestions of prosperity and an education fund derived from the sale of western lands may have been the basis for the Western Reserve. However, the coming of the Revolution influenced a change of heart on both sides of the water. English authorities couldn't be bothered with such petty little boundary questions, and the colonists simply couldn't afford disunity.

The three years of this historic pre-Revolutionary conflict are well documented here, although Volume VI, which begins with the important Smith document and concludes with Plunket's expedition of 1775, probably has the advantage of better material, better presented.

In any event, it is virtually impossible to survey the breadth of documents contained herein within the confines of a limited review. Since both volumes are published as a set, Dr. Taylor's introduction precedes the documents of Volume V. Even though compressed to a three-year period in this presentation, Professor Taylor's introduction and the documents offer the full panorama of the frontier experience with its intercolonial conflicts, individual exploits, and problems of imperial polity. The sum of it all is an heroic account of the classic test of man's intelligence, the ability to survive and function regardless of the problems and obstacles of any age. The impact of this successful effort by a group of stubborn Connecticut Yankees was still to be felt some sixty years later when the New England concept of public education began its perilous course toward acceptance by the equally stubborn Pennsylvanians.

This ambitious publication is an outstanding project, well done. The format, Professor Taylor's superb contribution, the tenacity of purpose clearly evident in the membership and leadership of the Wyoming Historical and Geological Society, and the pioneer labors of Julian P. Boyd, make this a significant publication in the documentary annals of American and Pennsylvania history.

The Pennsylvania State University (Capitol Campus)  GEORGE D. WOLF

The centennial years of the Civil War brought forth a veritable barrage of military books of varying merit, and now we are seeing the first examples of the many that will appear for the bicentennial years of the American Revolution. Some wag has said: "Some are written for the scholar; others for the almighty dollar." On this basis we will have to place Harold Peterson's with those written for the scholar.

Peterson's vast knowledge of his subject, combined with his experience as a very competent writer, make The Book of the Continental Soldier an excellent standard reference for historians, writers, museum curators, artists and illustrators, and collectors. Additionally, it is an interesting and valuable book for the newcomer who would aspire to becoming an expert.

While the book includes nothing not previously known in subject matter, it perhaps has its greatest merit in bringing together most of the scattered bits and pieces of information concerning the soldier of the American Revolution, his weapons, clothing, and equipment; his artillery, and the lesser-known instruments of the doctor, the engineer, and the musician. Wisely, Peterson has drawn on friends and acquaintances who have specialized in areas where his own background is limited, and his list of acknowledgments includes several of the best military research historians living today. Some material and artwork have been transferred from The Journal of the Company of Military Historians, and endorsement by the Company's Review Board assures the historical accuracy of the book's content.

No book can satisfy its severest critic, nor encompass the wishes of every reader. However, in this one there are several noticeable omissions that need not have occurred. Illustrating ornamented military buttons, a small sampling of eleven is shown without much discussion, although about fifty different patterns are now known, with most identified. There is a sharply rising interest in American military buttons, and many persons will be disappointed because more are not included. With reference to military huts and hutting, the text sums them up in one sentence: "In winter quarters the soldiers preferred to build log huts with fireplaces and wooden bunks for six to eight men." Whether or not soldiers preferred log huts, they had no choice but were ordered to build them, and those of the most common dimensions (14' x 16'; 6' height to eave line) housed twelve men. Much more information is available on huts and hutting in order books, journals, diaries, and other sources. It should have been included.

Peterson's bibliography and notes at the end of each chapter are more than adequate for anyone who might care to pursue a subject in much greater detail. Unfortunately, some of the contemporary source books are most difficult for the average reader to locate. However, his list includes some little-known early publications that are readily available, and would form a basic reading structure for anyone who wants to explore logistical
problems of the American Revolution, or who seeks specific answers to obscure questions concerning soldiers and their tools of warfare. In sum, The Book of the Continental Soldier is interesting, factual, and valuable. It is doubtful any future reference book will surpass it for completeness or historical accuracy.

William Penn Memorial Museum

J. Duncan Campbell


Biography, despite recent comments to the contrary by John Higham, seems again to be achieving a respected place in American historiography. Although it was the most difficult to write of the three recent biographies of second rank Federalists, Ernst's life of Rufus King is better than Winfred E. Bernhard's life of Fisher Ames or Richard E. Welch's life of Theodore Sedgwick. Bernhard gives the historian a great amount of detail about the 1790's but provides us with a lifeless portrayal of his subject (perhaps a criticism of Ames and not Bernhard); Welch says less about the times and more about the man; but Ernst gives us a carefully balanced picture of both King and his times.

King is not without previous biographers, but none of them is as successful as Ernst. While Charles R. King's six-volume life is a gold mine of source material, few take the time to read it. And Edward Brush's study is too short and too complimentary to be satisfactory. Ernst traces King from his youth in the 1750's and 1760's until his death in 1827. At each stage he gives an interpretation of King's role. King entered state politics at the close of the Revolution and served Massachusetts as an active member of the Confederation Congress. During his term Shay's Rebellion was fundamental in changing him from a defender of states' rights to a nationalist. In the Federal Convention King stood high among such second-rank leaders as George Mason, Charles Pinckney, and Edmund Randolph, and in the Massachusetts Ratifying Convention he was of the first rank. Elected to the first United States Senate, after adroitly changing his residence to New York, he stood out as a Federalist leader until his appointment as minister to Britain in 1796. In London he was well received by the British and ably served the United States until his resignation in 1803.

From 1803 until 1813, despite the involvement of his name in presidential politics, King remained in retirement, unwilling to help the Federalists when they perhaps needed him the most. His criticism of the War of 1812 helped to return him to the United States Senate in 1813 where he served as a respected and sometimes influential leader of the opposition for over a decade. This outstanding career ended in a sad, anticlimactic six-month mission to Britain where he was again the American minister.

Ernst sees King as a moderate in all things, "a leader of measures, not of men," a constant opponent of the extension of slavery, a sectionalist but never a disunionist, and as less Anglophile than most of his party.
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It is difficult to quibble with most of Ernst's interpretation although King had less influence at the Federal Convention than Ernst believes. One aspect of the interpretation is naïve: Ernst claims that King was not a political wheeler-dealer and that he avoided extra-legislative bargains. For example, in discussing the contest over the location of the seat of government, a fight in which King immersed himself from his first recorded vote in Congress in 1784 until the final solution during the First Congress, Ernst sees King as rightfully critical of Alexander Hamilton in 1790 for having “stooped to bargain” with the South. Such behavior was “beneath the dignity of a statesman.” On the contrary, King’s criticism was not that of a man who avoided secret caucuses and bargains, but that of a bitter man whose many hours of bargaining had failed. Indeed, King was so angry as to oppose assumption temporarily.

Despite this flaw, the reader comes away from this book feeling that he understands King’s personality and character. He also comes away with a fuller realization of the long and active public career of the twice Senator from New York. The success of this study is better appreciated when one recalls that King, unlike Ames, Sedgwick, and most Federalists, did not cease his positive thinking and political action in 1801. When Thomas Jefferson and John Adams were retired—indeed, when they were in the grave—Rufus King was still holding public office.

University of Wisconsin, Madison

KENNETH R. BOWLING


If one greets the publication of Professor Remini’s volume with a “What, another account of the Bank War!” and then sets it aside for other things, he will miss an enjoyable and instructive experience. Building on his Andrew Jackson (1966), Remini has produced a good account of one of the major political battles of American history. The author appreciates the complexity of the war and thus appropriately points out early that while it was a many-sided phenomenon and had many ramifications, his object is “to restate the War as a political phenomenon” because “that is essentially what the struggle was all about.” The contest, Remini writes in his valuable “Bibliographical Review,” “was essentially a political struggle, with the President calling the shots, and only secondarily an economic battle among various ‘men on the make.’” This approach is justified both by the nature of the contest and because of its political impact. Its effect on the presidency was profound and “in terms of party history the Bank War was the single most important event during the entire middle period of American history.”

In the Preface, Remini succinctly puts his position on the line, for, he says, this book presumes to argue that the destruction of the Bank occurred because it got caught in a clash between two willful, proud, and stubborn men: Andrew Jackson and Nicholas Biddle. It was
a battle involving arrogance, stupidity, and confusion. It was
a clash that can be appreciated only by an understanding of the
President's political psychology and only after an examination of
the involved political events directly associated with the War.

One of "The Norton Essays in American History," this volume will be
of value both to the general reader and to the specialist. It is based on a
solid and wide reading of general and specialized studies relating to the
Jacksonian period and the Bank War and, most importantly, on a thorough
use of basic manuscript collections. The material is organized in seven
chapters, beginning with brief but adequate sketches of Jackson and Biddle
—"The Antagonists"—and proceeding through the early development of the
conflict, the premature proposal to recharter, the famous veto ("the most
important presidential veto in American history"), the election of 1832, the
struggle following the presidential decision to remove the deposits, down
through the failure of Biddle's counterattack and the end of his Bank.

Remini has, of course, the advantage of what is a naturally structured
political drama. But it is to his credit that he exploits this drama to the
hilt by writing with a degree of interest and excitement all too rare in
monographic works. The sketches of the characters in the cast are excellent
as is the treatment of many scenes in the drama, witness the "confrontation"
of Clay and Vice-President Van Buren over a snuff box in the course of
the bitter Senate debate.

Jackson does not emerge blameless; this is no historical eulogy. And it
is made abundantly clear that this was indeed a power struggle involving
conflicting points of view. For better or for worse, however, Jackson not
only destroyed the Bank but produced a most profound impact on the
presidency. In this, "the first time in American history that a major issue
was taken directly to the electorate for decision," Jackson

stretched the veto power and claimed the right to block legislation
for reasons of policy or expediency rather than constitutionality . . .
broadened the political power base of the presidency . . . *demon-
strated* this authority by destroying the Bank over intense
Congressional opposition . . . widened the President's responsibility
to include all the people . . . advanced the concept that the President
is the direct (and sole) representative of the people, a revolutionary
concept for its time . . . settled the question that the President has
absolute power to remove subordinate executive officers at will.

In sum: "In his two terms of office [Jackson] virtually remade the presi-
dency; and he did it, to a large extent, during the Bank War."

The picture of Jackson as the able, adroit political leader and tactician
may be overdrawn. (Would not the politician of superior talents have achieved
a viable accommodation with Biddle?) Nevertheless, no one can deny the
importance for the American presidency and for the country's political
system of what Jackson ("the first modern President") did in the course
of the Bank War. Remini has analyzed the struggle soundly, readability,
and well.

*Muhlenberg College*  
*JOHN J. REED*

Muhlenberg College is fortunate to have as its historian James E. Swain, who has been a faculty member for over forty years and is well known for his books on world civilization and European history. With loving kindness and care he has written tenderly of the college's history since it took the name of "Muhlenberg" in 1867 and of its antecedents. He has told the story chronologically against the background of the nation's educational and religious history. Appropriate tribute is paid to educational leaders and financial benefactors. The format is attractive, and the photographs add much to the narrative. The volume is readable, and it will be popular with alumni.

Historians of other denominational colleges will see many parallels with the histories of their own institutions in Dr. Swain's narrative. After several changes of name, Allentown Seminary founded in 1848 became Muhlenberg College in 1867. The first president was the Reverend Frederick A. Muhlenberg, great-grandson of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, the Lutheran patriarch after whom the college was named. At first the college faced difficult financial problems. In 1904 there appeared a strong scholarly president, Dr. John A. W. Haas, who during a term of office of more than thirty years firmly guided its course and development. The college weathered well the impacts of World Wars I and II and the depression. Its curriculum, faculty and finances have adjusted to meet present-day demands. Although Dr. Swain cannot foretell the effects of the welfare state, the democratization of education, and changes in demands on the college of the future, he believes that past experience and tradition have prepared it well for the challenges of tomorrow.

Historians might have wished that he had been more critical and analytical. The impact of World War I and of the depression is related in general rather than in specific terms. Would it not be more fitting to place the list of trustees, faculty and administrators found in the appendix of this volume in an alumni directory? Would not some topics, i.e., fiscal, lend themselves better to a topical rather than a chronological development? As a source, why has he not used the correspondence of the presidents? Would graphs and charts of finances and enrollment not be illuminating?

The reviewer, who is in process of writing the recent history of a similar liberal arts college of another denomination, may be less critical of Dr. Swain's approach when he finishes his own writing, but he believes that his format will be different.

In comparison with some other histories of denominational colleges, the volume is not nearly as scholarly as Headley's and Jarchow's Carleton: the First Century; it is less interesting than Chessman's Denison: the Story of an Ohio College, and it deals with less minutiae and detail than Roberts' North Central College. In comparison with the histories of two Pennsylvania denominational colleges, it is not footnoted and as well researched as Oliphant's The Rise of Bucknell University, and it is less voluminous and more inspired than Gingrich's and Barth's detailed A His-
tory of Albright College. Swain's volume is closer in format, style and objectives to the histories of two state-supported institutions, Miami University in Ohio by Havighurst, and the University of Cincinnati by McGrane.

Dr. Swain's book hits the high points of Muhlenberg's past history well and will please the friends of the college, but the volume is less satisfying to members of the historian's craft. It is not the definitive history of the college.

Otterbein College


Extinct Medical Schools ... is peculiar, but as a chronicle of the myriad institutions which flourished, with more or less vigor, in Philadelphia between 1840 and 1880, it is a singularly useful volume. The institutions it treats were spawned in the years following what conservative medicine considered to be a break in the dam—the chartering by the State Legislature in 1838 of a second independent medical school for Philadelphia. Jefferson Medical College was finally lifted from the somewhat lowly condition of being a division of its parent institution in bucolic Canonsburg in western Pennsylvania. This had been its plight since its founding thirteen years earlier, and it now faced the University of Pennsylvania's school armed with new status. The message was irrevocably clear: Philadelphia could have more than one medical school.

These years, 1840-1880, mark the period of the founding of an additional two of the five presently established Philadelphia medical schools (Hahnemann Medical College, and Women's Medical College), and it is fascinating to have the stories of the defunct institutions to compare with those of the successful colleges.

The late and often unmourned institutions were a mixed bag. They ranged from the very respectable Medical Department of Pennsylvania (now Gettysburg) College created under the aegis of Dr. George McClellan, a founder of Jefferson Medical College, who was later ousted in a power struggle, and Franklin Medical College, which was an outgrowth of Dr. Nathanial Chapman's "Medical Institute," to the dubious diploma mills exemplified by John Buchanan's Eclectic Medical College of Philadelphia and the American University of Philadelphia. Between these poles was a brace of schools of varying degrees of academic soundness that reflected the stresses rampant within a profession transforming itself, and sometimes being unwillingly metamorphosed from its reliance on more or less sophisticated witchcraft to a scientifically based discipline—all the while not being subject to any legal restraints. It was a confusion which led to the establishment of the Eclectic Medical College of Pennsylvania and the Eclectic Medical College of Philadelphia. Both stood ready to adopt what was "useful" from allopathy and homeopathy as well as to draw upon elements of ... Electropathy, Hydropathy, Newropathy, Thomsonism, and Botanic and Chrono-Thermai
As Dr. Abrahams observes in a minor masterpiece of understatement, "Eclectics were not 'exclusivists.'"

Prior to the issuance of this monograph, the only compilation of these now extinct schools was to be found in Saul Sack's general History of Higher Education in Pennsylvania which still remains preeminent as the reference work to consult for information on institutions outside of Philadelphia and for those schools in the allied medical fields.

The truly unique contributions of Dr. Abrahams' work are to be found in the lists of matriculates and graduates of the various institutions (about twenty-five percent of the book); as well as in the wealth of tabular information on faculty, textbooks, and curriculum; and in the description of physical plants. Essentially the work represents a tour de force of the skills of the cataloger, the encyclopedist, and the annotator rather than the critical historian. Each school or group of schools is given its (or their) own chapter, with little attention paid to synthesis. The chores of comparison and evaluation, to a large degree, are left to the reader.

Giving the monograph its peculiarity is the fact that the text is in large part drawn from the publications of the defunct institutions themselves—bulletins, valedictory addresses, etc.—and there is virtually no recourse to collateral or direct evidence to support the reportage. Few if any diaries, memoirs, or newspaper accounts are employed, and as one reads on, quotes, paraphrases, and narrative join together into a single entity; one not always capable of being dissected into its component parts.

Pennsylvania State University (Capitol Campus)  Irwin Richman


Readers of Pennsylvania History who were privileged to receive a preview of Edwin B. Coddington's study of the Gettysburg campaign in the excerpts from it published in the April, 1963, and April, 1964, issues of this journal, have awaited publication of this volume sure that it would be no ordinary Gettysburg book but one that would immediately become indispensable to students of the campaign. They will not be disappointed.

The Gettysburg Campaign is worthy of a place beside D. S. Freeman's studies, one of which gave it its subtitle. More than that, as a study in the command of both armies it is in a class by itself; no other rounded study of the campaign, seeking to discover the motives and actions of both headquarters, can match it. Coddington not only combed the Official Records with the care of a Kenneth P. Williams, but beyond that—and making his work superior to Williams's as a study of the Union command—he traveled the country to ferret out manuscript collections, using them with a thoroughness unparalleled in histories of this campaign. Among the noteworthy dividends of his industry is the light he throws on Colonel John B. Bachelder, the nineteenth-century "Superintendent of Tablets and Legends of the Gettysburg Battlefield Memorial Association," and thus on the historiography as well as the history of Gettysburg. Characteristically,
Coddington not only used the Bachelder papers in the New Hampshire Historical Society but found others in the possession of Bachelder's grandnephew.

Coddington's diligence in research gives his book a freshness in small things and in large. To cite one of the small things, the Spencer repeating carbines which John Buford's cavalry are reputed to have carried on July 1 disappear from this account, as they should have disappeared from others long since because there is no good evidence to indicate that Buford's men had them. To cite one of the larger matters, the account of the first day's battle is also mercifully free from dependence upon Abner Doubleday's recollections, which, conveniently available in print, have too often supplied the framework for histories of the battle's early hours.

Those concerned not simply with the Civil War but with the whole of American military history will appreciate the breadth of Coddington's views. The artillery organization of both armies, for example, is discussed with reference to the larger history of nineteenth-century doctrine about the employment of that arm. The problems of recruiting emergency troops to defend the North against Lee's invasion are set in the larger context of the vexed history of militia in the United States.

Diligent research alone does not make good history. In our graduate schools we may stress it too much, at the expense of the necessity to make judgments about what the evidence means. Fortunately, Coddington displays a refreshing willingness to make judgments, sometimes even an audacity. Some earlier reviewers have accused him of writing an apologia on behalf of George G. Meade. It is true that Coddington leaves no doubt of his conviction that through the Gettysburg campaign Meade displayed a mastery of the military art unmatched by any other participant in the campaign, including Robert E. Lee. But anyone wishing to dispute Coddington's argument must take upon himself a formidable task of debate.

This book is A Study in Command. It is not a history of small unit actions or of the common soldier at Gettysburg, in the manner of Bruce Catton. In weighing the perplexities of command decisions, it requires the most careful and thoughtful reading. It is not, however, merely an intellectual exercise. It does offer flashes of the drama and emotional intensity of the Civil War. This reviewer will long remember Coddington's portrayal of the long night march of the VI Corps from Manchester, Maryland, toward Gettysburg, when for the first time in the history of the corps the bands played not only on entering towns but throughout the march, the brasses alternating with the fifes and drums, men's voices picking up the "Glory, Glory, Hallelujah," to speed the corps on to the battlefield.

All that I have written above would have been the same if Edwin Coddington had had no connection whatever with the Pennsylvania Historical Association. As it is, the Association must count itself honored to have had the writer of this book as its president, and with the book we must feel our loss of him all the more deeply.

_Temple University_  

_Russell F. Weigley_
This new book on Eakins says little at great length in a dull and wooden style. Mr. Schendler states his intentions quite clearly in the Introduction. On page xiii he says, "... I pretend to be neither aesthetician in the modern mode nor historian of art in the Germanic." This is fair warning concerning what we should expect but it is little preparation for the tedious work which follows. He continues, "... if we behave as if whatever it, or whatever happens, profoundly matters, then we may be moralists." This reviewer, although he dislikes the idea, must see himself, according to the author's definition, a moralist because he does believe that Eakins' painting and whatever happens to it profoundly matters.

To begin with the positive. *Eakins* is a long book which deals extensively with the life of the artist, his environment, and a large number of his works. There are one hundred and fifty-eight illustrations. Much of what is said in the book is common knowledge and no new information other than the insights of the author is added. Mr. Schendler's approach to the discussion of much of Eakins' work is that of a "C" student writing a term paper or a long final examination. For example on page 121:

"In Professor Henry A. Rowland (Figure 51), done in 1891 Eakins examines a scientist not a humanist, a man in whom one may detect an emotional limitation, as if the painter were in part concerned to observe the consequences of work limiting the growth of understanding or the development of more humane knowledge. Professor Rowland has the stare not merely of the posed sitter but the scientist caught in abstraction, a lean cerebral man caught up in a dream of numbers. In his posture one reads a devotion to science and a rectitude that are both exemplary, and one prays, not mere historical curiosities. Professor Rowland's work was one apart from committees and corporations; the diffraction grating he holds in his hand was born from the forehead of Zeus after purely disinterested labor. Behind him, his assistant, the serious craftsman technician, is a less cerebral, less intellectually intense presence. Yet though Mr. Schneider may be more fully in contact with human realities than Rowland, his presence more nearly defines than limits the observer's sense of Rowland's humanity. Eakins has a profound sympathy for the man. The painting achieves a warmth and depth quite apart from its apparent subject matter, drawing in part from the human oppositions embodied in Rowland, caught up in his abstracted mood as he sits there, and his assistant, standing in the shadows of the laboratory, another of Eakins' silent choric figures."

This is "fine" subjective writing and is typical of the author's discussion of the paintings. If we believe that "whatever is ... profoundly matters" one might question the content of the paragraph just as one might a paper received from any undergraduate. For example:

1. How does one "detect an emotional limitation" in the sitter?
2. Does the stare of the "scientist caught in abstraction" differ radically from any other stare, and if so, how?
3. In what way or ways does Professor Rowland’s posture indicate “a devotion to science and a rectitude that are both exemplary, and one prays, not mere historical curiosities.” One might write in the margin with a red pencil, “Distinguish Prof. R.’s posture from that of other portraits such as some of those by Raphael, Velasquez, Rembrandt, Copley, or Eakins himself, e.g., Riter Fitzgerald, illustrated on page 138 of Eakins.”

4. Explain the Zeus forehead image.

5. How is it that Mr. Schneider’s presence “more nearly defines than limits the observer’s sense of Rowland’s humanity”?

6. What is meant by “the apparent subject matter”?

Mr. Schendler has truly avoided at least one aspect of the “aesthetician in the modern mode,” a discussion of the thing in itself. He is adept at the subjective and unqualified statement. On page 286, in a note referring to page 81, he says, “Lloyd Goodrich says that Eakins’ Crucifixion ‘has suggestive similarities to Ribera’s Martyrdom of St. Bartholomew in the Prado.’ He is mistaken, I believe.” There is no further comment to suggest why Mr. Schendler believes that Mr. Goodrich is mistaken.

One should note negative qualities in the book. The illustrations are overly dark. This can easily be seen by comparing the reproductions in the present $15 work with those in Thomas Eakins: A Retrospective Exhibition which was published as a catalogue for the 1961 exhibition in Washington, Chicago, and Philadelphia, and for which Lloyd Goodrich wrote the introduction. For example, most of the interesting and valuable background detail of The Chess Players is clearly visible in the Catalogue, number 23, page 56, but is lost in blackness in the reproduction on page 68 of Eakins. If the painting has actually suffered such damage in so few years The Metropolitan Museum should be asked to explain what has happened. The Agnew Clinic is reproduced on page 86 of the Catalogue and on page 109 of Eakins. Again the loss of detail in the more expensive and later work is startling. The spectator sees much more in the earlier reproduction for not only is it clearer and more detailed, but it is also larger.

On the basis of this book, Mr. Schendler need never fear being mistaken for an “historian of art” whether the mode be Germanic or the current standard of most undergraduate courses. Even for a book without scholarly intent the lack of basic scholarly discipline in this work is surprising. There is a most cavalier attitude toward sources. Quotation marks enclose numerous passages with little or no suggestion given as to source or sources. What, for example, is the source of the extremely important letter extending from the bottom of page 90 to the middle of page 92? The author’s dependence on Lloyd Goodrich for quotations is noted seven times in the Index, although what of Goodrich is being quoted is not always indicated. Mr. Schendler also relies on Goodrich for quotations from Eakins, as on page 110, rather than checking the available original sources. Lloyd Goodrich’s Thomas Eakins, His Life and Work was published in 1933. It is essentially a long essay, a catalogue raisonné with 515 entries, and a selected
Bibliography of books, pamphlets, catalogues, and periodicals. Unfortunately, Mr. Schendler's work makes no effort to bring any of this scholarly apparatus up to date.

This book is not worth the price. If anyone is interested in buying a book on Eakins every effort should be made to buy a copy of either of the works by Goodrich.

Philadelphia College of Art

BERNARD HANSON


While American painting, architecture and the decorative arts have long been studied and collected, American sculpture—present as an important means of artistic expression since the seventeenth century—has been overlooked almost totally. Only in the past few years have signs appeared that it is about to receive the serious attention it deserves from scholar, collector and curator alike. Two important monographs have appeared—on Horatio Greenough and Thomas Crawford—and others are in preparation. James Dennis' excellent book on the life and work of Karl Bitter takes its place as the third significant study to come forth in this rich field of the American arts that is so ripe for pioneering efforts.

It has not been generally recognized that the period of Bitter's activity (ca. 1885-1915) is an exciting and fascinating era in the American arts, since interest has usually stopped with the Civil War and quickened again only around the group of The Eight and the Armory Show of 1913. But Bitter was one of the prime movers in a period that saw a revitalization of sculpture in this country led by such men as Augustus St.-Gaudens and Daniel Chester French, and a rejection of the diluted, outdated and moribund neoclassicism of earlier decades. Professor Dennis points out in both scholarly and readable prose the importance of Bitter's work which incorporated elements from the Secessionist movement and the Beaux-Arts Style, and, most significantly, experiments with the abstraction of naturalistic form for decoration of the new type of architecture then emerging.

Soon after his arrival in America in the late 1880's, Bitter's talents were employed by the eminent architect Richard Morris Hunt, and he quickly became recognized as the leading sculptor of architectural decoration in the Beaux-Arts Style; this is most clearly seen in his work on the Administration Building of the World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago in 1893 and in the Vanderbilt mansion, "Biltmore," both in collaboration with Hunt. Bitter's special genius for organization was revealed to greater advantage when he served as director and coordinator of all sculptural art at the expositions in Buffalo in 1901 and at St. Louis in 1904. The Beaux-Arts Style, with Paris as its fountainhead, of course, reached its most lavish fulfillment in these world's fairs, and Bitter played a vital role at each.

It is curious that students of modern art have not taken notice of Bitter's
experiments with abstract architectural decorations which were made several years before the famous Armory Show. As early as 1907 he designed several pairs of simplified and abstracted figures for the First National Bank in Cleveland—about a decade before Zorach, Laurent, Flannagan or Stirling Calder began their attempts at simplification and abstraction of naturalistic form. This was, in truth, a momentary rejection of the eclecticism of the Beaux-Arts Style, and although Bitter did not choose to pursue its potential, it was nevertheless a historic event in the evolution of early twentieth century sculpture. Dennis recognizes the importance of these sculptures and explains it fully.

All of Bitter's major works—including the excellent portrait statue of Dr. Pepper at the University of Pennsylvania, the sculptures for Philadelphia's Pennsylvania Station, and the elegant nude female figure of the Pulitzer Fountain in New York City—receive proper analysis and criticism, and there are ample if not always first rate reproductions of details, sketches and completed works which illustrate the sculptor's prolific career. Between 1890 and 1915, when he was killed in an accident while crossing a street in New York, Bitter operated one of the busiest and most productive studios in America. James Dennis has thoroughly researched his material and has written a scholarly study of an important artist. The book is highly recommended to anyone who wishes to understand more fully the transition from nineteenth century Beaux-Arts eclecticism and romanticism to twentieth century modern movements. Bitter's work, in large measure, represents one of the last glorious flowerings of the old guard before it was replaced by the impellent wave of abstract and non-objective art of our time. The reviewer's only criticism is that in reading the book—and certainly in future reference to it—a catalogue of works would have been helpful, as would a bibliography.

WAYNE CRAVEN

The Papers of Woodrow Wilson, Volume III, 1884-1885; Volume IV, 1885.

American historians continue to return to the figure of Woodrow Wilson. The ambiguities of his thought seem to embody the ambiguities of the transitional age in which he lived. There is confidence that if we can grasp the riddle of Wilson, then we are on our way to understanding how nineteenth century America grew into twentieth century modernity. These two volumes cover but two years of Wilson's life, yet they contain more than thirteen hundred pages of textual material which go far in helping us to fathom both the man and the era. These were busy years for Wilson—courtship and marriage, scholarship and publication, the lure of political life and the security of an academic one. The personal letters, the sample of lecture notes, the complete texts of his first published work, Congressional Government, and of his unpublished study, "History of Political Economy in the United States," which make up these volumes provide us with the
insights into a society in flux and how an older American outlook began to respond to the mighty transformation.

Volume Three begins with Wilson's career as a graduate student at the Johns Hopkins University. There, in the seminar on History and Political Economy he encountered the new Germanic scholarship in the institutional history of Herbert Baxter Adams and the historicist economics of Richard T. Ely. It is in this intellectual context at Hopkins that his study of Congressional government begins to flower. Taking Walter Bagehot's study of English government as his exemplar and showing due regard for the a priori approach and attempted to write of the government in terms of reality.

His intellectual labors in the Bluntschli Library were tempered by another attraction. Back in North Carolina he had proposed marriage to Ellen Louise Axson. His correspondence with her from Baltimore now revealed a mutual concern with self-examination. These letters clearly show that Wilson was a man of his age and of his section. Despite the 'revolt against formalism' at the base of his study of congressional government, and what we might expect from his exposure to the new scholarship at Hopkins, we do not find that sort of rebelliousness in his private papers. Ellen's own minister-father had been committed to an institution where he died. Wilson tried to console Ellen and in so doing demonstrated the religious faith that was so much a part of his character. "His Savior, we may be sure, did not desert his servant at the supreme moment... It is altogether best for him." It was hard to reconcile oneself with God's will. Still, the Almighty had a purpose for the living as well as the dead: "... have we not above all the things the blessed privilege of living for the service of God, in a glad performance of duty." Throughout all the weary months of study, Wilson's recurring theme of accepting service and duty as God gives it to him, indicates one of the most significant motivating forces in his life.

If the religious orthodoxies were devotedly observed, then, so were the social ones. A friend wrote Wilson attacking the "scalawagism" of George W. Cable, because Cable had urged the South to concede the justice of the Union cause. Wilson's correspondent urged him to "write a short letter striping Cable's jacket for him... next to the pleasure of administering the lash to him myself, it will please me most to have you deal with the little man." But Wilson did not. He considered Cable "a fool for his pains... Give Cable rope enough and he will hang himself and so save us the trouble." On some issues, however, the studied silence of civility must give way to the stern voice of admonition. Ellen reported from New York about a certain Dr. Taylor, a minister there, and queried Wilson, "Did you know that Dr. Taylor advocates marriage between white people and Negroes?" Wilson returned answer that if indeed this was Taylor's position, it had certain serious consequences: "If he favors miscegenation of blacks and whites, as a desirable or tolerable solution of the social question in the South, or a general mixture of African and Aryan blood, as a
thing to be wished for anywhere that the two races come into contact, both
his moral judgment and political judgment are radically unsound, and a
whole province of good sense being thus cut off from his mind, the soul
of the rest of it may be expected to bring forth only a rank growth of
weeds. . . . He has never seen the Negro as we have seen him."

Politics was a constant preoccupation for the young scholar; not the
politics of place and patronage but of service by men of intelligence and
principle. He recognized that he was "under the necessity of earning a
living" and that the present conditions of corruption forestalled the
entrance of a "man of independent action." Until those conditions were
radically altered, Wilson was content with the position of a critical
academic observer. Indeed, he preferred "outside influence not only because
its ways are more congenial but also because its power is greater." Through
his writing, then, and his teaching Wilson anticipated that he would exert
a profound influence through affecting the thought of men.

This faith in rational discourse was akin to Wilson's religious faith. The
issues must be presented to the electorate. That office seeker who appealed
to their passions only betrayed the title of statesmanship. This comes out
most effectively in Wilson's views on oratory. Rhetoric had always been
for him an essential tool for the political leader. If the audience would not
listen, one had to persuade them into doing so. In the campaign of 1884,
Wilson had attended a rally for Governor Jarvis in North Carolina. The
crowd was not what Wilson considered "an intelligent audience" and the
"silly girls" seemed out of place "because of their desperate ignorance of
the matters the speakers were talking about." But Jarvis performed the
teaching function of the political orator admirably. For, in Wilson's opinion,
the "well-commanded voice, the manly bearing, the earnest manner of the
capable speaker, trick men into listening with pleasure."

Other themes pass through the volumes in addition to Wilson's search for
personal identity. Harvard visitors frequented Hopkins. President Charles
W. Eliot delivered a speech on the new educational reforms designed to
widen liberal studies beyond the Latin, Greek, and mathematics which
Wilson considered "the staples of the sixteenth century curriculum." Josiah
Royce, philosopher, lectured "seeing everything with a clear and unerring
vision . . . because he has the faculty of bringing masses of detail into a
single luminous picture." Wilson received news of the trials and tribula-
tions of his uncle James Woodrow, a professor at the Columbia Theological
Seminary in South Carolina whose defense of the evolutionary Darwinian
hypothesis involved him in serious controversy. Wilson was chagrined for
he knew his uncle to be "quite as good a Christian" as any of his de-
tractors. In a supreme irony Wilson wrote a letter to Bradstreet's in Feb-
uary 1885 criticizing the action of former President Chester Arthur for
sending American delegates to the Berlin Conference on the Congo. The
grounds that Wilson gave were "that representatives of the United States
could have no legitimate business at such a conference, and that their
presence in it was in direct contradiction to the foreign policy to which
we had considered ourselves pledged since the administration of Wash-
Isolationist appeals to the Fathers was thus not original with Lodge and Borah.

As for his unpublished work on political economy, the editors have an extensive note which describes Professor Ely's invitation to Wilson and Davis R. Dewey to collaborate with him on the history of American economic thought. Wilson's section was to deal with American political economists after Matthew Carey. The reason the editors ascribe for its failure to be published is "simply that Ely, for some reason, failed to do his part." As for the substance of Wilson's analysis, the editors build a case that he "had a thorough exposure not only to the writings of the classical school but also the work of the new school of German historical economists up to that time," and that consequently Wilson "had positive disdain, if not contempt, for classical economic theory as expounded by Malthus and Ricardo and considerable suspicion of all theory per se, . . . in other words, . . . he had assimilated the assumptions of the new economists."

These volumes maintain the high level of scholarly proficiency we would expect from such a distinguished staff of editors. There was however one disappointment for this reviewer. In their general introduction to the whole series the editors cite the copious notes that Wilson took while a student at Hopkins. They promise us a "sample" of them only. Their definition of sample is rather slim. Only a very few pages of the notes are included. Perhaps this is understandable in light of the extensive holdings of letters and other valuable material the editors do not publish. Yet, the picture seems rather incomplete without more of the transcribed notes from the classes of Ely and Adams which played so crucial an influence in the intellectual formation of Woodrow Wilson.

Vincent A. Carrafielo

Correction: The editor of The Papers of Benjamin Franklin is Leonard W. Labaree, not Leonard L. Labarre, as it was given in Pennsylvania History, XXXVI (January, 1969), 100.