

Jeremy Engels. *Enemyship: Democracy and Counter-Revolution in the Early Republic* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2010). Pp. xi, 316. Illustrations, notes, bibliography, index. Cloth, \$59.95.

Jeremy Engels's *Enemyship* contributes to a growing body of scholarship that argues for the contraction of radical democratic possibility in the United States immediately following the American Revolution. Influential recent studies in this line such as Rosemarie Zagarri's *Revolutionary Backlash: Women and Politics in the Early American Republic* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007) and Terry Bouton's *Taming Democracy: "The People," the Founders, and the Troubled Ending of the American Revolution* (Oxford University Press, 2009) have told this story through the lenses of gender and class conflict, respectively, underscoring the betrayal of ordinary white men and women by their governments in what they and others have convincingly argued was a reactionary—even counterrevolutionary—political atmosphere during the 1780s–1790s. Engels, an assistant professor of communications at Pennsylvania State University, offers a new perspective on this narrative of declension by emphasizing the role of rhetorical strategy in its unfolding. Charting a course through histories of unrest in the early Republic from Shays's Rebellion to Fries's Rebellion and the response to the Alien and Sedition acts, Engels shows how elites adapted rhetorical practices of "naming and denouncing enemies" (17), once central to justifying the Revolution's "state-toppling violence" (5), into techniques of governance aimed at producing "a national identity, socioeconomic stability, and more obedient citizens" (31). Engels thus tracks the practice of identifying enemies—or "enemyship"—as it transformed from a strategy of revolutionary liberation into a technology of state-building designed to extort the consent of the governed in a culture of fear.

Engels's exploration of how rhetoric organized political identification and allegiance in the Revolutionary period represents a potentially exciting alternative to more traditional histories oriented toward the discovery of the Revolution's economic or ideological origins. With this attention to the power of language, Engels takes an expansive measure of the forces that motivated historical actors and of the strategies by which those actors attempted to move one another.

In the book's first and most compelling chapter, Engels traces "enemyship" through *Common Sense* (1776), in which Thomas Paine argued that the colonies' connection to the mother country did not bind them together as

reliably as it drew them into conflict with Britain's enemies: "France and Spain never were, nor perhaps ever will be our enemies as *Americans*, but as our being the *subjects of Great Britain*" (44). For Paine, "enemyship" named a state or condition of antagonistic relation, but Engels shifts to consider it in more performative terms, as a "rhetorical architecture" (35) that can be mobilized to produce such identifications. Indeed, he argues that both *Common Sense* and the Declaration of Independence employed this architecture to urge the cause of revolution during the 1770s. Engels is ambivalent about Paine's "decision to name the enemy" (60), however. On the one hand, Paine's goal in deploying this strategy was "to encourage Americans to fight for their independence" (59), generating new possibilities for concerted democratic action in a moment of danger. On the other hand, Engels writes, Paine's recourse to the rhetorics of enemyship "corrupted democracy by turning it towards the creation and preservation of dangerously unstable homogeneities of friend and enemy, Whig and Tory, revolutionary and criminal" (62).

In the richness of this ambivalence, Engels proffers a troubling glimpse of Revolutionary politics in which the distinction between radical and reactionary positions may be less clear, less governable, than we might have hoped. As such, this reading of Paine offers a potential challenge to Engels's own historiographical premise, adopted from Gordon S. Wood, that the Revolution stands unproblematically as a radical moment whose visionary promise was compromised only after the fact. Engels concludes, however, that Paine's—and, indeed, Jefferson's—deployments of enemyship are ultimately liberatory ideals whose "unintended consequences" were subsequently elaborated by the founders in a more sinister key (65).

Engels moves on, in chapters 2–4, to delineate what he calls the "three faces of enemyship" as it appears in political discourse of the early Republic: "enemyship as the means to justify coercion, . . . as a tool of distraction, . . . and as an instrument of discipline" (28). Tracing each of these faces through a series of three particular national conflicts, Engels addresses, in turn, Shays's Rebellion, the Whiskey Rebellion, and Fries's Rebellion and the XYZ Affair. Each of these chapters relies more heavily on historical narrative and dwells less closely on primary texts than the first chapter. While Engels draws a wide array of sources into conversation with the events he recounts, readers may thus begin to miss the fine-grained rhetorical analysis that characterizes chapter 1. In each of these chapters, moreover, Engels sees the rhetoric of enemyship as a form of social power wielded by elites and distributed

top-down to susceptible masses; he thus sets an unfortunate horizon on how the force of rhetoric operates in his narrative.

Given Engels's explicit, stirring investment in a more radically populist democracy, ordinary people's voices seem conspicuous by their absence from this study. *Enemyskip* paints a lively and persuasive portrait of how elites rhetorically shaped a culture of fear and hostility in the early Republic, but it gives us less sense of how, whether, and why people might have accepted (or, indeed, resisted) such tactics.

EMMA STAPELY

University of Pennsylvania

George E. Thomas, ed. *Buildings of Pennsylvania: Philadelphia and Eastern Pennsylvania* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2011). Pp. 696. Illustrations, bibliography, index. Cloth, \$75.00.

The rich and varied architectural history of Philadelphia and eastern Pennsylvania has been given an exhaustive and sophisticated representation in *Buildings of Pennsylvania: Philadelphia and Eastern Pennsylvania*. The book's editor and author, architectural historian George E. Thomas, and his colleagues, Patricia Likos Ricci, Richard J. Webster, Lawrence M. Newman, Robert Janosov, and Bruce Thomas, have provided a treasure trove of delights. The book explicates the spectacular as well as the typical, mining the region's past as well as exploring the pressing questions of its future. This provides appeal for a varied audience, from academics and educators in varied disciplines to design professionals and interested laypeople, all united by a common interest in the history of Pennsylvania and the Mid-Atlantic region. This book is one of two volumes on Pennsylvania—the other addresses Pittsburgh and Western Pennsylvania—in The Buildings of the United States series, comprised of more than sixty volumes, founded and commissioned by the Society of Architectural Historians. The book series itself has a rich history: it was inspired by German-born British architectural historian Nikolaus Pevsner's series *Buildings of England* and its founding editor-in-chief was distinguished architectural historian William H. Pierson Jr.

Buildings of Pennsylvania: Philadelphia and Eastern Pennsylvania begins with a broad historical overview of the region. Philadelphia and Eastern Pennsylvania's history is explicated from its origins as William Penn's