

work reveals, they can tell us much about how religious communities operated and maneuvered. At the same time, however, one must be aware that congregational records can mask as much as they reveal. Church officials may have been reticent to record disagreement or reluctant to admit controversy. Longenecker says little about how Gettysburg religion reacted to antebellum politics or the emergent women's rights movement. Perhaps the sources are silent about these issues, but the silence itself is then telling and needs to be explored.

If there is one weakness to the book, it is that Longenecker's discussion of religion and culture can be somewhat unbalanced. While he offers a detailed discussion of how social conditions influenced the town's religious communities, the book has much less to say about the ways in which their distinct religious beliefs, thoughts, and practices shaped Gettysburg society in return. Longenecker deftly notes how religion contributed to the diversity and refinement of the community, but more could be said about religion's role in education, social reform, and family life.

That criticism aside, the book provides a fine case study of religious development in antebellum north. It provides a foundation for studies that trace religious transformations of the post-Civil War era and adds to a growing literature on the mid-Atlantic as a region whose religious and social diversity prefigured the future path of the nation.

THOMAS RZEZNIK

Seton Hall University

Carl Smith. *City Water, City Life: Water and the Infrastructure of Ideas in Urbanizing Philadelphia, Boston, and Chicago* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013). Pp. 327. Illustrations, notes, bibliography, index. Hardback, \$35.00.

In *City Water, City Life: Water and the Infrastructure of Ideas in Urbanizing Philadelphia, Boston, and Chicago* (2013) Carl Smith sets out to write an intellectual and cultural study of how people conceptualized the development of urban waterworks in nineteenth-century Boston, Chicago, and Philadelphia. His analysis rests on the proposition that "cities are built out of ideas as much as they are of timber, bricks, and stone, and that the discussion of city water is a kind of a universal solvent that reveals this in striking ways" (2).

Thus, Smith sophisticatedly explores the development of waterworks as an “infrastructure of ideas” that serves to reveal larger lessons about the cultural and intellectual changes brought forth from rapid urbanization in three of America’s prominent nineteenth-century cities.

To better understand the shift from rural to urban cityscape through water development, Smith explores a healthy body of source material, including various print sources such as reports and surveys made by engineers and health officials, newspapers, periodicals, poetry, paintings, sculptures, and the built environment itself. Smith admits that the majority of his sources express the ideas of a small elite group of white men. He defends his choice by noting that these were precisely the individuals who dominated conversations of city water. Once one accepts his admittedly limited albeit unique use of primary materials, the intellectual and cultural histories of Philadelphia (1790s to 1820s), Boston (mid-1820s to 1850), and Chicago (1840s to 1870) are revealed through dialectics of what water meant for the common good in terms of politics, progress, urban growth, sanitation, temperance, health, and the commodification of water. The issues in turn reflect similarities in the histories of the three cities.

“As cities grew larger and more polyglot, and their social and economic divisions became more distinct, the sense that all residents were united by a common cause and the feeling that every individual should think of the welfare of others in the community became harder to sustain,” writes Smith, noting that the idea of the common good varied along class and ethnic lines (53). The need for water, however, challenged those assumptions. “However much the growth and diversification of a city’s population might have weakened ties among individuals,” notes Smith, “its size empowered its members to do great new things,” such as spend large sums on public waterworks projects (54). The overwhelming need for water transformed urbanites and urban America, connecting individuals and individual property into a central water supply by a simple service pipe. Hooked up to water, one indisputably became an urban dweller and part of a larger diverse city population composed of individuals connected to a shared resource. Although the desire to tap into public water transcended sectarian, sectional, party, race, class, and ethnic lines, that was not to say that diverse citizens automatically fit neatly into a common urban core. Smith explains these issues through an examination of how water challenged values at many levels.

The issue of water brought to light political disagreements over whom constituted “the people” and who should provide the resource in a growing capitalist

democracy that fiercely valued freedom of individual action. Individualism and water seemed incompatible, as more and more city dwellers were put “on the grid” in an ever more complex centralized landscape. Although all three major cities decided on publicly owned systems rather than private, Smith’s discussion of the debates over public and private water demonstrates how a city’s need for centralized public works clashed with traditional American values of limited government. “Building a central system enormously expanded the size, responsibility, and expense of urban government,” explains the author (58). Despite a historical suspicion of political rulers, faith in free capitalism, fear of incompetent and corrupt public officials, and an overall aversion to government involvement in city life, leaders and voters in Boston, Chicago, and Philadelphia overwhelmingly supported public water.

Smith reconciles this apparent inconsistency by presenting how city leaders and urban planners emphasized the connection between water, progress, and the common good of the city. Resting his claims on plenty of interesting and entertaining primary sources, Smith shows that political leaders wanted to encourage the wide use of water, thus making it affordable and easy to access. This in turn made their cities appear to the nation as modern and progressive. Waterworks expressed civic achievement and commitment to the public good. Smith explains how even the design of the infrastructure was meant to symbolize a city’s “heroic sense of itself and what it aspired to be” (66). Accordingly, cities had no qualms spending extra sums to make otherwise utilitarian structures visually impressive. For instance, Philadelphia’s original pumphouse at Centre Square included the famous *Water Nymph and Bittern* statue by William Rush that “depicted a nubile maiden in a diaphanous gown, which clung to her body as if it were actual cloth dampened by the slender jet of real water that sprayed a dozen feet or more into the air from the regally upturned bill of the bittern perched on her shoulder” (67).

Besides political leaders, other city dwellers touted water as the source of progress and promise for burgeoning cities, explains Smith, even if their goals were fueled by misguided xenophobic assumptions and perceptions of cities as dirty, gritty hubs of sin. Smith draws on the sanitary movement, the temperance crusade, and the water cure movement to illuminate how water indeed quenched the needs of social and moral reformers. In all three movements, water was a cure-all and thus a necessity for the collective good. In what is arguably the most interesting chapter of Smith’s monograph, the author explains a new sense of interdependence in cities and the need for water to ensure that city dwellers were healthy. “Sanitary reformers claimed

that water was the best deterrent against disease-breathing filth, temperance leaders hailed it as the salutary alternative to demon alcohol, and water-cure practitioners declared that it could remedy almost any ailment,” explains Smith (161). The author masterfully makes real the connections felt by nineteenth-century reformers between the individual natural human body and the collective human-made body of the city.

While environmental historians such as Donald Pisani, Ted Steinberg, and Richard White arguably remain the go-to scholars for water history, Carl Smith has undoubtedly added a useful and unique study. His ability to draw on local sources makes his monograph strong and his ability to link those sources to a thoughtful interpretation of the intellectual history of three developing American cities makes Smith’s project truly distinctive.

NATALIE SCHUSTER

Frostburg State University

Patrick Griffin. *America’s Revolution* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013). Pp. xviii, 342. Illustrations, notes, index. Cloth, \$39.95.

Patrick Griffin presents a masterful synthesis of the revolutionary era in *America’s Revolution*. Emphasizing the Revolution as a process, based on a triptych model that includes a beginning, middle, and end, Griffin provides a new interpretation that helps to connect the revolutionary era and beyond. In this comprehensive yet concise narrative, Griffin compellingly argues that throughout the revolutionary process, the idea of sovereignty informed and shaped much of the way that individuals interpreted and acted during the years encompassing the American Revolution.

In part 1 of the book, “The Beginning,” Griffin establishes a firm foundation for understanding the revolutionary era by tracing the history of the British colonies back to their founding during the seventeenth century. He first presents an overview of the different regions of the colonies, while examining the process of becoming “British.” He details the regional variation in this process, yet also acknowledges how this common identity bound the colonists together through their political institutions and, more significantly, their familiarity with the idea of dividing sovereignty. He moves into the eighteenth century and focuses on how the Seven Years’ War affected the relationship between the colonies and the Crown, arguing that “cultural realities and political expectations fractured