

BOOK REVIEWS

American Diaries: An Annotated Bibliography of American Diaries Written Prior to the Year 1861. Compiled by WILLIAM MATTHEWS with the assistance of ROY HARVEY PEARCE. (University of California Publications in English, Volume 16. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1945. xiv, 383 p. Cloth \$4.00; paper, \$3.50.)

Mr. Matthews' compilation will not disappoint those who had learned of its inception and looked forward to using it. An annotated, chronological listing of American diaries prior to the Civil War was a happy idea, and in this book it has been carried out with admirable competence.

A bibliographer should carefully define his field of coverage, and Mr. Matthews has done so. This is a register of printed diaries only; manuscript diaries have been omitted with regrets and with the suggestion that a supplementary list of them might well be compiled. (Such a list would doubtless exceed in number of entries the present list of about 4,000 printed diaries. The suggestion is one that ought to be taken to heart by research librarians.) Only diaries written in English or translated into English are included—a workable and liberal arrangement; and Canadian diaries (in English) are embraced in the term “American.” The term “diary” has called for close definition. As Mr. Matthews points out, the names “diary” and “journal” are often loosely applied to works that should be otherwise designated, for instance reminiscences, religious autobiographies, travel narratives, commonplace books, annals, ships' logs, orderly books, and so on. A true diary is “a day-by-day record of what interested the diarist, each day's record being self-contained and written shortly after the events occurred, the style being usually free from organized exposition.” A true “journal” is a diary kept as part of a job rather than for personal reasons. In practice there is often little distinction between the two, and both are admitted to this list. Mr. Matthews, who is writing a critical history of American diaries, holds that the diary or journal as thus defined is “a unique form of writing” because of its freedom from literary devices. To this statement no exception can be taken. His further statement, that diaries and journals “are in general the most immediate, truthful, and revealing documents available to the historian,” might be debated. Private letters often have these qualities in as high a degree. The superiority of diaries to letters or of letters to diaries, whether as historical sources or as something to read, depends upon the gifts of those who have written them.

However this may be, Mr. Matthews' bibliography spreads before us a superb panorama of national history told in personal terms. The earliest

entry, dating from 1629, is the Reverend Francis Higginson's diary of his voyage to Salem, recording (like many another New England diary in the century following) God's providences to the faithful and describing the new Zion in the wilderness. Diaries of New England clergymen and New Netherlands travelers predominate in the next several decades. Then begin the Quaker diaries, with a scattering of Virginians' and other southern colonists' sea, military, and travel journals. The immortal Sewall made the first entries in his *Diary* in 1673 and continued them for fifty-seven years. After 1700 the journals recording exploration of the interior and missionary efforts, negotiations, and conflicts with the Indians become more and more frequent, as if to show what an ever-present force in colonial life the American natives were. Relatively few accounts of Indian captivities appear in the list, because, one may suppose, the Indian mode of living afforded neither leisure nor materials for journal-keeping. The published captivities, so popular then and so sought after now, were mostly narratives, written after the events they record. A number of excellent journals were kept in the first half of the century, among others those of Madame Knight, William Byrd, Conrad Weiser, and Pehr Kalm. In the middle years the appearance of diaries kept by gentlemen traveling for reasons of business or health strikes a modern note. The great increase of entries in this list during the 1740's and 1750's attests the length and bitterness of the struggle with the French to the north and west. There are but four entries for the year 1735, but for 1745, the year of Louisburg, there are thirty-two. Most of the thirty-two are military or naval journals, but a perusal of all the entries shows strikingly the varied patterns of American colonial life. Here is a clergyman recording the events and weather in his Gloucester parish; a settler staking his claim and encountering a colony of Dunkers in Smyth County, Virginia; an itinerant Quaker taking down notes on Indians, slaves, racial problems, and schools from Canada to the Carolinas; a Logan of Philadelphia on a business trip to Georgia; William Pote of Maine languishing in a Quebec prison; a Moravian preacher at work in the Swedish colony in West Jersey.

It is tempting to continue sketching the contents of this bibliography as it moves into the Revolution, which furnished hundreds of diaries of American, British, Hessian, and French participants, then through the early republic with its abundant diaries of society and politics, then after 1800 to the classic journals of the fur-trade and of trans-Mississippi exploration, the naturalists', the Oregon settlers', the Mormons', and the Forty-Niners' diaries, and the journals of literary men who traveled abroad, like Irving, Cooper, and Ticknor, and of those who mainly stayed home, like Alcott and Thoreau. But enough has been said to show that *American Bibliographies* is the key to a treasure chest. Everyone concerned with American studies before 1861 will find it useful: the historian, the student of literature and language, the genealogist, the historical novelist, and the librarian.

So far as this reader can judge from persistent thumbing, it is also a thoroughly reliable book. Mr. Matthews prudently does not claim completeness and appeals for information regarding items he has overlooked. Reviewers would do well to send him any omissions they note rather than to announce them in print with an air of superiority. As for inaccuracies, those noticed by this reviewer are inconsiderable specks in a very carefully compiled and printed book.

In a bibliographical tool of this kind the organization of the material is virtually as important as its completeness and accuracy. Mr. Matthews' method of presenting his material has great merit. Each diary is listed under the year in which its earliest entry occurs. Diaries beginning in the same year are arranged alphabetically by authors. Some identification (place of birth, life-span, occupation) is given for each author. The nature of the diary ("sea journal," "travel diary") is mentioned, followed by its time-span, brief notes on its content (places and people, dominant interests of the writer), and, often, a phrase of evaluation on the diary's fullness, its historical or linguistic value, and its readability. The location of the printed text is then given, with a notation of the best or fullest text when more than one is available. Every part of such an entry is helpful, and taken all together they provide much more information than the usual bibliographical entry or library catalogue card. Readers will inevitably disagree with some of Mr. Matthews' evaluations. The perfunctory "fairly good" means little and is misleading when applied to Richard Smith's very full and entertaining *Tour of Four Great Rivers*, written in 1769, or to Colonel Adam Hubley's journal of the Sullivan Expedition in 1779. Hubley's topographical sketches of all the camp sites on the march form a unique record not mentioned in Mr. Matthews' entry.

There is one radical defect in the plan of the list that impairs its usefulness. Each diary being entered only once, the reader is therefore warned in the preface that in "seeking diaries about particular events or periods . . . he must begin searching several years ahead of his interest." This is a serious understatement. John Woolman's *Journal*, for example, covering fifty-two years, is entered solely under 1720; there are other journals that have even longer time-spans. According to this scheme, one must read the entries for the preceding fifty to sixty years in order to be sure of coverage. Whatever defence may be offered for this, there can be none for grouping all diaries by the same writer under the year in which he first kept a diary. All thirteen of Conrad Weiser's separate travel and treaty journals for nearly half a century are entered under the year 1710; all sixteen of Irving's journals in Europe and America are listed under 1803. This arrangement will lead to readers' sometimes missing the very thing they want. A reader looking for Loyalist journals, for example, will scarcely be likely to turn back to the year 1745 and discover that, following the entry for Samuel Curwen's brief and unimportant journal of the Louisburg expedition, occurs the entry for his excellent, book-length journal as a Loyalist exile.

This defect in method could have been eliminated by assigning a serial number to each diary and then repeating under the following years the numbers of all diaries still current. The gain in usefulness from such a device will more than justify the greater space it will require in subsequent editions. Another improvement, less urgent but still desirable, would be the printing of the author's names and the time-spans of the diaries in boldface type. At present they do not sufficiently stand out. This reviewer is certain that *American Diaries* will become a standard and indispensable handbook, and he offers these suggestions in the hope of making a useful work still more useful.

Franklin and Marshall College

L. H. BUTTERFIELD

The House of Hancock: Business in Boston, 1724-1775. By W. T. BAXTER, Professor of Accounting, University of Cape Town. Harvard Studies in Business History X. Edited by N. S. B. GRAS. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1945. xxvii, 321 p. Index, illustrations, and charts. \$3.50.)

By the time of his death in 1764, Thomas Hancock was Boston's most prominent merchant. His less able nephew John, inheriting control at the beginning of unusually trying times, failed to maintain this business eminence, and virtually retired from active trade in 1775. In Professor Baxter's hands the characters of the two men are well delineated; they come to life, a rare phenomenon in business history writing. The major outline of the Hancock trade as "general" merchants during international war and imperial quarrels makes interesting reading, and the description of colonial barter and of foreign exchange difficulties is the best that has appeared in our literature. The role of war and government contracts in creating mercantile fortunes is colorfully emphasized, as well as the upsets to "business as usual" occasioned by the new British colonial policies after 1763. The author has done able research in filling in when possible the gaps of the internal record from outside sources. Placing the footnotes on the bottom of the page makes an important improvement on the format of the preceding volumes of the Harvard Business History series.

But in spite of its literary excellence and historical accuracy, the study necessarily illustrates a basic difficulty in writing the business history of eighteenth-century merchants: the Hancocks kept no profit and loss account, drew up no annual statements or inventories. The usual modern test of business success or failure, however, is net profit, or net rate of positive or negative return on the capital invested. As Professor Gras writes in the Editor's Introduction: "It has been a weakness in history, particularly business history, that so few workers have a flair for accounting. We might extend this lament, of course, to students of economics and government who often reckon not the costs nor determine the net results of the events they

deal with." Neither capital employed, nor profits derived can, apparently, be deduced from the Hancock records. Since the author is a professor of accounting, it is reasonable to assume that he did all that could be done to secure these essential business facts.

The value of his study, even without over-all quantitative data and net results, shows that we must accept two different levels of business history writing. There can be studies set in the more recent period that give the facts to answer the questions of the business economist, studies that supply a precise quantitative picture of business operations. While in most studies set in the period before 1800, the reader must be satisfied with knowing only the quality of business relationships, illuminated by fragmentary quantitative data. Usually it cannot be said what a merchant capitalist would consider a good annual return on his ventures, as he didn't know himself. Often he lived out his life growing richer or poorer without ever reckoning his exact position, or applying cost accounting to his various operations. There are exceptions to this neglect in the records of some companies or large partnerships, or individual cases such as that of Andrea Barbarigo, fifteenth-century Venetian merchant, studied by Frederic C. Lane, who always kept profit and loss accounts, but the practice was probably uncommon.

Neither the author nor the editor make these problems explicit in their introductions. No doubt they regard the limitations of the records of such early periods as obvious. But for the general American historian, and the younger student it should be made clear that this is not the type of study that would be made of a modern mercantile partnership.

New York University

THOMAS C. COCHRAN

Origins of Inter-American Interest, 1700-1812. By HARRY BERNSTEIN. Prepared and Published under the Direction of the American Historical Association from the Income of the Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fund. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1945. x, 124 p. \$2.00.)

The problem this monograph addresses is one of the most challenging issues in American history: how much did North and South Americans know about one another, how much did what they knew affect their destinies? It is a story that must be told with discrimination and restraint, in order that casual and occasional incidents do not stretch themselves too thin; but with spirit also, for commerce in the days of sail was an epic adventure. And certainly the drama of inter-American relations deserves a persuasive pen. Two great colonizing powers had kept their empires separate for more than two hundred years, until the pressures of profit, of intellectual curiosity, of religious zeal, and of elementary human sympathy burst political bonds as the mercantile empires themselves collapsed, and

began an intercourse that might (had the Americans been able to change with the times) have produced a cultural affinity from Cape Race to the Rio Plata.

It is a great story of what was, and what might have been, even if this book doesn't tell it. The subject calls for an analytical work, based on extensive research, largely conceived, and written for a wide audience. Mr. Bernstein has pieced together parts of a skeleton, but has not finished the job, nor clothed it with the integuments of life or the aspects of beauty. He limits himself to the inter-American relations of New York, New England, and Philadelphia, omitting New Orleans, Charlestown, Savannah, Norfolk and other centers on the questionable basis that they have received their due. His researches in manuscript collections were entirely limited to New York City. Consequently the many merchant papers of New England and Philadelphia houses which could have added much to the story are conspicuously absent. In the files of The Historical Society of Pennsylvania are treasures long in its possession that needed his interpretation. The contents of The Library of Congress' manuscript collections are easy to assay on any general topic. Some published merchant papers of New England would have added valuable data, and the unpublished resources of libraries there are rich. Diaries of supercargos exist, and are very appealing reading. They have their place in such a study. I should have liked a few American pirates in the picture, also. The Spaniards took them seriously; why should not we? American governors sometimes corresponded with Spanish colonial governors, not on grim issues suitable for doctors' orals, but at least to the extent of exchanging formal courtesies. As big a subject as this needs all the information easily available.

Mr. Bernstein has made a great deal out of the fraction of the whole data he has considered. There is much worth-while information gathered here which will suggest attractive avenues for more generous development. No part of the work is definitive, but much of it is helpful. Perhaps it is to serve as an introduction to a larger work; if so, the usefulness of the material here will appear.

As it stands now, however, it moves one to urge that if we are to have this continuous publication of doctoral monographs, candidates be furnished with a list of American libraries, a guide to Washington, a booklet on photographic reproduction, and the advice, "do *all* the work."

The Free Library of Philadelphia

J. H. POWELL

Thomas Cresap, Maryland Frontiersman. By KENNETH P. BAILEY. (Boston: The Christopher Publishing House, 1944. 322 p. \$4.00.)

There is no doubt that Thomas Cresap deserves a place among the frontiersmen who wrested the Appalachian country from the Indians and the French. That his motives were for the most part selfish cannot be denied,

but neither can it be denied that the conquest of the West was wholly motivated by the desire to get rich quick. (George Washington was no exception.) Cresap first comes into prominence during the Conojacular "War" in the course of which the Calvert and Penn families fought out the location of the Maryland and Pennsylvania border. He later moved to Western Maryland where he was well known for the rest of his life as an Indian trader, an innkeeper, an agent of the Maryland government and a collaborator in the Ohio Company. He lived to a great age; some authorities say over one hundred years (Lawrence C. Wroth, *Maryland Historical Magazine*, IX, 37); others, among them Mr. Bailey, declare that ninety is more accurate. In any case, he lived long, he was active and he was acquisitive so that he was well known in his time.

Several sketches of Cresap's life have appeared but this is the first full biography. One would have expected such a work to be well worthwhile. However, the results indicate otherwise. The author has exhausted most of the sources, and yet the picture of Cresap is no clearer than before. This is perhaps due to the fact that almost all of the sources are official records. Such materials rarely furnish more than a framework upon which the details may be woven. Lacking such details, it is hardly worthwhile to do more than prepare a chronology. Mr. Bailey has extracted the utmost from his materials, enough to fill 182 pages of unthrifty text.

Appendix I, "Correspondence of Thomas Cresap," is complete but disturbing since it includes various depositions, petitions, proceedings of the Council, and finally, Cresap's last will and testament. Appendices II and III contain the statements of Maryland and Pennsylvania to the King in Council concerning their boundary dispute. Appendix IV is entitled "Cresap's Financial Affairs Before the Lower House." Since it also contains Cresap correspondence, it might have been combined with Appendix I. The bibliography of twenty-five pages is too long and too inclusive to be of value. The footnotes fill forty pages, the index another sixteen. A critical apparatus almost as long as the text cannot be justified here.

This reviewer observed that no materials in the Hall of Records of Maryland were used by Mr. Bailey, except those which have been published in the *Maryland Archives*. Since Cresap lived beyond the Revolution, it is surprising, therefore, to find that the Proceedings of the Assembly were not consulted after 1751, the date which the printed *Archives* had reached so long ago as 1929! It is also surprising that the Sharpe letters were used only insofar as they have been published. The records of the Provincial Court, the General Court or the County Courts might have proved fruitful. Moreover, Mr. Bailey's use of unpublished archival materials is imperfect as witness the footnotes to Chapter V (p. 277). The author should have known that all of the Prince George's County records cited have been at the Hall of Records since 1941. The remarks under footnote 1 about volume titles are superfluous. Sometimes "Liber" is spelled out and other times the letter "L" is used. The Land Office volume cited as "Liber L.G.E." is

"Liber L.G. No. E." These errors are, of course, minor but repeated often, as they are in this book, they are likely to prejudice the reader against the whole work.

Maryland Hall of Records

MORRIS L. RADOFF

The Journals of Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg. Volume II. Translated by THEODORE G. TAPPERT and JOHN W. DOBERSTEIN. (Philadelphia: Evangelical Ministerium of Pennsylvania and Adjacent States, and the Muhlenberg Press, 1945. vi, 772 p. \$3.50.)

In my review of the translation of the first volume of Muhlenberg's journals (see *THE PENNSYLVANIA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY*, July, 1943) I wrote: "A nation formed from the fusion of various ethnic groups and having a composite culture can easily, in its unified maturity, forget or minimize the part played in its development by those groups which originally did not speak or write the common language." For this reason, I said, Theodore G. Tappert and John W. Doberstein are to be congratulated for making the journals of Muhlenberg, patriarch of the Lutheran Church in America, available to a larger public, and particularly to those historians who may have an incomplete understanding of the development of our "melting pot" country because of the regrettable fact that they are monoglots. Scholarship and style in the second volume are at the same high level as in the first volume. For details thereof I refer again to my review of the first volume.

The second volume gives in Muhlenberg's own words (translated) the period of his life and work from 1764 through 1776. (Volume I contains his sketch of his own life from 1711 through 1742 and the journals from 1742 through 1763.) He wrote the journals to furnish his superiors in Halle with a record of his ministry, and so that he might be able at any time to give an accounting of his affairs.

In the twelve years covered by Volume II we see no startling change in Muhlenberg's character, but rather a strengthening of those traits we have already observed. He is still the gently militant, hard-working pastor, intent on winning souls for God—primarily those of the Germans, secondarily those of any nationality, and providing churches and church organizations for them. He still castigates the godless and the vain; his telling the truculent inn-keeper that the latter was no "free-thinker" but a "free-drinker" is one example of this, as is his answering in Latin to the Latin speech in open congregation, of a well-wisher: "There is little cause for prating in a strange language in old age unless it is necessary and serves some purpose."

Although he professed to shying clear of politics, Muhlenberg's journals present a vivid picture of political developments before the Revolution. We see the German Lutherans and Reformed, now as groups more financially

secure, tending to make common cause with the Scots-Irish to challenge the leadership of the Quakers who, in turn, are supported by the German "sectarians," the Schwenkfelders, Moravians, Dunkards, etc. Feeling becomes bitter when most Germans of the Philadelphia area fail to report when citizens are called to arms against a German and Scots-Irish "army" of frontiersmen coming to protest alleged inadequate protection against the Indians (February, 1764). Loose talk that "the Germans were increasing so rapidly that the time would come when they would have to be put down," and German charges of Quaker corruption at the elections did not help matters. No wonder, then, that the Germans who were to play a prominent part in the Revolution were reluctant to take an active part in the organized protest against the Stamp Tax (1765). There were "grumblings" about this, said Muhlenberg, "but I was glad, for the English, etc. are prone to incite and egg the Germans on and then put the blame on us."

Muhlenberg's attitude toward the quarrel with England was orthodox enough from the liberal point of view of the eighteenth century: the colonists, he stated, were only defending the liberty and rights vouchsafed them by God and stipulated by earlier governments. The mother country had no right to abuse the colonies. But his account of the signing of the Declaration of Independence is quite sober, and he open-mindedly states that only God will know if the move was good. Toward the Continental Congress he was skeptical. He thought it was made up of honorable men with good understanding of farming and trade, but little skill in giving a clear opinion in English and too prone to be influenced by skillful orators. He and other ministers sent a letter to Benjamin Franklin (presiding at the historic meeting) in which they charged Congress with disregarding specifically in the Declaration of Independence, religious rights and liberties. He was indignant about alleged British atrocities, but was fair enough to write that the British also accused the Americans of atrocities. The innocent suffer, he wrote. They are either "traitors" or "rebels," constantly between fire and sword. And Muhlenberg, father of a member of Washington's own staff, and an unimpeachable patriot who gloried in the victory at Trenton, commented: "Whoever has any human feelings experiences compassion when human blood is shed, no matter whether it be on one side or both sides." Only God is the final judge of the justice of a cause, he warned intemperate partisans.

His observations on Negro slavery and redemptionism seem also to have been conditioned by his being a pastor and a Christian. Like Saint Paul he recognized slavery as a legal institution, but decried abuse of any human being and condemned the alleged neglect by some Southerners of religious and moral instruction for the slaves. In his careful way he notes, nevertheless, that the Southerners lived in constant fear of a slave uprising. Surprising but valid, when one considers the subject, is his opposition to slavery on the grounds that it created habits of idleness and viciousness among the

slave *owners*. Likewise did he condemn abuses of redemptionism from the point of view of the master as well as the bonded.

It is possible only to indicate, in a review, the wealth of source material in the volume, whether the subject be Baron von Stiegel, Indian mythology (no worse, Muhlenberg asserts, than the heathen imagery of poems "composed in the advanced taste"), or Regina who was brought back from the Indians. And reading about Regina, whose history, it seems to me, has been gradually distorted in folklorist manner by writers who have taken it one from the other, all the way back to whoever took it first from Muhlenberg, reminds me of one great service which translation of the *Journals* can perform. It can help the next generation of American historians to correct errors made in statements about Muhlenberg and his circle, errors made quite easily and excusably, since one writer borrowed from the other, back to the first writer who paraphrased what Muhlenberg himself had written in German, and what Theodore G. Tappert and John W. Doberstein have made accessible in translation.

State College, Pennsylvania

RALPH CHARLES WOOD

The Diary of a Public Man. Prefatory Notes by F. LAURISTON BULLARD.
Foreword by CARL SANDBURG. (Chicago: Abraham Lincoln Book Shop.
1945. xii, 117 p.)

One of the most interesting mysteries in American history has been the identity of the author of the "Diary of a Public Man." Since it was first published in the pages of the *North American Review* in August, 1879, there has been much speculation as to who wrote it, but, so far as is known, no one has yet found the secret. Now Ralph Newman, proprietor of the Abraham Lincoln Book Shop in Chicago, has had the interesting document reprinted. Carl Sandburg has written a foreword and F. Lauriston Bullard has supplied prefatory notes. There is also a chronology of the period between December, 1860, and March, 1861, during which the entries in the diary were written, and a list of the people mentioned with identifying comments. In addition there are inserted some letters of Stanton to Buchanan which were printed in the *North American Review* in 1879 currently with the "Diary."

Mr. Bullard's notes add much to the interest in the "Diary." He gives an excellent sketch of the editor of the *Review*, Allen Thorndike Rice, who was a "character" himself and a figure not altogether free from mystery. Rice was one of the first editors to promote public interest in reading about the history of the Civil War and used the pages of his *Review* to preserve much good historical material. In this case, however, his interest proved as exasperating to historians as it is useful for he refused to reveal the identity of the "Public Man."

At first blush one would think that there were sufficient clues so that his

identity could be deduced. The confident investigator after a careful reading says he must have been a Senator. But the facts don't warrant such a conclusion. The diarist was in New York City on February 20. On that day the tariff was under debate in the Senate and all the probable Senator authors, such as Bayard, and the editor's distant kinsman, Rice of Minnesota, were several times recorded as voting in Washington. Unless this February entry is faked, or unless this is a combination of two diaries, the Senators are practically eliminated. Most clues end in such blind alleys. A half century of research has not given the answer. Perhaps the most tireless sleuth, Frank Maloy Anderson, will find the clue.

The diary itself, if it is genuine, and there is much evidence to indicate that it is, gives many vivid touches to the period from December 28, 1860, to March 15, 1861. It is particularly interesting from the standpoint of the relations of Lincoln, Douglas, and Seward. It gives an account of a fantastic plot to kidnap Buchanan and make Breckinridge President and the efforts to promote a reunion of the nation by building a railroad to the Pacific. This mysterious looker on seems to see everything and talk with everybody. When we know who he was, we can better judge of his reliability. For the student of Pennsylvania history the most interesting item is a long account of Sumner's efforts to get the "Public Man" to aid him in an effort to keep Cameron out of Lincoln's cabinet.

University of Pennsylvania

ROY F. NICHOLS

Lee's Lieutenants: A Study in Command. By DOUGLAS SOUTHALL FREEMAN. Three volumes. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1942-1944. lvi, 773; xlv, 760; xlv, 862 p. Illustrations, maps, bibliography. \$15.00.)

In a time of the Nation's peril the fitness for command of our military and political leaders has much to do with determining both the length of a war and its cost in human life and treasure. When war comes the men at the top are often there as much because of age and seniority as from any other reason. This is more particularly true of the politicians in responsible position than with the leaders of the army, navy and air force. In any case, many of these men may be second-rate men. The fires in the crucible of war will soon burn out this second-rate dross in the military leadership, but in the political sphere longer time and greater heat is needed because many of the unfit have been elected to their positions or were appointed by elected officials for some political, personal or ideological reasons and are kept there for the same reasons even though their unfitness and incapacity may have been repeatedly demonstrated.

Dr. Freeman's *Study in Command* here presented considers only one phase of the problem so far as it related to the Confederacy. It is confined to the origin and development of the military leadership in terms of those who were appointed to responsible command in Virginia, some of whom be-

came Lee's lieutenants. The command careers of some were of short duration; others moved slowly upward through the mass, eventually arriving at or near the top. Limitations of age, physical condition, temperament, judgment, personal habits, intellect, alertness or audacity were the usual causes of failure. Often men who did well in subordinate command failed when released from the direction of a superior intellect; others failed because of age or poor health; others were temperamentally unfitted for command.

In his first volume—*Manassas to Malvern Hill*—Dr. Freeman analyzes the background, training and achievements of those who offered their services to Virginia in 1861 and shows how and why many of those who came first, failed and were replaced by more capable and usually younger men who had health, temperamental fitness to command, tenacity under pressure, resilience, adaptability to changing, unfamiliar, and unusual conditions, audacity, inventiveness, originality in movement and maneuver, and the like. First came Beauregard, the "Hero of Sumter," with "Prince" Magruder, the "preacher" D. H. Hill, "Pete" Longstreet and "Deacon" Jackson, the future "Stonewall," among his subordinate commanders. "Joe" Johnston soon followed and then came Lee, the magnificent. All the time subordinate commanders were working their way to the notice of the high command—A. P. Hill, J. B. Hood, Jeb Stuart and others replacing Huger, Holmes, Gustavus Smith, Whiting, Magruder and others who for one reason or another had failed. In this connection it is interesting to note that of the fourteen brigade commanders in Beauregard's Army of the Potomac at the First Bull Run, only five—Longstreet, Ewell, Early, Wade Hampton and Kirby Smith—were in responsible command at the beginning of 1865. Of the forty-odd regimental commanders only three were in divisional commands and one—A. P. Hill—was a corps commander. Other leaders in Beauregard's army had resigned, been killed in action, or were in minor commands.

The second volume—*Cedar Mountain to Chancellorsville*—is largely an account of Jackson's growth and evolution to the full stature of one of modern military history's best known strategists and tacticians. Withal, he was a forceful, dynamic leader who knew what he wanted to accomplish and who was able to execute his strategical and tactical conceptions in a minimum of time and with the least loss of life. Jackson was the rapier with which Lee forced his opponents into situations where his other principal lieutenant, Longstreet, could bludgeon the opposition into submission or retreat. Jackson's brilliant conceptions and masterly maneuvers, discussed with and approved by Lee, have always held the spotlight for the student and reader of military history, but it should never be forgotten that Longstreets' hard-hitting attacks were a necessary complement of Jackson's masterly maneuvering in order that they might be effective and successful. It was Lee's consummate genius that was able to understand, direct and co-ordinate the movements of the sensitive Jackson and the

hard-driving Longstreet to the successful attainment of the desired end. After Jackson's death this unusual combination was broken never to be reformed. The entire burden of command, in all its varied aspects, fell more and more on Lee's shoulders, even as the odds of men and materials against him increased. In addition to recounting the meteoric career of Jackson, the second volume also tells of the passing of the original and older of Lee's lieutenants and of the rise to prominence of younger men who were demonstrating on the field of battle their competence to command.

The third and final volume, centers in large measure on Longstreet. Justice is done to the lieutenant about whom long and bitter controversy has raged. Longstreet, the realist and skeptic, was right about Gettysburg when Lee was wrong, but he did much to contribute to the losing of the battle because he did not approve of it. Longstreet was a great general, who owed much of his success to Lee's firm and sympathetic control, but he was prone to be insubordinate and he suffered from an excess of strategical conceptions which occasionally were fantastic. A. P. Hill lacked Longstreet's breadth of vision and Jackson's executive ability, but as the last of the trio of Lee's corps commanders, was always a tower of strength both on the offensive and the defensive. Jeb Stuart brought to the leadership of the cavalry new conceptions and methods.

The first two volumes deal with the organization and command of Lee's army in victory. The final volume—Gettysburg to Appomattox—describes and analyzes the greatness in defeat of Lee's army—its leaders and personnel. It describes the destruction of a nation, the defeat of a great army bravely fighting against ever-increasing odds; it describes the course of the Army of Northern Virginia from high noon to the final setting of its sun and the resultant darkness of defeat and despair. Much of this final failure was due to the decline of Confederate manpower as it affected command, to the inability of Confederate resources and the failure of the Confederate military system to develop leaders of sufficient ability to replace those who failed to measure up to the requirements of command or who were killed or disabled by wounds and sickness. The erosion of leadership in the Army of Northern Virginia accelerated after Chancellorsville, rising to a peak during the bloody Wilderness campaign and the ensuing battles about Richmond and in the Shenandoah Valley. Men who had come to responsible command were stricken and their successors were untested, unprepared or even unfit for the new and added responsibilities. In the end the battle lines were stretched so thin and capable leaders were so few that the bond that held the Southern Confederacy together finally snapped. Appomattox and Reconstruction followed.

Dr. Freeman uses the development of army command as a unifying means of tying together the biographies of Lee's lieutenants and of showing why one failed and another succeeded. One of his conclusions is that "it was plain that a good general had been a good officer from the time of his first commission," but it was equally obvious that a man did not make a

good general simply because he had been a good captain or colonel. Likewise, good men who when subject to Lee's firm and intelligent control made good generals did not always succeed as independent commanders. This is strikingly illustrated in the case of Longstreet when he went to Bragg's army in Tennessee and later commanded independently in east Tennessee, and also in that of Hood as Joseph E. Johnston's successor in command of the Confederate Army of Tennessee. Dr. Freeman concludes that the experience of Lee's army demonstrates so far as may be that professional training in arms is essential for men who are to exercise command, but that such training does not guarantee success as a combat officer. "Command was essentially a gamble." Lee did not hesitate to relieve incompetent or temperamentally unfit commanders though at times he was hampered in finding suitable successors because of statute limitations or lack of suitable material.

The army to the command of which Lee was assigned on June 1, 1862, was a collection of brigades operating individually or in divisional organizations under officers not of his choice. In the ensuing thirty days this assortment of men and organizations became an army in name and in fact. Tactical and administrative considerations caused Lee to divide his army roughly into two wings under Longstreet and Jackson. When the campaigning of the summer of 1862 demonstrated that this arrangement could be improved on, the army was organized as the First and Second Corps, headed respectively by Longstreet and Jackson, a division that was continued until after Jackson's death at Chancellorsville. Subsequently a Third Corps, commanded by A. P. Hill, was constituted and this three corps arrangement continued to Appomattox.

One of Lee's superior attributes was his general good health and uninhibited judgment. Weapons may change and methods improve, but the fundamental conditions of successful military operations and the characteristics required of leaders are unchanging. Fundamental strategy and tactics and the varied problems of logistics still determine the outcome of battle, campaign, or war. A skillful and capable leader will select and draw to himself the lieutenants needed to carry out his plans and will promptly replace those who fail either in understanding or execution.

Lee's "incomparable infantry" constituted the backbone of his army, as has been the case throughout recorded military history and as has been demonstrated on world war battlefields. The leaders must have loyal, devoted followers; these followers must have capable leaders. The Wilderness campaign for Lee, though technically a Confederate victory, was achieved at such a cost in the losses in the higher command as, in fact, to have constituted a defeat. Lee's strategy and tactics were of an unusually high order, the heroism of the men in the ranks has seldom been equalled, but the character of the Federal leadership and the immense growth in Northern resources made it clear that neither military genius nor fortitude were enough. Lee and his army soon went down in total defeat. The con-

flict had been fought to a physical finish. It was not a Southern effort to impose one way of life and political, economic and social system on another, but rather it was a fight for a way of life, for a political ideal, for home and fireside, for the right to govern one's self as desired.

In concluding a careful reading and survey of the three volumes one cannot but marvel at two things: the steadfastness and inspiring character of Lee as a man and a soldier and the thoroughness with which the relations of Lee and his lieutenants have been studied and evaluated. One of Lee's valuable characteristics was that he constantly attracted capable and brilliant young men. His discernment singled them out and by precept and example he inspired the best in them and he was never disappointed. Many of them died on the field of battle and all of them were wounded one or more times in the thick of conflict. The loss or disablement of these young, capable, and inspiring leaders had much to do with the final defeat of Lee and his army. "At desperate hours, when soldiers most needed intelligent direction, many of their officers took chances more desperate, and, falling, made disaster complete."

Dr. Freeman is interested, almost wholly, in personalities and their effect on each other; he has sought to determine why one man succeeded and another failed; he has presented "a study in command" solely as it concerned Lee and Virginia. In doing so he has neglected the contribution—physical, material and moral—made to Lee and Virginia by regions elsewhere in the Confederacy. Success and failure in other parts of the Southland vitally affected the effectiveness of Lee's leadership in Virginia. Nearly three-fourths of the leaders and of the men they led came from beyond the confines of Virginia; the origin of the supplies and munitions that enabled Lee to fight effectively is not given consideration. In fact for Dr. Freeman Virginia and the Confederacy are synonymous and exclusive. The rest of the Confederacy, by implication, contributed little or nothing to Lee's success or to the four-year defense of Richmond.

Likewise, there is no discussion of weapons, either small arms or artillery. In view of the great development and high specialization of weapons in the last twenty-five years, many readers perhaps will find apparent contradictions in Dr. Freeman's battle accounts as compared to those presented in the accounts of the recent fighting on the far-flung battlefields of the world. Although the weapons have changed in range, power, and variety, the requirements for successful command in the formulation of grand strategy and in the tactical handling of troops have changed hardly at all. Troops now seldom face each other in serried ranks firing point blank at each other, but the essentials of competency and personal leadership in the command, troop mobility and adaptability to changing or unusual conditions are still essentials in combat. While weapons and methods have changed, fundamental principles are immutable. In the last analysis the man on the ground with a gun in his hand is the final arbiter in military conflict.

The essential contribution of Dr. Freeman in this *Study in Command* is his account of the growth and evolution of the successful field commanders

in Lee's army from the unknown subalterns to the dynamic and forceful leaders of men. He has shown that the essential equipment for such success is good judgment, health and good physical condition, an equable temperament and audacity in movement and maneuver. Of these health and good physical condition combined with understanding and judgment are perhaps the most important. An officer in high command who is in poor health or suffering from the effects of wounds is often a liability, hard to get along with, irascible and intolerant, uncertain and unreliable under pressure and in a crisis. It has been so through all of the military history of the world.

Dr. Freeman has made a valuable contribution to American military history. Thanks to his industry and interpretation, no army has ever been so well known as the Army of Northern Virginia. He has presented a record of heroes and of heroism which constitutes a precious and an enduring heritage not only to the South but to all the nation. It is a record of the great deeds of Lee and his lieutenants; it is a record of the devotion, the courage, the fortitude, the patience and the loyalty of the common soldiers, who always bear the brunt of the battle and who made Lee and his lieutenants possible; it is a record that will endure as an inspiration as long as this nation survives.

This work of three volumes is based on sound, extensive, and original research and study. The narrative flows smoothly and because it is concerned with men, and personalities, the interest never flags. It is based on an extended and careful study and interpretation of letters, diaries, and special studies of the period. Because of the many individuals who move across Dr. Freeman's panorama, it would have been helpful to the general reader if a table showing the organization of the Army of Northern Virginia to the extent of indicating the brigade, divisional, and corps commanders had been included. Each volume has a useful bibliography of the "Principal Manuscript Sources" and a brief "Short-Title Index." Each volume has a number of illustrations and maps and a good index; and each has a number of appendices—the most interesting of which are a discussion of the origin of the name "Stonewall" in volume II and of "The Careers of Lee's Lieutenants after Appomattox" in volume III. This latter volume also contains a long list of "Acknowledgments" and a "Select Critical Bibliography" which is especially valuable for the manuscript sources which it lists. There is no consolidated index of the three volumes.

Locust Valley, N. Y.

THOMAS ROBSON HAY

Delaware's Buried Past, a Story of Archaeological Adventure. By C. A. WESLAGER. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1944. ix, 170 p. Illustrated. \$2.50.)

History and its allied sciences profit in many ways from the entrance of journalists into their domains. One such benefit is the stylistic improvement

which the journalist, trained to be conscious of the audience for which he is writing, brings to the field. A second benefit is the increased productivity in historical writing, for the journalist not only knows how to write but does write.

Delaware history has profited in both these respects from the interest of Mr. C. A. Weslager, a former Pennsylvania journalist. A resident of Delaware for less than a decade, he has enriched its printed legend by two recent volumes published only a year apart. Following a recital of the unfamiliar story of the Moors and the Nanticokes, *Delaware's Forgotten Folk*, he has turned his attention to recording what is known of those whom he believes to be their ancestors, the Indians of Delaware. In doing so, he has produced no scholarly definitive study of aboriginal life in what became Penn's lower counties, but rather a record of the progress being made toward the time when such a definitive survey may be written. *Delaware's Buried Past* is not so much a study of the past itself as it is a chronicle of the digging up thereof—in other words, "A Story of Archaeological Adventure" in Delaware, to quote the subtitle.

Employing a well-developed sense of suspense, Mr. Weslager makes a fascinating romance of the interest found in the contents of Delaware's soil by three Philadelphians of the nineteenth century—Dr. Joseph Leidy, the parasitologist, who explored the Lewes shell heaps, Francis Jordan, importer of chemicals, who unearthed the Rehoboth encampment, and Hilborne T. Cresson, who excavated near Claymont in search of relics of a pre-Indian culture. The archaeologist's spade and trowel passed from the hands of these out-of-staters to a small band of Delawareans, including Joseph Wigglesworth, who gathered the largest collection of Delaware artifacts, now housed at the University of Delaware. Another impetus to local study was provided in 1933 and 1934, when another Philadelphian, Dr. D. S. Davidson, of the Department of Anthropology of the University of Pennsylvania, invited Delaware archaeologists to join him and his students in investigations along Slaughter Creek in northeastern Sussex County. In the earlier of these years the Archaeological Society of Delaware, of which Mr. Weslager is now president, had been formed and its members, well trained for their task by association with the Davidson party, have since that time directed, performed, and assessed most of the work of local excavation. Their efforts on free week ends and holidays to keep ahead of the steam-shovels of contractors and the growth of communities, encroaching upon and threatening to seal for centuries lands where Indian remains are likely to be found, make no less interesting a tale than the initial discoveries of the early investigators.

After relating the story of his own experiences with various excavations in Sussex County and at Crane Hook, near Wilmington, Mr. Weslager performs the valuable service of listing the types of Indian relics, from arrowheads to trade pipes, which have been found in Delaware. Another service is his summary of what is known of Indian civilization in this small

state and its relation to the culture of other Indian tribes of the present United States and especially those tribes which lived in areas near Delaware.

In well-phrased prose, interweaving interesting characterizations of individual archaeologists as well as a generous background of the history of archaeology in the United States, and with the help of excellent and plentiful illustrations, Mr. Weslager has done justice to his story. His bibliography evidences the activity of the Archaeological Society and the wisdom of its policy of publishing the results of its members' investigations.

The volume is so useful that it is a shame it has been published without an index. Compensation for the lack of notes is in part provided by a topical bibliography. More care should have been taken in certain geographical references: Lewes is near the junction of the Delaware Bay and the Atlantic Ocean, not of the river and bay (p. 10); Rehoboth Beach lies on the ocean, not on Delaware Bay (p. 21); Naaman's Creek runs near, but not "through the town of Claymont" (p. 34); Cedar Creek runs eastward, not westward to the bay (p. 97). It might also be noted that the town is Edge Moor, not Edgemore (p. 46), and that "the Late Neolithic or Early Paleolithic" Age (p. 152) is somewhat paradoxical.

The value of such a volume as this is considerable. It should lead to greater popular appreciation of American archaeology, to the development of increased interest in our local backgrounds and thus a greater pride in and sense of obligation to our native culture. By an intriguing display of the romance of archaeology—e.g., the mystery of Indian Hole Farm (pp. 146, 148)—Mr. Weslager's book will surely interest many in this field for the first time and will spur on the initiates to fresh endeavor.

At the present rate of progress of Delaware archaeology, it may be possible that another generation will produce a definitive study of the Indians of Delaware, and perhaps of the whole Delmarva Peninsula. It is to be hoped that such a volume will be as appealing to the general public as is Mr. Weslager's account of *Delaware's Buried Past*.

University of Delaware

JOHN A. MUNROE

West to the Setting Sun. By HARVEY CHALMERS, 2D. (Toronto: The Macmillan Co. of Canada, Ltd., 1943. xii, 362 p.)

Mr. Chalmers has written a most vivid and exciting novel of New York state in the period leading up to and including the American Revolution. His theme is the early history of Joseph Brant, noted Mohawk warrior who led the main body of the Iroquois in frontier warfare against the Americans during the Revolution. Although Mr. Chalmers has chosen a most difficult era of Iroquois history and the least known and most conjectural portion of Joseph Brant's life for his study, he does a remarkable job of adhering to the historical facts, insofar as they have been recorded. Nevertheless, the greater part of the book deals with material which is not in history, and

which is highly imaginative and filled with excited action. On the whole, it is a book which should be much enjoyed by the reader of historical fiction.

The author of an historical novel is certainly allowed the literary license necessary to make a good story of his material. Mr. Chalmers has distorted very few of the facts. However, he and the editors are not willing merely to let the book stand as a piece of historical fiction. The author, according to his acknowledgment and the foreword by Mr. Arthur Pound, wishes to picture the Indian as he really thought and lived, and wishes his results to be considered "really Indian." According to the wrapper, "Seven years of research, writing, and rewriting have resulted in a story of the American Revolutionary War which embodies the most vivid and authentic pictures of Indian life which have yet been written."

This is hardly true, for the picture of Iroquois culture is very one-sided and places extreme emphasis on Iroquois warfare. Had Mr. Chalmers spent more time with Joseph Brant's own people, the conservative Longhouse Iroquois of Grand River, Ontario, his characters would neither talk or act after the fashion they do. Neither would his book contain so many erroneous characterizations and interpretations of specific phases of Iroquois life. It is a case of the book being written without sufficient attention to the living people who should serve as models and interpreters. The people of the book are still storybook Indians. The conversations are a combination of the speech of an Army officer of Brant's time and of an imitation of the figurative speech of the Indian orator. The constant repetition of a few Mohawk words makes these conversational effects even more strained. Finally, a few specific errors should be pointed out. Catherine Crogan was probably Brant's wife according to Indian custom before they were married by Butler in the manner of white people. Brant's Indian name, Thayendanegea, means "He who places two bets side by side" (referring to the attendant in the sacerdotal bowl-game of the Longhouse), not merely "He who holds the bets." Brant's telling his son to eat the heart of the man they have killed is one of the most conspicuous examples of ethnological blunder. However, Mr. Chalmers' book is historical fiction, and as such it should be read. It is a stirring and interest-holding account of one of the most reckless and tragic eras of Iroquois history, and as such it is to be recommended.

University of Pennsylvania

JOHN WITTHOFT

John Dooley, Confederate Soldier: His War Journal. Edited by JOSEPH T. DURKIN, S. J. Foreword by DOUGLAS SOUTHAL FREEMAN (Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press, 1945. xxiii, 244 p. \$3.00.)

The author of this journal was twenty years of age when he left Georgetown College to enlist in the Confederate Army in the summer of 1862. He fought with the famous First Virginia Infantry through Second Manassas,

South Mountain, Sharpsburg, Fredericksburg, and Gettysburg. At Gettysburg he was wounded, captured, and in due course sent to Johnson's Island from which he was exchanged on parole in time to visit his parents in Richmond before the fall of that city. During April, 1865, he made a journey south by way of Lynchburg, Danville, Greensboro, and Salisbury to Charlotte from which point he returned to Richmond. In September, 1865, he entered the Novitiate of the Jesuit Order at Georgetown, where he remained until his death in 1873. The diary ends with the entry of May 6, 1865.

Young Dooley rewrote parts of his journal while a prisoner of war and other parts were revised later. The editor has used some portions of the revised journal but these are distinguished from the original which constitutes by far the larger portion of that printed. It is not always easy to tell the date of the entry, and occasionally there is some confusion in names, but otherwise the editing seems clear enough.

There is no doubt of Dooley's patriotism and willingness to die in the cause of liberty which, to him, was the cause of the Confederacy. From a distance he had learned to abhor the Yankees, and on closer acquaintance during his prison days this feeling increased. So long as the war lasted he did not cease his uncomplimentary references to the money-making Puritans and the "whining hypocrites of N. England." Moreover, there were similar strong animadversions against the Irish who fought in the Union Army, though Dooley himself was Irish. Besides the expressions of sentiment on the glory of the cause, and the horrors of war, there are the more realistic details of camp life, the ready-made humour of the soldiers and their efforts to relieve the drabness of camp by their own brand of "fun." There are comments on the methods of keeping discipline, the lack of food and other hardships, the feeling of men in battle, and the excessive weariness that few escaped.

Young Dooley's account of his wounding at Gettysburg and the terrible carnage there, the lack of medical care, or even fresh water, for the wounded and dying, his arrival at Fort McHenry which was filthy and full of vermin and almost without beds, and where a Yankee doctor with a faint show of kindness was good enough to pick the maggots from his wound, all suggest that the improvements in modern warfare are not all on the debit side. The situation improved somewhat at Johnson's Island, and Dooley joined the Thespians who undertook to amuse their fellow prisoners. Even here, however, it was discovered that rats could be quite a delicacy.

If this journal adds no startling facts to our knowledge of the Civil War, it is nevertheless authentic and revealing, and students will be glad that it has been made available.

Duke University

R. H. WOODY

A Letter by Dr. Benjamin Rush, Describing The Consecration of the German College at Lancaster in June, 1787. Printed, with an Introduction and Notes, from a newly discovered Manuscript, now in the Fackenthal Library at Franklin and Marshall College. (Lancaster: Published by Order of the College, 1945. 37 p. Limited.)

The introduction and notes referred to are by Lyman H. Butterfield, who is now preparing a definitive edition of the letters of Benjamin Rush. His treatment of this item is superb, and the typographical excellence of the volume makes it a handsome specimen for collectors of fine books.

Franklin College was an inter-sectarian, bi-lingual establishment, a significant part of the effort of the Germans of Pennsylvania to participate in the larger life of the state. It was also a significant part of the effort of the Federalists to win the German vote for the new constitution which they hoped would come from the Convention sitting in Philadelphia.

It was not to begin with one of the major interests of Dr. Rush, as Dickinson College at Carlisle had been, but with characteristic enthusiasm the Doctor absorbed the whole movement in his elastic schedule of humanitarian works, and found the occasion of the founding of the college "one of the highest entertainments I ever enjoyed in my life."

Rush did not greatly admire the German character in Pennsylvania for reasons he describes in this letter to his mother-in-law. But he had confidence in the college and its future. "The fears of some little minded men, that we shall have too many Colleges," he wrote, "& too many learned men, are as absurd as it would be to say that we shall have too plentiful harvests—too much religion—or too much happiness—"

Mr. Butterfield will have no difficulty demonstrating his contention that Rush was one of the most gifted epistolary stylists in an age when, as the late Miss Leach used to say, "the *bourgeoisie* corresponded, but *Gentlemen* wrote letters!"

The Free Library of Philadelphia

J. H. POWELL