This small volume has a distinguished parentage. A conference of the Social Science Research Council was devoted to the discussion of "Trends in Research on American History." This meeting led to the appointment of a Committee on Historiography composed of eight scholars widely and favorably known in the profession. The Committee decided "it might best fulfill its obligations to the Council and to the historical profession by preparing a manual designed to help clarify thought about history and to aid historians in teaching and writing it."

The natural expectations aroused when such a group of scholars avow such a purpose are not fulfilled. The book will, it is true, provoke and will sometimes clarify thought about the writing and study of history. It will not, however, be more useful than previous literature which is readily available. Moreover it provides little or no light on some of the dark areas through which the present generation of writers and students of history is groping its way.

The first chapter written by Charles A. Beard is entitled "Grounds for a Reconsideration of Historiography." This chapter could have been omitted without much loss.

The second chapter devoted to "Controlling Assumptions in the Practice of American Historians" is by John Herman Randall, Jr., and George Haines, IV. It is a valuable and thoughtful discussion of the part played by the frames of reference according to which historians select certain facts as significant, and especially of certain of these assumptions which have determined the nature of much of the history written in America. The main objection that can be made to this penetrating analysis is that the authors, like the good historians they are, concern themselves too much with past assumptions and too little with those which control the scholars now at work. The present generation can see clearly and can scarcely refrain from smiling at the assumptions of their scholarly grandparents without being keenly aware of their own mental processes. Would it not, therefore, have better served the purpose of this study to have devoted less space to the Teutonic germ theory of the generation from 1876 to 1901 so as to have some space for the assumptions of the 1940's? Everyone who writes or studies history must confront the problem of human behavior and must accordingly make certain psychological assumptions. An analysis of those commonly made, of the changes in them resulting from the development of
the science of psychology during the recent past and of their influence on
the history being written would be of more value to historical scholarship
than the exceedingly good accounts of older assumptions no longer potent.
In addition to the psychological there are many other current assumptions
that could be studied with profit. One of these the authors themselves
illustrate when, referring to the present and their own generation of scholar-
ship, they assert, "With this practical recognition of the functional nature
of historical knowledge, American historiography had come of age." Here
is an assumption, based on the egotism of the present, which controls the
practice of many historians. Did not American history come of age when
Bancroft published his first volume in 1834, as G. P. Gooch said using those
very words, and will it not continue to "come of age" for every generation
in the indefinite future?

The third chapter, by Howard K. Beale, is a study of "What Historians
Have Said about the Causes of the Civil War." This is the longest and prob-
able the most instructive section of the book. No student can fail to benefit
from the experience of reading this judicious analysis of explanations of the
coming of the Civil War by American historians. At least it will make him
temporarily humble in his own conclusions. At best it can make him aware
of the complexity of causation in human affairs and of the need of historians
for great wisdom as well as for erudition.

The fourth chapter, entitled "Problems of Terminology in Historical
Writing," consists of several pages of explanation by Charles A. Beard and
over twenty pages of definitions by Sidney Hook. The original plan had
been to collect from various histories numerous illustrations of the ways in
which fifty words or terms were used and then to have Professor Hook
correlate the results and formulate definitions as exact as possible. This
proving impossible, the definitions of Mr. Hook alone are presented. The
definition of "Cause" occupies almost six printed pages and a little over
three pages are devoted to "Understanding." Without denying the value of
epistemology and semantics as branches of knowledge, and without mini-
mizing the problems of terminology for historical scholarship, it can be
doubted that this section will materially aid historians in their teaching
and writing.

The fifth and final chapter contains what is evidently the heart of the
report of the Committee on Historiography. Believing that every branch of
knowledge rests upon a number of propositions accepted as valid by scholars
in such fields, the Committee attempted to formulate the propositions in
historiography which they and other historians would accept. Twenty-one
such "Propositions" are presented. Proposition XV states an ideal to which
anyone could subscribe with no apparent danger and with no discernible
benefit. It says "The ideal which controls the historian in search of the
utmost knowledge of the past is to achieve the most informed understanding
of occurrences and personalities that available sources and discriminating
imagination will permit, so as to write history with the highest possible
degree of credibility.” There are others equally bromidic. Proposition XX, for instance, says that historians must work in close and constant co-operation with specialists in the social sciences and humanities. Some of the propositions make one desire either reconciliation or more explanation. Proposition VI states that every written history “is a selection of facts made by some person or persons and is ordered or organized under the influence of some scheme of reference, interest, or emphasis—avowed or unavowed—in the thought of the author or authors.” On the other hand Proposition IX says, “Those who work in historiography in the scientific spirit cannot embrace any of the absolutes put forth by theologians or philosophers of any school as furnishing mandates by which the data of the past must be selected and organized or shaped to fit the institutional requirements of those who espouse such absolutes.” Of course, if IX means merely that the historian must not blatantly select only the facts which will conform to the philosophy of Karl Marx or of St. Thomas Aquinas, most scholars would agree. Nonetheless it suggests bothersome questions. What if that frame of reference, which Proposition VI asserts every historian must have, is an absolute put forth by some school of thought? And isn’t Proposition VI itself an absolute of that philosophical school known as relativism?

There is one proposition conspicuously missing from the list. Not many years ago the theory expounded to graduate students and unchallenged in the profession was that a scholar should examine all the source material on his subject and should read all the secondary studies. Obviously practice among historians of the modern period does not follow theory except when the historian confines himself strictly to a monograph on some small phase of a subject. Yet who among them employs a deliberate method of sampling or knows the theories of the physicists and mathematicians on sampling as a means of establishing truth? A committee which will face this problem and formulate a new theory on which the profession can operate would render a great service to historical scholarship.

No review of this volume should fail to point out that it includes a very valuable Selective Reading List prepared by Ronald Thompson.

University of Washington

W. STULL HOLT


This volume presents what appears to be a better story of the West than of Trent. Mr. Slick has not been particularly successful in filling in the unknown gaps in the life of this Indian trader and land speculator. While the material gathered together shows a logical organization and describes some of the most interesting episodes of our colonial frontier history, a student of the period is not apt to learn anything new from it. Much of the
material condensed into this book has been published in its original form, and the basic western patterns, which Mr. Slick interprets for us, have also appeared before.

Some of the omissions with respect to Trent's life are disappointing. Mr. Slick does little more than mention his extensive activities in the fur trade, and does not discuss them in an informative manner. A very real need for a study of this trade exists, and one would have expected to have found some sort of contribution to it in a life of William Trent. Mr. Slick appears unfamiliar with the Hockley, Croghan, Trent partnership arrangements, and does not mention Trent's voyage to England in 1749 on its behalf. His treatment of Trent's employment in the Ohio Company might well have merited more importance. Additional information about his suit with Dinwiddie, which one might infer to be a suit for slander, would also have been of interest. It was Trent's attorney who caused the former governor's arrest. Washington, somewhat critically handled by Mr. Slick, helped Trent get restitution for carrying the two Indian presents and for military services. While noting that Trent served on the Forbes expedition as an assistant working with the southern Indians, Mr. Slick fails to mention the desertion of the Cherokees at a critical moment. This episode had a great significance in shaping Indian policy for years to come, and Trent must have played some part in it. His statement that Fort Duquesne was reoccupied "in exactly the same manner as the French had acquired it—without firing a shot!" is misleading and would not account for the men lost under Grant and Burd. With reference to Trent's duties as an Indian agent at Fort Pitt, he simply states that Trent attended treaties and performed "routine activities," a rather barren commentary. This reviewer feels that Mr. Slick is often uncertain of Trent's itinerary.

Mr. Slick was one of the first users of a journal received by this Society in 1935 which was believed to have been Trent's. As he notes in his bibliography, it was not until after his book had been set in type that he received information that this journal had been recatalogued as that of George Croghan. At the same time he was informed of new Trent material which would have been of great value had he felt able to use it. His paraphrase of the journal, which takes up twenty per cent of the book, does not reveal critical research or interpretation nor is it supplemented with much other material.

In correcting his book to place Croghan as the author of the journal, Mr. Slick seems to have made an effort to associate Trent with it as an assistant Indian agent until the last conceivable hour. The last official date I can find on which Trent served in the Indian department was October 26, 1759. He was not included on Croghan's pay roll, starting December 1, 1759. Sir William Johnson, in mentioning Indian agents at Fort Pitt in that month, does not include Trent's name. He did not attend the Indian conferences in April, 1760. Around this time Croghan employed a new agent, Thomas Hutchins, whom I regard as Trent's successor. In May, Trent went into the
Indian trade which should have disbarred him from serving in the Indian department. Nevertheless, Mr. Slick states that he left the service "about" January, 1761, presumably on the basis of a list of Croghan's assistants of that date which, of course, did not include Trent's name.

The last third of Mr. Slick's book is devoted to the land company promotion schemes. This story is antedated by George E. Lewis' earlier (1941) volume, *The Indiana Company 1763-1798*. Although this book appeared six years prior to Mr. Slick's, it should be noted that Mr. Lewis used Slick's unpublished doctoral thesis and was closely influenced by it.

The authoritativeness of Mr. Slick's work is diminished by an excessive number of minor errors in spelling and, in fact, most of which could readily have been avoided. The reader should note that the index is far from inclusive of all names appearing in the book.

*Ambler, Pa.*

Nicholas B. Wainwright

*Jefferson: War and Peace 1776 to 1784.* By *Marie Kimball.* (New York: Coward-McCann, Inc., 1947, x, 398 p. Illustrations, index. $6.00.)

Mrs. Kimball in *Jefferson: War and Peace* seems to have undertaken a eulogy of Jefferson, much as she did of his father, Peter Jefferson, in *Road to Glory*. It does not seem to the writer of this review that Jefferson needs either eulogies or excuses. Every man must have his weaknesses and it would seem as if Jefferson had fewer than most. There are few who would not rank him among the five greatest Americans, possibly higher insofar as personal accomplishment is concerned. Jefferson was what would today be called an isolationist, perhaps even a pacifist. He hated war and knew nothing about soldiering. There is then no question of cowardice, and it seems to be stretching a point to make that charge against him because he did not wait at Monticello to be captured by Tarleton. Perhaps Wayne, Henry Lee, or McClean might have done something about it, but they were soldiers who loved a fight, and Jefferson was not of that temperament. He was, furthermore, a philosopher, and his reasoning probably said, "The Governor of Virginia should under no circumstances be captured." He was undoubtedly correct.

So far, I gladly agree with Mrs. Kimball, but she is not satisfied with this and spends half her book attempting to prove Jefferson a great war governor when, as a matter of fact, history and his own words signify that he was a very poor one. It seems to me that Eckenrode, in *Virginia in the Revolution* (Chapter 8), tells the complete story and adequately answers all Mrs. Kimball's queries!

There is not the slightest doubt that Jefferson had an almost insuperable job, nor is there any doubt that he gave his "all" to saving Virginia. Certainly no man could have worked harder than he did. Nor is there any doubt that he was most unselfish in sending men and supplies to Washington
and Green. Whether or not this was wise is problematical. Jefferson thought he was doing right, and few questioned the action at the time. I will agree with Mrs. Kimball that he received small co-operation, but is it not probable that a Washington, a Green, a Wayne or even a Nelson would have received more by their warlike measures? Jefferson thought Nelson could do better than he, and it is for this reason that he refused a third term as governor. It did not take much perspicacity to foresee that sooner or later Clinton would attack Virginia, and Washington so warned Jefferson several times. When the attack came Virginia was lamentably unprepared. This would seem to be the criterion upon which the merit of a good wartime governor should rest. Mrs. Kimball is a great scholar, and her research in *Jefferson: War and Peace* has been tremendous. If (and history seems to belie it) a good case for Jefferson as a war governor could be made, she has come as near as possible to establishing one. It does not seem to me that Jefferson's greatness suffers one iota because he could not cope with this difficult situation.

The two years of Jefferson's governship are the least known of his whole life. He had little time for personal correspondence and about half his official correspondence was destroyed by the British. Consequently, Mrs. Kimball has done a real service to history in resurrecting what little there is left.

I have not dwelt on George Nicholas' stupid charges in the Virginia Assembly against Jefferson, which probably hurt him more than any other event of his life. He spoke of it to Adams as late as 1820. Jefferson was completely exonerated; his fault was one of omission, not of commission. Mrs. Kimball makes a good bit of this exoneration, which to me seems rather unimportant. I also have not dwelt on her chapter devoted to the "Notes on Virginia" which have been discussed so ably and so often.

*Philadelphia*  
Frederic R. Kirkland

*Moreau de St. Méry's American Journey [1793-1798].* Translated and edited by Kenneth Roberts and Anna M. Roberts. Introduction by Stewart L. Mims. (Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1947, xxi, 394 p. $5.00.)

On November 16, 1794, over his shop on Front Street near Walnut in Philadelphia, a French émigré hung up a "beautiful signboard" which bore the legend, "Moreau de St. Méry and Co. Bookseller, Printer and Stationer." Thus began the Philadelphia career of one of the most distinguished of the French and Santo Domingan refugees to America, a jurist and scholar, sometime president of the électeurs of Paris in 1789, and the author of a diary and compiler of data on the United States which together form the present work.

Examined by three or four students in the nineteenth century, Moreau's
manuscript was published in its original French in 1913 by Mr. Mims, who has contributed a biographical introduction to this new edition. Mr. and Mrs. Roberts have made this accurate and literary translation of Mims' edition and so have brought the journal to a larger audience. They have, however, added little by way of explanatory notes; they have allowed most of Moreau's errors to stand unnoted; and they have made no effort to track down the sources of his information.

The translation alone, of course, was worth doing, for Moreau is worth reading. It is true that the diary lacks individuality; that many entries are tantalizingly incomplete (there is no recorded impression of Washington, whom Moreau saw address Congress; no characterization of the Duc d'Orleans, who came to call; no account of what transpired at the meetings of the Philosophical Society, of which he was a member); and that the whole journal has an unfinished quality about it—for it was never prepared by its author for publication. At the same time, however, it must be allowed that this combination of diary, in-letter file, and memorandum book holds a good deal of miscellaneous information, a few unforgettable pictures (as of the homesick émigrés who used to come to Moreau's shop at night and, long after Mme. Moreau had tried to send them home, talked and gossiped, and tussled like boys), and some penetrating observations. The pages on sexual morality in Philadelphia must make Moreau's journal unique among those of the period. This is by no means the most informative or the liveliest of the eighteenth century travel journals, but it is useful and honest; it was not made with a scissors and paste pot.

By 1794 Americans were revealing some of those traits of character which so struck visitors half a century later. The twenty-five passengers who crowded aboard a Chesapeake Bay vessel at Baltimore, talking, snoring, and chewing tobacco, may have been reincarnated on the Erie Canal in 1840. Moreau remarked the mobility of population in America, the unfortunate effect of the merchant aristocracy on aesthetics, the indifference or hostility to foreigners and the hospitality to strangers, the willful and naughty children and (a questionable blessing of liberty) the freedom with which strangers shared the same hotel bed. Even national boasting was developing—"the Governor of Philadelphia" told Moreau "that America wouldn't change places with any other country in the world, since in America one could have venison, turtle and wine."

Moreau's life in America was useful and not unpleasant. By virtue of his position in Santo Domingo and in France and because of his own character and talents he was well received. But he was not deceived by the spontaneous sympathy he saw for the French. "In spite of their pretended detestation of the English," he observed shrewdly of his American hosts but recently come to nationhood, "they really love them, even though they fear them. In spite of their conceit, they subconsciously feel themselves to be inferior to the English, and this leads them to treat them with adulation."

Dickinson College

Whitfield J. Bell, Jr.

Charles Sellers here continues and completes the engaging biography of his remarkable ancestor, of which the first volume, The Artist of the Revolution, appeared in 1939. Meanwhile the American Philosophical Society has taken up the project, and with reason. Peale was the first Curator of the collections of the Society, those of his own Museum being housed, wholly or partly, in its building from 1797 to 1810. His son Franklin, born there, was ceremoniously exhibited to the members and named for the founder. Since 1939, the Society has bought the Peale papers, aided the author with grants, and now presents his second volume. A third will comprise a catalogue raisonné of paintings by Charles Willson Peale.

In the years after 1790, Peale’s chief interest was in his Museum, which became increasingly one of natural history. Painting became secondary among his activities, although, as illustrations in this volume amply show, it was by no means abandoned. His greatest triumph was his excavation, in 1801, of the bones of the mastodon—the first organized scientific expedition in America, financed by the Philosophical Society. The discoveries encouraged the Legislature to grant to Peale for the Museum, the Old State House (Independence Hall), where it flourished, then languished in its founder’s last years. The conflict between the demands of science and of showmanship—of which Peale was also a master—dogged it as it must every museum dependent on the fees of visitors.

The endless fertility of mind, in other fields, of this ingenious, sanguine man receives due attention from the author, who likewise does full justice to the numerous members of Peale’s patriarchal family.

The book is written with a warm humanity and a mastery of language which make it a delight to read.

Philadelphia Museum of Art

Fiske Kimball

The Selected Writings of Benjamin Rush. Edited by Dagobert D. Runes. (New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1947, xii, 433 p. Appendix, index. $5.00.)

Only one thing about this collection of Rush’s writings can be commended. That is the idea of compiling it. As a writer of considerable force and charm and of unquestionable importance in our early cultural history, Rush deserves to be known by a larger public than the small minority who frequent research libraries. In 1800, Rush was regarded as the leading literary figure of Philadelphia; his output in the form of essays, addresses, scientific papers, pamphlets and books treating an amazing variety of subjects was prodigious. President Jefferson told Rush that he “read with delight everything that comes from your pen.” Ex-president Adams de-
clared in 1811: "Your writings are always as entertaining as The Lady of The Lake and much more instructive." Among other admirers outside the medical profession were Priestley, Dickinson, Madison and Noah Webster. These men were good judges of matter and style. The truth is that Rush was the progenitor of the distinguished line of American physician-authors which includes Holmes, Mitchell, and Osler. But with the waning of his reputation as a physician, his writings, nonmedical as well as medical, fell into a neglect that is unaccountable to those who know their quality.

The more is the pity, then, that the need created by these circumstances has not been better met in this volume. Four hundred pages is not enough to represent all sides of Rush's output adequately, but even within these bounds a better selection could have been made. The editor has disposed his material under four topical heads: "good government," "education," "natural and medical sciences," and "miscellaneous things." The first section, which includes examples of Rush's humanitarian propaganda, is the most nearly adequate among the four. The section on education prints the tedious "Defence of the Bible as a School Book" but omits the stimulating "Observations upon the Study of the Latin and Greek Languages" and the important "Thoughts upon Female Education." By far the longest section is that on the sciences, but it is also the least satisfactory. Two very long pieces—"Three Lectures upon Animal Life" and the early "Oration" on Indian diseases and medicine—, here printed entire, would have been improved rather than injured by abridgement. Space would then have been available for one or more of Rush's clinical inquiries or at least for some excerpts from his pioneering treatise on "Diseases of the Mind," Rush's most influential book. Though the miscellaneous fourth section of the anthology covers a good deal of ground, it does not include either of Rush's significant essays in ethnology—on the Pennsylvania Germans and the Pennsylvania Scotch-Irish—or any example of his charming series of biographical sketches of such figures as the Quaker saint, Anthony Benezet, and the "baker-general" of the Continental Army, Christopher Ludwick. Readers of this book will thus obtain only a partial grasp of Rush's intellectual range and fertility.

It is futile, of course, to quarrel with an anthologist's choices. Since none of Rush's work has been easily available heretofore, this collection renders a service deserving of thanks. But the thanks can be bestowed only grudgingly, for the volume has been put together with a total disregard for the procedures and standards of scholarly editing. It is in fact a monument of editorial irresponsibility. The editor's contribution is slight, perfunctory, and highly inaccurate. His preface, functioning as an introduction but covering only four and a half meager pages, provides an appraisal of Rush of which the principal point seems to be that Rush was a great man because he was a friend of Tom Paine and a collaborator of Paine's in social reform. It is true that Rush and Paine were friendly during Paine's first years in Philadelphia, but to identify their philosophical points of view is thoroughly
misleading. The facsimile used as a frontispiece in this book shows how misleading. It is a page from the manuscript of Rush's autobiography, now at the American Philosophical Society, and contains the well-known statement that Rush instigated *Common Sense* and supplied its title. But farther down the same page Rush enters on a discussion of "the extensive mischief" done by Paine's writings on religion. Perhaps not so great a man as Paine, and certainly not so gifted a writer, Rush was a more complicated personality. For all his social awareness, he had a deep vein of orthodoxy in his make-up evident in his political activities during the Confederation period and in his religious thinking all through life. But of this we learn nothing from Mr. Runes' commentary, which supplies instead a few biographical facts, partly garbled, and a good many exclamations over Rush's crusading zeal. No serious attempt has been made to show the evolution of Rush's ideas or to relate them to contemporary developments in science, politics, letters, and religion.

This lack of orientation for the reader is not compensated by introductions or notes to the individual selections, for there are none; and it is made worse by the capricious order of the selections under the several headings. Why Rush's political and scientific papers could not have been printed in chronological order, it is impossible to understand. In the present arrangement a tract written against the Pennsylvania constitution of 1776 follows tracts favoring the adoption of a new federal constitution in 1787 and 1788; and the callow "Oration" on the Indians (1774) follows Rush's mature philosophical statement in "Three Lectures upon Animal Life" (1799). To add to the confusion, dates of selections are given only in the table of contents, and some of these are wrong. Furthermore, Rush's own titles for his essays and tracts, having been thought too cumbersome, have been in some cases docked and in others rejected in favor of new ones invented by the editor. The result of this highhandedness is that one sometimes does not know what work by Rush he is reading and cannot find out without a good deal of hunting and comparing of texts. Nor has the editor deigned to tell the reader whether a given selection is here published for the first time or reprinted from a published source. All but one of the selections, apparently, are reprinted, but no indication is given whether these were originally independent publications, contributions to magazines or newspapers, or parts of longer works or collections. (The single unpublished piece is Rush's early journal of a trip to Paris, printed from a manuscript in the Pierpont Morgan Library but not properly credited to that institution.)

In short, the aim of the anthologist seems to have been to impede, rather than to encourage, the study of Rush outside the covers of this volume. This impression is not dispelled by the showy bibliographical appendix. Its first section consists of a "List of the writings of Benjamin Rush published during his lifetime," lifted without acknowledgment from David Ramsay's *Eulogium upon Benjamin Rush*, which was published in Philadelphia in 1813. The list has no dates for its entries and is by no means complete, being
merely a joint table of contents for Rush's collected volumes. The first selection in Mr. Runes' volume, for example, is not in Ramsay's list. Then follows a "Selected Bibliography" of works by and about Rush that is a hodgepodge largely drawn from previous bibliographies. The most remarkable entries here are those giving the locations of surviving Rush manuscripts, incomprehensibly divided between "Rush Papers" and "Rush Letters." From these we learn that there are both "Papers" and "Letters" in The Historical Society of Pennsylvania; but all the Society's collections containing Rush manuscripts are named in parallel form with the Society itself, as if they were separate, perhaps privately owned, collections. Bungling of this kind, as every reader of undergraduate "research papers" knows, does not speak well of the compiler's knowledge of the sources he cites.

From cursory testing, the texts of the selections themselves appear to have been accurately prepared. There is an index. The physical design and manufacture of the book are respectable. Otherwise this is a specimen of cheap and easy bookmaking quite unworthy of its subject.

Princeton University

L. H. BUTTERFIELD


The Pennsylvania Society of Colonial Dames has made a contribution to Americana with the publication under competent editors of Church Music and Musical Life in Pennsylvania in the Eighteenth Century. Although the historical material has been collected from various known sources and is not entirely original, the selection of topics is excellent. Chapters are devoted to music in the Episcopal, Lutheran, Roman Catholic and Jewish churches; articles are included on Welsh Music, the Ballad Opera, Francis Hopkinson and Benjamin Franklin, with added reprints of the songs of Free Masons and a firsthand account of a famous Tory Ball.

The early churches in their struggles to maintain good musical standards experienced hard-earned acquisitions in good and bad organists and choir-masters but finally obtained the services of such professional musicians as Reinagle, Schetky, Hopkinson, Taylor and Carr who were to write and present sacred music of a superior order. Accurate lists of publications, including Saur's Marburg Hymn Book of 1753 which was to link Lutheran hymnody with the Marot-Beze and Lobwasser versions in France and Germany, are of value and information on the organist's manuscript tune-book, one example being extant in Lancaster, is of interest. The economic picture of 1792 is given background in the statement that a choir was to charge four dollars for singing High Mass, and for other singing at a funeral,
"Two dollars which sum shall be equally divided between the organist and Principal Singer of the Choir."

Strictly Orthodox Jews of the Sefardim (Spanish-Portugese) group settled in Pennsylvania and established the Mikveh Israel Congregation. Their music was similar to the Mozarabic chant of thirteenth century Spain. The Welsh who founded Merion, Haverford, and Radnor added color and rhythm to the musical landscape with their singing and dancing festivals.

Although the theatrical and operatic seasons from 1750 to 1800 were dominantly English, Handel was the vocal favorite for smaller entertainments and Haydn, the instrumentalist’s choice. With the appearance of Francis Hopkinson, harpsichordist, publisher, and composer of the earliest American song, "My Days Have Been So Wondrous Free," the native development was assured. Benjamin Franklin’s challenging ideas on aesthetics and criticism and his defense of folk-music against ornate operatic arias served to foster the national art. Franklin sang as a member of the Junto, played the guitar, and invented the Glass Harmonica for which he left typical playing-instructions. Valuable reprints of the songs of Freemasonry include "A New Song," sometimes ascribed to Franklin.

The most important social events were the Dancing Assemblies, one in particular having historical significance, the Mischianza, given in honor of Sir William Howe after his defeat of Washington at Brandywine in 1777. The organization and execution of this extravaganza was the work of Major John André whose actual account is notable. The original editor of this volume, Miss May Atherton Leach, found the names of young ladies present at such Assemblies in 1765-1766, and a list of first-families is thus made available. A bibliography of no mean dimensions is furnished for the benefit of more ambitious students of the colonial period.

University of Pennsylvania

JOYCE MICHELL


Horace Greeley and the Republican Party, 1853-1861 by Jeter A. Isely is a scholarly study of an important phase of the great editor’s career. Mr. Isely has dealt with his subject with the precision and grace of a true craftsman. His analysis of Greeley’s motives is always careful and is sometimes touched with penetrating insight. This is an accomplishment that deserves a generous meed of praise, for Greeley was far from simple, either in personality or in motivation, and the period in which he lived and moved was complex.

The year 1853 saw ominous discord between the sections apparently lulled to rest by the great Compromise of 1850, but there were plenty of potential causes of trouble yet remaining. Northern opposition to the
fugitive slave law was strong and often violent. There were basic sectional differences over the tariff and over the disposition of the national domain. The Kansas-Nebraska Bill of 1854 once again precipitated a sectional conflict. From then on, through seven feverish years, crisis piled upon crisis until the thunder of the guns at Charleston Harbor, on a gray and stormy April morning in 1861, ushered in the Civil War.

Greeley's role as a Republican editor and politician during this stirring time is the central theme of Mr. Isely's book. Greeley was much in the limelight of the period. It was inevitable that this should be so, for he was a great editor, a very active politician, and a patriot and moralist whose word carried tremendous weight with the Northern masses. This baby-faced eccentric, with his white coat, red and blue blankets, shambling gait and generous heart exerted an influence that has fallen to the lot of few men. His pen distilled the pure milk of the word for perhaps a million voters. Saloon and brothel keepers hated him, and with reason. He spearheaded the movement for free land that culminated in the Homestead Act of 1862. He helped reverse the downward trend of the tariff. And he inspired the maledictions of irate slaveholders by the vigor of his attack upon slavery, an attack that was a real factor (though perhaps not of such importance as Mr. Isely maintains) in bringing on the Civil War.

There is only one really serious criticism of Mr. Isely's interpretation of his subject. That is its almost exclusive preoccupation with the political and economic aspects of his subject. This makes for underestimation of other factors, particularly of moral considerations, both in the shaping of Greeley's attitudes and in the general development of events. Exception can also properly be taken to the author's final statement—that much of Greeley's career "had been spent in vain." This statement provides an anticlimactic ending that is both inadequate and unjust. It is, of course, true that Greeley, the lover of peace and the exponent of national unity, helped to produce the Civil War and its bitter heritage of sectional hatred. But it is also possible to look upon that conflict as a second American revolution (which was the way Greeley viewed it). And Greeley, at least, felt deeply that there is virtue in an unremitting struggle for the welfare and happiness of one's fellow men. "Say not the struggle nought availeth" was a precept that lay close to the warm if cantankerous heart of Horace Greeley.

The University of Rochester

GLYNDON G. VAN DEUSEN

Lincoln the Liberal Statesman. By J. G. Randall. (New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1947, xv, 266 p. Illustrations, annotations, index. $4.50.)

In eight essays, the last of which titles the volume, Professor Randall polishes several facets of the Lincoln portrait, combining the mature results of his researches with those of others. The first and last essays are printed
for the first time; those intervening re-examine and expand earlier publications.

"Moot Points in the Lincoln Story" corrects specific misconceptions. It puts Ann Rutledge and Mary Owen in proper perspective and, while admitting shortcomings on both sides, lightens the shadows of Mary Todd's married life with Lincoln. Its picture of the complexities of Lincoln-Douglas relationships adds stature to the Little Giant. It lowers the antislavery potential of the early Republican Party, questions the inevitability of the Civil War, and removes much of the glamor attaching to the "Great Emancipator." "A Blundering Generation" applies general doubts as to the inevitability of war to the circumstances of 1860-1861, and repeats the familiar thesis that the irrepressible conflict was not irrepressible but the work of scattered and fanatic minorities. "The Unpopular Mr. Lincoln" shows how radical and conservative Republicans alike lampooned and belabored the President to the point of considering, as late as August, 1864, displacing him as the party's candidate. "Lincoln's Sumter Dilemma," while balancing the conflicting issues out of which peace or war might develop, defends Lincoln against the charge of using the episode to precipitate war while inducing the South to fire the first shot.

"The Rule of Law under Lincoln" portrays his vast expansion of executive authority and his usurpation, without effective checks, of both legislative and judicial functions, concluding that the dangers inherent in the situation were largely tempered by the moderating character of Lincoln himself. "Lincoln and John Bright" compares the two men as contemporary liberals and studies the attitude of the English common people toward things American. The least satisfactory essay insofar as convincing evidence is concerned, it deals largely with intangibles and ignores much of the issues of British policy toward the American war which the diplomatic historian considers decisive. "Lincoln's Peace and Wilson's" shows reaction wrecking a program of enlightened leadership in 1865-1877 as in 1919-1920, and advances a plea for active internationalism. The title essay attempts to isolate Lincoln from the Lincolns who have been drawn for us, and to answer charges that he was a conservative by showing from the record that he was basically a Jeffersonian, "a tough minded, liberal realist."

The book as a whole ably distills the author's years of concern with Lincoln and the Civil War; its footnotes provide a useful review of the Lincoln literature. It has the inevitable diffuseness which comes from binding disparate matters between covers; not even Lincoln's liberalism can blend the eight essays into a complete unity. Occasionally, too, the author falls into the pit dug for those who live long with a subject—his efforts to relate Lincoln's policies to the issues of a later day submit the reader to a strain. For his long devotion to the Lincoln story he deserves from his publishers a better arrangement of footnotes than the peculiarly difficult one which they have provided.

Rutgers University

L. Ethan Ellis

The legends which form the central themes of this small volume are those dealing with Thomas Lincoln, the "average pioneer," with Ann Rutledge, and with Mary Todd Lincoln. The discussions of these legends are preceded by a brief discourse on legends in general and a somewhat longer essay on those responsible for the formation, growth, and later acceptance of these legends in particular. This is attempted both from the positive and negative points of view.

The legends which the author presents as having degraded the good name of Thomas Lincoln are the result of that natural tendency on the part of humans to view all events in the light of their own experience and environment. Thomas Lincoln was not an average pioneer but rather better than average when judged by the standards of his contemporaries and not our own. Probably not more than half of the pioneers purchased and completed the payments on their land. The celebration of a marriage ceremony was occasionally dispensed with as a result of necessity. Sometimes it was virtually impossible to go through such formalities in the rough conditions of the frontier. Similarly, derogatory allusions to the use of whiskey by the Lincoln family are unhistorical. Whiskey was a valuable commodity on the frontier, and possession of whiskey did not constitute a crime against society.

It is just as unhistorical to attempt to make a mountain out of the Ann Rutledge "molehill." Every healthy young man is entitled to at least one immature infatuation. The Ann Rutledge incident is proof that Lincoln was living a normal life. If disappointment in the outcome of his little romance cast a spell of despondency over Lincoln, he was only following a normal pattern. Those individuals who insist that such commonplace behavior is evidence of disgraceful or immoral acts should reflect upon their own lives before becoming too critical of the lives of greater men.

Criticism of Mary Todd Lincoln is even less justified. She had more trials and tribulations than the wife of any other great American of her generation. The strain of Lincoln's public life was just as much a drain upon her resources as upon those of her husband. The loss of her child, the division of her own family, and the eternal suspicion and questioning by those in Washington who should have been her friends made her load doubly heavy as the war dragged on toward its conclusion. The assassination of Lincoln was the last straw. It is no wonder she was thrown off her mental balance. Lincoln's life with Mary Todd was probably no worse than that of most public figures in the mid-nineteenth century. It was certainly not a "hell on earth." One may well ask how many normal women could have done as well. In many respects the author has given this impression clearly, but in a few places he has only intimated that the Lincoln family was well-balanced and normal in most respects.
It is the personal opinion of your reviewer that such "legends" should be permitted to die of their own inertia. If this volume were nothing more than new fuel added to the fires of animosity and recrimination, it would be of little value and certainly not justified. But it is a good deal more than just another diatribe on old subjects. The author has provided much good biographical material. He has brought many small but interesting new facts to light. However, its greatest historical value is as a treatise on much that was written about Lincoln during the years 1855–1890. It presents many new approaches to most of the old and generally accepted biographies of Lincoln, shows how the opinions of the authors of these works varied from decade to decade, and in several instances identifies the particular "axe" that was being ground. In these and similar respects the work of Mr. Lewis has been more than worth-while. If your reviewer may be permitted one more personal comment, it is that Mr. Lewis will continue in his serious study of Lincolniana and give the world a really good historiography on the subject.

University of Pittsburgh

Theodore R. Parker


This volume presents manuscript and printed material in such a manner as to make clear the evolution of Whitman's important prose essay, "A Backward Glance O'er Travel'd Roads," which is his conclusive statement of his intentions as a poet. The editors provide an introduction setting forth with admirable clarity the complicated bibliographical problems they have resolved.

Whitman students have, of course, been aware of the fact that the ideas in "A Backward Glance" (first printed as the Preface to November Boughs, 1888) appeared in print in various fragmentary forms before the publication of the essay. What the work of Messrs. Bradley and Stevenson particularly makes clear is how extensively Whitman worked over these ideas between 1883 and 1888. He began with an essay entitled "A Backward Glance on My Own Road," printed in The Critic for January 5, 1884. Almost all of this appears in some form in the final Preface to November Boughs. He next prepared an article on the making of the Leaves of Grass. This was allegedly printed in the New York Star in 1885, though it seems to have survived only as a posthumous piece in Frank Leslie's Popular Monthly for June, 1892. This article contains ideas developed in the second half of the November Boughs Preface. Meanwhile, in Lippincott's Monthly Magazine for January, 1887, Whitman published "My Book and I," which he took over, with only slight changes, to form the first half of the Preface.
But this is not the whole story. Whitman was enjoying a considerable reputation in England where there was demand for his prose as well as his poetry. In 1888, the Walter Scott Company issued Democratic Vistas and other Papers in which is printed not only the germinal "A Backward Glance on My Own Road" (considerably abbreviated), but as well the two essays which formed, substantially, the two halves of the final Preface! Thus there are in print seven articles which are related to "A Backward Glance O'er Travel'd Roads," with the possibility of an eighth, if the mystery (if mystery there be) of the alleged article in the Star is ever cleared up.

The editors have been so fortunate as to discover the holograph of the germinal essay of this series. The reproduction of this manuscript fills ten pages of the present volume. Each purchaser of one of the special sets of the Complete Writings of Walt Whitman (10 volumes, Putnam's, 1902) received, bound with the first volume of his set, a Whitman letter or piece of manuscript. Mr. Stevenson's set fortunately contains the whole of the essay which Whitman sent to The Critic. With the facsimile in front of him, the reader can see for himself how carefully the poet worked to make his prose perspicuous. Ideas he seldom changed, for he knew what he wanted to say when he began to write. But he crosses out circumlocutions and redundant words and phrases, tidies up the syntax, and changes abstractions into concrete figures. On a typical page of twenty-four lines there are fourteen emendations.

The evidence provided by the germinal manuscript and by the various fragmentary essays which were fused in the Preface shows not only that the ideas in "A Backward Glance O'er Travel'd Roads" were long pondered by Whitman but that he was determined to state them with as much force and clarity as he could command.

Princeton University

Willard Thorp


If Professor Persons had not favored us with this study there would be strong reason to suspect such a movement as the Free Religious Association, even though its extent and its leaders might remain unknown. Free Religion was the inevitable outcome of continued protest against the restricting forces of orthodox Calvinism, weakened as it was; the pendulum swing was incomplete at the moment when Unitarianism tended to come to rest in a new orthodoxy just on the eve of Appomattox. That there would be dissident spirits, goes without saying.

The author skilfully portrays the struggles of a small band of religious radicals, spearheaded by Francis Ellingwood Abbot, Octavius Brooks Frothingham, and others, to unite discordant and dissatisfied religious elements into the Free Religious Association as a substitute for what had
become organized Unitarianism. To effect co-operation within the Association, it was necessary to avow no principles save the principle of religious freedom, the unequivocal right to apply thought freely to religious problems. The faith of the Free Religionists was a "Faith of Reason," a belief in the essential rationality of men and things. There was no certainty about man's religion; there was much that could be known about man's religious nature, though Free Religion's adherents did not seem to recognize how much this had been conditioned by a past they sought to disavow. For them, natural law provided all the essential testimony to support belief in God, Providence, and to confirm other spiritual values.

The Free Religious Association naturally attracted liberal reformers whose activities had dissociated them from former ecclesiastical allegiances. The temptation to support the varied reforms advocated by its constituents only promised dissipated efforts with little avail. Early in its career the Association determined that social reform could be achieved only through an enlightened society and designated itself as the intellectual leaven.

Essentially Free Religion sought to approach the vague frontier between religion and irreligion. With no criteria save that of intellectual freedom, the movement found itself tempted to surrender the Christian idea and that in opposition to the vestiges of the Christian tradition in community living. Lacking those who were capable of interpreting an almost mystical belief as a popular idea, the Association found itself more allied with irreligion in the mind of the masses. Its final achievement was the World Parliament of Religions held in connection with the Columbian Exposition at Chicago in 1893. Here it knew success and failure. Though exponents of the world's great religions probed principles held by all in common, it was evident that the religious world could not be held together in negations. Though the Association went on into the twentieth century, its active days virtually ceased with this last effort.

The mosaic of the late nineteenth century religious scene is enhanced by Professor Persons' study. The completed picture will in time indicate whether Free Religion was more than an intellectual overtone.

*The University of Pennsylvania*  
RUSSELL E. FRANCIS

*Wilson: The Road to the White House.* By ARTHUR S. LINK. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1947, xviii, 570 p. Illustrations, bibliography. $5.00.)

To answer an obvious question first, this book is no rehash of Ray Stannard Baker's volumes on Wilson. It is the fruit of resolutely independent and enormously industrious investigation. While Mr. Link's findings are not revolutionary, they change appreciably the previously accepted picture of Wilson in numerous aspects and provide the most detailed study yet made of party politics in the years 1910–1912. Among other things, the
book revises the significance usually attached to the Princeton graduate school fight, throws new light on Wilson's relations with the New Jersey bosses, diminishes the role of Colonel House as a president-maker, places the break with George Harvey into more intelligible perspective, upsets the legend of Bryan's decisive influence at the Baltimore convention, demonstrates the extent of Brandeis' influence on the shaping of the New Freedom and points up the contrasts between the New Freedom and the New Nationalism.

Perhaps the author's most difficult biographical problem is the rather sudden conversion of the conservative Wilson to the progressive Wilson. With utmost candor he pictures the strait-laced professor, the Southern Cleveland Democrat with Federalist leanings, Manchester economics, and aristocratic predilections whom a group of Wall Street bankers, utilities magnates, and conservative editors began grooming for a presidential candidate in 1906. Side by side with this picture is that of the crusading progressive who won Bryan's hearty endorsement and outdid the Bull Moose as a prophet of reform. Biographers who do not belong to the mind-reading school rarely succeed in "explaining" such marked transitions in their subjects. Mr. Link's only concern is to trace in detail the progress of the change and to describe fully the circumstances under which it took place. While he does not answer all the questions, he makes this enigma of Wilson's career more intelligible.

Mr. Link's book is more properly classified as political history than as biography, since more than 400 of the 528 pages of text are devoted to three of the fifty-six years treated. His assumption is that Mr. Baker's treatment of the early years leaves little to be added. He cannot be justly criticised for failing to do what he has not attempted, and he has a right to devote himself to that part of the larger subject upon which he has decided to concentrate his attention. He has already raised a question, however, to which the methods of the biographer rather than those of the political historian are more likely to yield the answer. This is the question of the recurrent pattern of crises in Wilson's career, repeated while he was President of Princeton, Governor of New Jersey, and President of the United States. The crises always arose, as Mr. Link says, out of Wilson's "temperamental inability to cooperate with men who were not willing to follow his lead completely. . . . It was the only kind of leadership he knew." It would seem likely that a pattern repeated with such regularity in later life had deep and early origins. Whether Mr. Link will solve his political problems in later volumes without the answer to the biographical problem remains to be seen.

The Johns Hopkins University  
C. Vann Woodward

The first edition of this book by the Professor of American History in the University of Pennsylvania was published by the press of that University in 1936. The present edition has been so much enlarged, revised, and so thoroughly brought up to date that it is practically a new work.

Professor Shryock's book is a survey by a thoroughly equipped professional historian of the development of medical science from its true beginnings in the opening of the seventeenth century to the present day, with especial reference to its bearings on the sociologic and economic relations of the period and people with which it had most concern. He shows how the early foundations for subsequent scientific advance were laid by Vesalius in anatomy and by Copernicus and Galilei in astronomy and mathematics, Boyle in physics and Leeuwenhoek in microscopy. They and other workers demonstrated the importance of quantitative studies of natural phenomena and by them the foundations were laid. What Shryock terms "a curious lag" in the employment of the improved means of observation and measurement followed the studies and experiments of the 17th century scientists Santorio, Galilei, Leeuwenhoek, etc. Floyer's work on the measurement of the pulse and Stephen Hale's measurements of blood pressure attracted but little notice from physicians.

Shryock devotes an interesting chapter to the social factors in the medical lag after 1700. The first British act of Parliament legalizing dissection was the so-called "Anatomy Act" of 1832, resulting from the disclosures of the ghastly deeds of the "Resurrectionists" involved in the murders by Burke and Hare in Edinburgh. The Royal Society in London was practically the only scientific body in Great Britain where medical papers were read and discussed until the founding of the Warrington Academy in 1757. The clinical teaching of medicine had to await the development of large hospitals which came with the growth of great towns, "the amazing urbanization," which in turn was due to the great industrial revolution. Professor Shryock gives much of the credit for this development of means of relief to the sick poor to farsighted physicians who realized that the old church foundations could no longer cope with the situation. The industrial revolution which caused poverty and hardship to thousands of people also brought into being a large class of wealthy persons who were animated with the humanitarian instinct and desirous of helping the unfortunate beings who were suffering from the very conditions which had given them their wealth, and they gave generously to enlarge old institutions and to establish new hospitals and asylums. As Shryock says, the eighteenth century was not only the "Age of Reason" but also the era of "Enlightenment." It marked the advent of the modern world. Professional men, merchants, the aristocracy, all classes turned to science as the solution for all their problems. Shryock instances
as notable examples, Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson. The work of Hunter in anatomy, of Haller in physiology, and of Malpighi, Valsalva, and Morgagni in pathology, placed those sciences on scientific bases; and Morgagni's great work "de Sedibus Causis Morborum" initiated clinical and pathological studies and founded the scientific study of modern disease. The steady progression of medical science was somewhat retarded by the so-called "rationalistic" views of a number of the most prominent leaders in Germany, Italy, and France, notably by Broussais in the latter country and by Brown in Edinburgh. Unfortunately Benjamin Rush while a student at Edinburgh had fallen under Brown's influence and as the foremost medical teacher of his time in the United States spread the doctrines of these medical systematists widely in this country. But rational empiricism finally triumphed over the theoretic speculations of the systematists. Shryock shows that the establishment empirically of the value of cinchona and digitalis in malaria and cardiac diseases, and of citrus fruits in combating scurvy were most valuable in this connection, and inoculation and later vaccination against smallpox were further proofs. One of the most valuable chapters in the book, Chapter V, "Early Contributions of Physic and Physicians to the Public Welfare, 1750-1800," will prove of special interest and importance to the lay reader, historian, or sociologist, for it was during those years that real interest in hygiene and the welfare of the masses of the population which were gathering in urban manufacturing centers became a vital subject to people in general, and the writings of Malthus, Francis Place, and others forcibly focused attention upon improvement in conditions of living which prevailed in overcrowded slums.

Shryock next devotes a very interesting chapter to "Science in a Romantic Age," dealing with mesmerism and other cults, even Christian Science being a belated offspring of the spirit pervading medicine on this continent and in Great Britain in the first half of the nineteenth century. In England the downfall of Dr. John Elliotson, at one time one of the leading physicians of London, was due to his obsession with hypnotism.

In Chapter VII dealing with medicine and the basic sciences, Professor Shryock shows how medicine escaped most of the evil effects of the romantic period because many of the shining lights in science of that time were physicians. Helmholtz, du Bois-Reymond, Humphry Davy, Berzelius and many others of their stamp kept medicine in the straight and narrow path, free from many of the vagaries which threatened its existence as a science. The development of the science of chemistry in the latter part of the eighteenth century and the early years of the nineteenth was truly astonishing. Professor Shryock gives a vivid picture of the work of Lavoisier, Berzelius, Humphry Davy and others who were the real founders of modern chemistry culminating in the observations of William Beaumont and the great studies of Claude Bernard.

A very important chapter, VIII, is devoted to the results of the application of mathematics to the study of sociologic medical problems. In the
years following the Revolution, the French led the world in medical teaching until the Germans came to the fore. Shryock gives a splendid résumé of the work of Bichat, Louis, Corvisart and of their American students and disciples, W. W. Gerhard, James Jackson, Stillé, etc., who carried on their work in this country. It is curious that, as he points out, the French tended to neglect the use of the microscope in spite of their interest in pathology. French surgeons Larrey, Dupuytren, Velpeau, Malgaigne and Ricord taught many young Americans and had a great influence on surgery for many years. Of course many young American students went to England (P. S. Physick was a house pupil of John Hunter's), but French influence predominated American medicine for many years. Anesthesia was really originated in this country and dentistry also was chiefly of American origin. In the middle of the nineteenth century Marion Sims developed his operation for vesicovaginal fistula and partly paid our debt to France by going to Paris where he introduced it to the French.

About the third decade of the nineteenth century, "Clio Medica," as Osler would have said, moved to Germany in which country there developed an unsurpassed school of physiologists and pathologists. Shryock attributes to Johannes Müller particularly the introduction of the modern scientific spirit into Germany. To Müller and his followers is due the increased use of the microscope to which we owe the foundation of our basic knowledge of normal tissues and the fundamentals of our modern views on pathology. Müller, Schleiden, Schwann and Henle developed our knowledge of cellular physiology and pathology and their work was worthily carried on by Virchow. The great von Helmholtz not only invented the ophthalmoscope but many other appliances of great value in physiologic investigation.

To the lay reader one of the most important and interesting chapters is number XII, "Medicine and the Public Health Movement," in which the history of the rise and progress in different countries of public health movements is given in the most delightful manner, making charming a subject which is too often encumbered by dry facts and statistics.

In a most depressing but vitally true chapter, XIII, entitled "Public Confidence Lost," Professor Shryock tells of the difficulties which beset medical progress and science in the mid-Victorian period. In physics and engineering the public could witness the wonderful progress made in the development of electricity and the uses of steam, but in medicine it only beheld the abandonment of the excessive dosing and purging, and the therapeutic nihilism which really signified that progress was regarded by the laity with distrust. During those years quacks and charlatans flourished. The patent laws favored the manufacturers of patent medicines. Cults developed in every country. Thomsonianism, a vegetarian cult; Grahamism, a food cult; and osteopathy, hydropathy, and Christian Science were of American origin. Cheap short courses in so-called medical schools added to the number of pseudo-doctors. The progress of medical science was also much interfered with by the efforts of many antivivisection organizations.
which were organized in direct proportion to the increase in the number of animals used for experimentation.

The next chapter, "The Triumph of Modern Medicine," rings out triumphantly. Ever since Leeuwenhoek had described his "little animals," considerable interest had been taken in microscopic organisms. The invention of the achromatic microscope and the publication of Ehrenberg's classic book on infusoria in the 1830's gave a great impetus to their study. Several investigators suggested that animalculae played a role in the transmission of various contagious diseases. Paget, Leidy, and Virchow proved that trichina spiralis was the infective agent in trichinosis and Schönlein showed that favus was due to infection by a living micro-organism. In 1858, Pasteur proved that fermentation was due to bacteria, that there was no such thing as spontaneous generation, and that putrefaction also was due to the activity of bacteria. A few years later Lister adopted this idea in the dressing of wounds in his hospital wards. General anesthesia had been demonstrated by W. T. G. Morton in the United States and by J. Y. Simpson in Great Britain, and these two revelations gave birth to modern surgery. The science of bacteriology developed rapidly. Koch and Weigert developed methods of fixing and staining micro-organisms and soon the specific bacteria which caused a disease could be definitely recognized. Professor Shryock summarizes concisely the changes wrought in the protective and other measures of quarantine by the discoveries following in quick succession of the role played by various insects, lice, flies, mosquitoes, rats and mice, water and foodstuffs in conveying different diseases.

The dramatic sequence with which specific remedies were found for many diseases one after another, and the wonderful results in immunization for so many of them culminating in Ehrlich's discovery of 606 are given with sufficient fullness and yet most concisely. Endocrinology followed close on bacteriology and the discovery of insulin was one of the most glorious results. In Chapter XV Professor Shryock demonstrates the vast results of all the achievements wrought by the researches conducted during the past fifty years—the reduction of infant mortality, the lengthening of life expectancy, the practical eradication of a number of diseases. Chapter XVI dwells upon the development of trained nursing and the great advance in hospitals and the techniques used in them in laboratories and treatment, and the elevation in importance of dentistry and various specialities.

Chapter XVII, "A Delayed Advance against Mental Disease," is a timely discussion of a subject very much to the fore since the last war. In view of the so general discussion among laity of psychoanalysis and Freud's theories, it is to be hoped that this lucid and impartial discussion of the vexed questions involved may be widely read, particularly by students and workers in sociology.

Chapters XVIII and XIX dealing with the question of public health in Great Britain, Europe, and the United States, are of great importance and
most interesting because of the very radical changes which have occurred in the attitude of the public in many countries towards the matters of public health. Professor Shryock deals very thoroughly with the various measures adopted by the different nations to meet the problem of increasing the general health and meeting the growing needs for the care of the sick and the prevention of disease among those not qualified to do so themselves.

In the last chapter Professor Shryock deals with "Some Contemporary Questions"—the greatly intensified interest in medical research as illustrated by the huge foundations like the Rockefeller, and the great increase in the number of laboratories devoted to it. A brief summary of the recent work on the antibiotics, sulfa compounds, and penicillin is an important conclusion to Professor Shryock's great work.

An excellent index is a valuable addition to a book which is a most notable contribution to sociological and medical history.

Philadelphia

Francis R. Packard


William Penn had once dreamed of a sister-city to Philadelphia along the Susquehanna River, but in the ordeal of settlement that dream was forgotten. It was not until after the American Revolution that the fertile Susquehanna Valley emerged from virtual neglect to become the center of a truly bitter trade rivalry. Dr. Livingood has characterized this rivalry as a "commercial tournament" with Philadelphia and Baltimore "jousting" for favored position. The weapon of this contest (to 1860) was transportation, each port vying with the other in its efforts to tap the resources of the Valley. Baltimore had the advantage of geographical proximity to trade outlets; Pennsylvania, with Philadelphia as its commercial center, claimed exclusive possession of the region within its borders.

In his capable analysis of this commercial rivalry, the author offers a fair picture of the two port cities, of the surprisingly wide concern evinced by the Susquehanna Valley question, and of the transportation race of Philadelphia and Baltimore during the canal era and the early railroad period. Dr. Livingood makes no decision in the struggle, stating that incomplete statistics and the merging of the local question with the broader problems of the West make such a determination impossible. By 1860 the rivalry had expanded with continued intensity into wider fields than transportation. The many appendices and maps and the good documentation make this a worthy study of an economic situation often repeated in the story of American internal expansion.

Ruhl J. Bartlett has made a real contribution to American history with his source book on the diplomatic relations of the United States. More than 300 documents, from the Treaty of Whitehall of 1686 to the Truman Doctrine of 1947, make up this collection. Dr. Bartlett has edited speeches, debates, and editorials, both official and unofficial, as well as state papers of various kinds, and has presented them in a chronological and topical arrangement which reveals the evolution and expansion of United States foreign policy. The broader aspects of the subject—neutrality, imperialism, isolationism and internationalism—receive their just consideration together with the more specific problems of American diplomacy.


It is appropriate that this history should appear in the centennial year of The American Medical Association. Morris Fishbein presents, in addition to the story of the organization and expansion of the Association, the campaigns of that body against quackery and medical fraud, the struggle against socialized medicine, and considerable discussion on the action of the Federal government (1938) against The American Medical Association as a trust operating in restraint of “group medicine.” The volume is an excellent reference book. Dr. Fishbein’s history is supplemented by biographical sketches of the presidents written by Walter L. Bierring, and by articles on the publications, councils, bureaus and other official bodies of the Association, which have been contributed by various authors.