BOOK REVIEWS

Travel and Discovery in the Renaissance, 1420-1620. By Boies Penrose. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1952. xvi, 369 p. Illustrations, maps, bibliography, index. $5.00.)

It may be, it probably is, quite inappropriate for me to review this book. The author is an old colleague and an old friend of mine. We have fought side by side on more than one civil battlefield and we are both members of the Publication Committee of the Historical Society of which this magazine is the organ. When the editor asked me to attempt the appraisal, I told him that I would read the book and if I found it bad, I would hold my peace. But I have found it good, very good indeed, and I cannot resist the temptation to say so.

Boies Penrose accepted a tough assignment when he undertook to carry forward the brilliant work of two scholars who, between them, have told the story of historical geography from its dim beginnings to the great days of Prince Henry the Navigator. I refer, of course, to Bunbury’s History of Ancient Geography, published seventy years ago and still the classical work on the subject, and to Beazley’s Dawn of Modern Geography, also more than fifty years old and in every way a masterpiece. These two books together fill five fat volumes. And yet the sources upon which they are based are scattered and fragmentary as compared with the wealth of material with which Boies Penrose has had to wrestle. He has done it in one slim volume of not much over three hundred pages. One has only to read his chapter on geographical literature or his excellent bibliography to appreciate his easy mastery, not only of the sources, but also of the vast literature of commentary upon the sources.

The period he has undertaken to cover is roughly that between Prince Henry the Navigator’s initial adventures and the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers on Plymouth Rock or thereabouts—almost exactly two centuries. Certainly, they are the richest two centuries in the whole history of discovery and exploration.

The best feature of the book is its comprehensiveness. It not only deals with the whole world from China to Peru, but it contains admirable chapters on cartography and navigation and on geographical literature. The latter is very far from being the customary dreary list of authors and titles, of interest only to the specialists. One reason for this is that those who explored were very often those who recorded. Even Camoëns, the great Portuguese epic poet, based much of his Luciads upon first-hand experience. Another reason is that Boies Penrose, though he professes to be a geographer, is more interested in people than he is in places. We know that
already from his *Urbane Travellers* and his *Sherleian Odyssey*. He has a keen eye for the man involved and a fine skill in revealing the essentials of that man, whether he be a navigator, a poet, or a mere chronicler, in a few terse, trenchant sentences. So even his bibliographies acquire vitality through the personalities of authors and compilers whose works are recorded.

I think his great service to American readers will be his sparkling appraisal of the Portuguese navigators and administrators. In our provincial way we tend to ignore the Portuguese, since their main efforts were directed eastward, not westward. But Boies Penrose has placed the great Albuquerque where he belongs, and has painted portraits of Pero da Covilhan and John de Castro which make even John Hawkins and Francis Drake pale in comparison.

Penrose is hardly less enthusiastic about Spanish efforts in the West. In fifteen pages he has distilled the essence of Morison's great book on Columbus, and his summary of the work of the Conquistadores deserves to be quoted: "Their courage was peerless, their cruelty revolting, their endurance was heroic, their lust for riches despicable. . . . Yet for all this we cannot withhold admiration for these little bands of Renaissance Spaniards whose dauntless courage enabled them to overcome mighty kingdoms, defended by huge armies. Truly the Conquistadores were men of superlative extremes."

His accounts of the efforts of the Dutch, the French, and even of the English, are less stirring. This is explained in part by the fact that in the East, at any rate, these latecomers reaped where others had sown, and that in the West their great achievements in discovery and exploration came after 1620. Certainly, Boies Penrose will yield to none in his admiration of the English. Almost all that he has published heretofore has dealt with English exploits. But his accounts of the early efforts of the French, the Dutch, and the English in North America are for most of us twice-told tales. One cannot resist the conclusion that Boies Penrose himself felt a little that way about them. But the Portuguese and the Spaniards were "fresh woods and pastures new." And to them he has imparted something of the thrill of a discovery and a good deal of the romance which still attaches to those early pioneers who braved all the terrors of the fearful unknown in search of the Spring of Perpetual Youth, or the River of Paradise, or King Solomon's mines, or, best of all, the salvation of those in heathen blindness.

*Villanova, Pa.*

**Conyers Read**


Professor Alden has performed a real service to the reading public in editing the late Dr. Ward's military history of the War of the Revolution. The study of the various campaigns and battles was almost completed by
Dr. Ward when death interrupted his labors; the editor added a chapter on the war beyond the Alleghenies, corrected and polished the text, and carried out the minute tasks of completing citations and bibliographical listings.

The great merit of Dr. Ward's history is that it is very well written. Dr. Ward seems to have developed something of the magic literary touch of a Francis Parkman. Few readers will be able to follow the chapters on the skirmishes at Lexington and Concord without experiencing a quickening of the pulse. The same may be said of the accounts of the storming of Bunker Hill, the invasion of Canada, and the battles of Long Island, Trenton, and Brandywine. In chapter after chapter, the author has succeeded in telling a stirring and exciting story as such a story should be told. The high standard of literary craftsmanship is maintained throughout the two volumes, with the possible exception of a few of the chapters which deal with the campaigns in the Carolinas.

The "Editor's Preface" explains that *The War of the Revolution* is based upon the use of standard secondary works and printed source materials. A glance at the citations will make clear to the reader that Dr. Ward has spent but little time delving in various archives for unpublished source materials. The volume of printed sources is very great, but some important letters and memoranda still remain buried in the unpublished portions of such collections as the papers of Lord George Germain, Sir Henry Clinton, George Washington, Horatio Gates and Nathanael Greene. Dr. Ward would undoubtedly have been able to make some corrections in matters of detail if he had labored in the sometimes rewarding, often discouraging, masses of manuscripts in the various archives and historical societies which contain materials bearing on the War of the Revolution. Perhaps the author would have written a bit more about the role of Lord George Germain, whose deadening hand did so much to stifle the zeal and initiative of his subordinates, if he had examined closely the correspondence of Germain and Clinton in the files of the Public Record Office or the collections in the William L. Clements Library. Perhaps, too, he would have laid more stress on the diversion of British troops and ships from North America to the West Indies during and after 1778 if he had studied closely the unpublished correspondence of Germain and Clinton.

Whatever changes the author might have made had he toiled long and diligently in archival collections, one thing is clear to the reviewer: Dr. Ward has been very thorough in utilizing printed source materials. He has written a detailed and accurate account of the principal military operations on land of the War for American Independence. He has avoided the temptation to praise the Continentals unduly or to vilify the Redcoats and their Hessian and Loyalist allies. And above all else, he has produced a work of outstanding literary merit.

The many sketch maps in *The War of the Revolution* are very helpful to the reader, but they would be even more helpful if hills, valleys, and other
important features of terrain were clearly indicated upon them. The map of Lord Cornwallis’ marches in Virginia and the Carolinas is, unfortunately, quite inaccurate; it does not show Cornwallis’ line of march from Guilford to the Dan, and it turns a mere cavalry raid to Charlottesville into an advance by the earl’s entire army! Finally, it would have been useful if Dr. Ward had concluded with a chapter on the blockade of New York up to and including the evacuation of the city by Sir Guy Carleton’s troops.

Lehigh University

George W. Kyte


The publication of The Catalogue of the Library of Thomas Jefferson is an event that has long been awaited by Jefferson scholars. The first volume of a proposed four on the subject has finally made its appearance. It is published under the imprint of the Library of Congress, ably edited by Miss E. Millicent Sowerby. It is handsome in format and sound in scholarship. No one will be disappointed.

The task was not a simple one. In 1783, on the eve of going to Europe, Jefferson made a catalogue of the 2,640 books he owned at that time. The system he used, which may seem archaic to the reader of the present day, was based upon Book II of Sir Francis Bacon’s Advancement of Learning. We read, in Jefferson’s clear and careful hand: “Books may be classed from the faculties of the mind, which being I Memory, II Reason, III Imagination, are applied respectively to I History, II Philosophy, III Fine Arts.” Under these general headings his books are listed in forty-six so-called chapters. Jefferson continued to add entries to this catalogue, as he acquired books, up to the time he sold his library to Congress in 1814. At that time, the letter addressed to Samuel Harrison Smith offering his books to the government, was accompanied by a manuscript catalogue which formed the basis for the one printed in 1815 as the Catalogue of the Library of the United States.

In the present catalogue the editor has, as she says, listed the books in Jefferson’s “own order, within his classification scheme as tabulated at the beginning of the 1815 catalogue,” which “differs in some respects from that in Jefferson’s ‘1783’ manuscript.” We are further informed in which of these catalogues, or whether in both, a given book is to be found. In addition to the name of the author, the title of the book, and the date, the editor has enriched each entry with notes which, as she says, “include extracts from Jefferson’s correspondence with the author or the publisher, comments by him on the book or its author, relatively minor details as to purchase and binding and anything that could be found that would add to our information concerning Jefferson himself by means of the books in his library.” It has been a gigantic task to go through the printed and manuscript letters,
drafts, documents and other papers in the numerous repositories of the Jefferson papers. It has been a task extremely well done.

In view of the numerous excellent features of this book, it would seem ungracious to wish that certain problems had been handled differently—that the source of the quotations, for instance, had been printed at the end of each one, rather than relegated to a somewhat unwieldy mass at the end of the volume, or to sigh that there is no index. We must wait for volume V which is to be a master index to the whole work. This reviewer feels, too, that it would have added most enormously to the interest of the work had the editor seen fit to include in the introduction, or even to present as an introductory essay, a discussion of the history of Jefferson’s library and its development. This would not have been too difficult of achievement. There is Jefferson’s own manuscript catalogue of 1783, with its evidence in differences of ink, of handwriting, and of the spacing of the lines; there are the several other manuscript catalogues, or portions of them, which Miss Sowerby does not discuss; there are numerous, almost countless, lists of books with additional evidence in the form of the watermarks of the paper; there are the many references in letters, of which Miss Sowerby has made such excellent use in another phase of her study; there are the two commonplace books in which Jefferson excerpted extracts from poets, philosophers, historians and men of letters—all this is material with which it is possible to trace in considerable and fascinating detail the growth of Jefferson’s library. But perhaps this would have led the editor into realms into which she did not wish to enter.

Jefferson had passed his three score years and ten when he made the terrible and courageous decision to sell his library. The time may be said to have been ripe. His own finances were in ruins. He had just learned, as he wrote his correspondent, “that the vandalism of our enemy has triumphed at Washington over science as well as the arts by the destruction of the public library.” Presuming that Congress would wish “to recommence their collection,” he offered his own. “I have been fifty years making it,” he wrote, “and have spared no pains, opportunity or expense to make it what it is. While residing in Paris, I devoted every afternoon I was disengaged, for a summer or two, in examining all the principal bookstores, turning over every book with my own hand, and putting by everything which related to America, and indeed whatever was rare and valuable in every science.” He speaks of his standing orders in “the leading bookmarts, particularly Amsterdam, Frankfurt, Madrid and London, for works relating to America as could not be found in Paris. . . . During the same period, and after my return to America, I was led to procure, also, whatever related to the duties of those in the high concerns of the nation. So that the collection . . . while it includes what is chiefly valuable in science and literature generally, extends more particularly to whatever belongs to the American statesman. . . .” “Nearly the whole are well bound,” he concludes, “abundance of them elegantly, and of the choicest editions existing.”
Thus modestly, yet proudly, Jefferson placed before his government the fruits of his passion for knowledge. From this volume we can glimpse how rich was the display.

*Philadelphia*

**MARIE KIMBALL**


The appearance of a biography on Thomas Mifflin raises an immediate and anxious question: Has the author found the "Mifflin Papers"? That such "papers" did in fact exist and would eventually come to light has been the ardent wish of those interested in the career of this remarkable man. He has long been an enigma—still is, for that matter—and his potential biographers, awaiting the discovery of enough evidence to make a study of his life worthwhile, must have been many. That Mr. Rossman has not found the "papers," or much evidence not known for some time, will be a source of keen disappointment. It is apparent that lack of reasonably conclusive evidence on the most important questions surrounding Mifflin's career, particularly during the American Revolution, is a constant source of embarrassment to the author. Although he has not shirked his biographical responsibilities—considerable effort is made to clarify obscure items of fact and motivation—it would seem that at times we should be favored with more in the nature of educated conjecture.

In the early stages of the Revolution Mifflin distinguished himself by his patriotic ardor, energy, and oratorical ability. That his efforts did not go unrewarded is attested by his rapid rise from an aide-de-camp to Washington in 1775 to a major generalcy in February, 1777. During most of this time he served as quartermaster general, a position for which, at first, apparently everyone but himself thought he was excellently suited. Preferring a field command, he found his job an endless frustration, and in it he came to real grief, if not to disgrace, at least in the view of some of his contemporaries and later historians.

By February, 1777, when he was made a major general, Mifflin's star was at its zenith. Congress had been liberal with its promotions, Washington had confidence in him, and he was very popular in Pennsylvania. But eight months later, on October 8, 1777, he abruptly resigned both his major generalcy and his job as quartermaster general. Here, of course, is one of the big mysteries. Why did he attempt such a complete break at this time? In his letter of resignation Mifflin pleaded ill health, but Rossman, and rightly so, is not content to let the matter rest at that. Conscientiously, he sifts and worries the evidence, but does not present a conclusive answer. Perhaps there is none, but it would seem that for some time prior to his resignation Mifflin's relations with Washington were not as cordial as they might have
been, and that he was not on the best of terms with Nathanael Greene and Henry Knox, for whom he probably felt some jealousy. Rossman refers to the "Mifflin-Greene feud, and the Mifflin-Washington quarrel," but the details of either are by no means clear. However, the author implies, or the reader can justifiably infer, that Mifflin resigned in a jealous pique, and not primarily because of ill health. Whatever his reasons, though, he could not have picked a worse time to quit, for his action followed the defeats of Brandywine, Germantown, and the evacuation of Philadelphia. Congress did not accept Mifflin's resignation of his major generalcy until February, 1779, but this was after the affair known as the Conway Cabal.

That Mifflin participated in an intrigue or cabal against Washington, or that such a scheme actually existed, has never been definitely established. Rossman thinks there "probably never was any concerted plot or any fixed purpose." Until more conclusive evidence is found the Conway Cabal looks very much like a dead horse which, despite the most vigorous whipping, will not spring to life. For Mifflin though, the charge of complicity in a plot against Washington "was a bogey which haunted him for the remainder of his life."

In dealing with a politician, which Mifflin was, par excellence, Rossman should probably pay more attention than he does to the tangled and complex party situation in Pennsylvania. For the factional warfare of the 1780's he relies heavily on Robert L. Brunhouse's thorough study, The Counter-Revolution in Pennsylvania, but in the field of Pennsylvania politics from 1790 to 1799 he is by no means comfortable. When launching Governor Mifflin on the murky political sea of the 1790's, with its tricky and conflicting currents, Rossman might have supplied his readers with charts and navigation instruments. He does essay a brief analysis of the situation on pages 214-215, but it is lacking in comprehensiveness, and some statements in it will not bear close scrutiny. For example, he asserts that national Republican and Federalist parties were "definitely organized" by 1792. This demands serious and extensive qualification, but even if it can be accepted as reasonably correct—which this reviewer doubts—there were certainly no "definitely organized" Republican and Federalist parties in Pennsylvania at that time. There were conflicting ideologies, bodies of opinion, "climates of opinion," if you will, but no such parties. In 1790 the Constitutionalist and Anti-Constitutionalist parties were disintegrating, as Rossman observes, but new parties would not "begin when an opposition to the state government developed." They would rise in response to national, not local, issues. Their formation, by 1798, is the central theme of politics during the Mifflin administrations. We are told that Governor Mifflin, "considered a Federalist, at least nominally," headed an administration in "full control" of the Federalists for nine years; that he was opposed only by Federalist candidates in 1790 and 1793; that in 1796 "it was realized" by the Federalists that he was a Republican, and as such was "too strong to oppose."
This raises some interesting questions. If Mifflin's opponent in 1790 was a Federalist, what was Mifflin? If there was a Republican party in existence in 1793, why did it not present a candidate? Why did only Federalists, nominal or otherwise, oppose other Federalists? What had happened by 1796 to make Republican Mifflin too strong to be opposed by Federalists who nonetheless held "full control" until 1799? There are some answers for these questions. They have been available for some time in secondary form, but Mr. Rossman gives no indication of familiarity with them, or even of their existence.

The scope of this book is much larger than the title implies. Only about one half of the total of 307 pages of text is devoted to Revolutionary politics, per se. The remainder deals principally with Mifflin's three administrations as governor. His span in office was highlighted by such interesting events as the Genét affair, the yellow fever visitations, the Presque Isle settlement project, the Whiskey Insurrection and Fries's Rebellion. Most of these are quite familiar, and the author is to be commended for keeping them in proper proportion.

Mr. Rossman's appraisal of Mifflin the man is a fair one. He is shown to be lacking in profundity, brilliance, and the greater qualities of statecraft. But there is no doubt that he was a good politician. This book will serve very well until much more documentary information is made available. We needed an assessment of this man and, by and large, a good job has been done.

Temple University

Harry M. Tinkcom


Elias Boudinot occupied a rank behind the vanguard of Revolutionary worthies whom we now distinguish as the "Founding Fathers." He was, like his fellow Jerseymen William Livingston and William Paterson, an ornament to his state, but his contributions to our national development were never of the first magnitude. Mr. Boyd, with a restraint not possessed by all biographers, does not exaggerate the stature of his subject. He is content to assert that this study of Boudinot's varied career adds a few brush strokes to the panorama of the early years of the republic.

Boudinot, the son of a silversmith, was born in Philadelphia, lived in Princeton during his teens, and achieved distinction while a resident of Elizabeth Town. Late in his life he maintained a splendid home at "Rose Hill" in North Philadelphia and spent his final years at Burlington. His rise to prominence began after his fortunate marriage to the sister of Richard Stockton, with whom he studied law. Through his important family connections and his own abilities, he rapidly gained for himself an outstanding
place in the political, social, and economic life of New Jersey. Not a personally popular figure, he nevertheless commanded wide respect and assumed positions of responsibility in many different fields. It is in his narration of the routine events of Boudinot’s personal life that Mr. Boyd writes most confidently.

The salient facts relating to Boudinot’s public life are set down in all too strict chronological array. Boudinot’s wavering course on the eve of Independence, his subsequent brief service in the difficult post of commissary general of prisoners, and his moment in the spotlight as president of the Continental Congress in the important year of 1783 are adequately treated. The account of Boudinot’s career as an ardent Federalist in the first three Congresses is unilluminating, for it is based too largely on the Annals alone. His vexatious trials during the decade that he directed the operations of the United States Mint are sympathetically reviewed. There are also brief glimpses of Boudinot as a faithful trustee of the College of New Jersey, as the first president of the American Bible Society, and as the author of ambitious but curious works in the field of theology.

Mr. Boyd relates almost nothing about Boudinot’s extremely successful law practice or about his real estate enterprises and financial speculations. It was in the field of business that Boudinot’s shrewdness found fullest scope, and it was because shrewdness was his chief attribute that he never quite reached the pinnacle of a statesman.

Many criticisms can be leveled against this book, which is not the work of a professional historian. The routine year-by-year approach is tedious and restrictive. More serious, the author leaves innumerable important questions unanswered and rarely displays the interpretative quality that is essential to good biography. Too, the sources used have not been imaginatively exploited.

Although this is, unfortunately, not the definitive life of Boudinot, it is ably written, relatively free from error, and carefully documented. Mr. Boyd, as a businessman-historian, deserves commendation for his efforts and accomplishments in the field of his avocation.

Rutgers University

Richard P. McCormick


The Keystone in the Democratic Arch comes very near to being the keystone of the political history of Pennsylvania, for it covers a period about midway between the present and the origin of representative government in Pennsylvania, and it connects the recent studies of Brunhouse (The Counter-Revolution in Pennsylvania, 1776–1790) and Tinkcom (The Republicans and
Federalists in Pennsylvania, 1790–1801) with the work of Klein (Pennsylvania Politics, 1817–1832). The title reflects the enthusiastic belief of Pennsylvania Republicans that they made possible the national victories of their party, that Pennsylvania's constancy in Republican principles permitted the Virginia dynasty of Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe to attain and maintain control of national affairs.

Of Pennsylvania's consistent Republicanism in this period there can be no doubt. The author carefully follows a chronological trail that leads from one Republican victory to another in this era of two three-term governors, Thomas McKean and Simon Snyder. These two sons of immigrants, the one of a Scotch-Irish tavern keeper, the other of a German mechanic, demonstrate through their careers that society in Pennsylvania was democratic in more than just political nomenclature.

So regular were Republican victories, indeed, that this chronicle of them would be a dull one were men not human and therefore factious. It is the factions within the Republican party that provide the excitement of this tale, and it is the leaders of faction, William Duane and Michael Leib, who, in a dramatic sense, almost steal the show. Dr. Leib and editor Duane are such troublesome men that their antics tend to give the book a Philadelphia orientation, which is re-enforced by the size and wealth of the metropolis on the Delaware.

Yet the author seeks to use the whole state as his background in this narrative of a period when the capital has moved from Philadelphia to Lancaster, and then on to Harrisburg, just as political hegemony moves from the city to the country Democrats. It begins in the year of the Jeffersonian conquest. The victorious Republicans are soon quarreling among themselves and dividing into supporters and opponents of the McKean administration. The former group, called Constitutional Republicans or Quids, hold power by alliance with the remnant of Federalists who survive their party's debacle. The latter group, the opponents of McKean, eventually triumph with Snyder's election in 1808, but the victors soon divide. Foreign affairs twice rescue them by enforcing party unity. The Embargo and the War of 1812 give new life to the Federalists, and temporarily the Democratic factions close ranks. By doing so, they save the state and the nation for Madison in 1812. In 1815 the Peace of Ghent crushes the Federalists and permits the Democrats to enjoy internecine war again.

Through these developments is interwoven the story of the development of party machinery. The district delegate system of nominating candidates becomes popular, though belatedly, even with the Federalists. The legislative nominating caucus has its day, and begins to retreat before the convention. As these devices are utilized, principles are found to provide an ideological basis for the pragmatic. Societies, like newspapers, are formed to further factional ends; the "Friends of the People" and the "Friends of the Constitution of the United States" are quite unfriendly to the villains who are their enemies.
The re-election of governors McKean and Snyder, up to the constitutional limit of three successive terms each, contrasts oddly with the failure to re-elect any Senator of the period. Most of these Senators—Samuel Maclay, Andrew Gregg, Dr. Leib, Abner Lacock, Jonathan Roberts, for example—seem a nationally undistinguished lot. The Pennsylvania politician of greatest national reputation, Gallatin, remains a shadowy figure in this volume as his career keeps him in the Presidential cabinet or on diplomatic missions abroad. Alexander Dallas plays a more important role at home, but avoids elective office. Hugh Brackenridge, George Logan, William Jones, John Binns, Nicholas Biddle and Peter Muhlenberg are other men of some renown who take parts, large or small, in this political drama.

It is good to know that this fourth volume of Pennsylvania political history is not to be the last. The reviewer is happy to anticipate extension of the series forward and backward in time. Eventually, as the series develops, it is to be hoped that a one-volume synthesis of these political chronicles will appear. Long life to the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission till then. Even longer life to the Commission, but may its wisdom extend in future volumes to inclusion of a good map of Pennsylvania, a map that will indicate county boundaries as they existed at the beginning or end of the period covered, a map that will allow the reader comfortably to gape at such wonders as the isolated Federalism of Adams County. A civil list would also be a useful appendix, but a map, sirs, is essential—at least for non-Pennsylvanians. And we outlanders are interested.

University of Delaware

JOHN A. MUNROE


Four purposes are served by this volume, which is at one and the same time a handsome art book and a significant contribution to history.

Primarily, it is a biography of a Quaker painter who is not as well known as his coreligionists, Benjamin West and Percy Bigland. Although not a Friend, Thomas Eakins belongs with this group, for his biographer wrote: "Eakins stands apart in his objectivity, and I search for a designation which would epitomize his qualities—perhaps Quaker-like would serve. His pictures certainly have the plainness, the calmness, the reserve, and integrity of that admirable sect." This could truly be said of Hicks, since he was a member of the Religious Society of Friends. The story of his life, 1780-1849, is well told, based on original research and access to existing family records never before used.

Secondly, there are forty-one illustrations from his work, including three in brilliant full color. The frontispiece is a reproduction of an oil painting
from the brush of his cousin, another artist, Thomas Hicks. It is a remarkable painting in that it was executed by Thomas when he was fifteen and Edward, the subject, was fifty-eight. The photographs form a representative group of the paintings of Edward Hicks in major art galleries and privately owned collections.

The author has also contributed well to Pennsylvania social history. While the life of Hicks was centered in the Delaware River Valley at the beginning of the Nation's independence, Alice Ford dips also into the Revolutionary period for background. Fundamentally, the book portrays the life and customs of rural and town life still flourishing, at the same time depicting their eighteenth- and nineteenth-century origins. It has only been within months that Big Steel has moved into the district. So, while changes will take place rapidly in the future, much of Bucks County's history which might otherwise have been lost has now been recorded in Edward Hicks.

Finally, Alice Ford, a non-Friend has labored energetically to analyze Hicks as a Friend and champion of his famous cousin Elias Hicks of Long Island, around whose religious tenets centered a most unhappy controversy in Quakerdom during the first half of the nineteenth century. The roots and the fruits of that schism are tricky to handle. Several documents previously unknown were discovered that make this volume a source book to be consulted when studying this tragic phase of Quaker history. Fortunately for the historian, Edward Hicks left a journal written in customary style and explicit in title: "Memoirs of the Life and Religious Labors of Edward Hicks, late of Newtown, Bucks County, Pennsylvania. Written by Himself. Published at Philadelphia by Merrihew & Thompson, Printers, No. 7 Carter's Alley. 1851." Not enough attention is given this excellent journal by the historians of the Quaker controversies of the nineteenth century. In it one finds the testimony of an artist who said: "I quit the only business I understood, and for which I had a capacity, viz. painting, for the business of a farmer, which I did not understand, and for which I had no qualifications whatever." Here was a man who wrote: "If the Christian world were in the real spirit of Christ, I do not believe there would be such a thing as a fine painter in Christendom." Here is the Pennsylvanian who thought himself insignificant, yet who today is possibly "the most beloved of American primitive painters."

Alice Ford has contributed an analysis of the true and inner meaning of Hicks's canvases and boards which will make them even more valuable studies in Americana, Quakeriana, and Biblical lore. All these strains are definitely related in the work of this artist, who devoted the major energies of his life to itinerant preaching as a humble servant of Christ, his Master. When he expressed himself with his brush, it was upon religious subjects and often with marvelous quotations lettered in Caslon type style.

A Quaker author would always follow the Friendly language usage, such as "First-day" for what the world calls "Sunday." And in Quaker Meeting, the "Queries" (questions regarding the state of the religious Society) are
read from the desk by the Clerks (p. 25). But these and other Friendly
solecisms detract only slightly. They are understandable because the author
has labored valiantly and successfully to portray nineteenth-century
Quakerism as seen through the life of a man who painted with words as well
as with brushes. This volume will give added impetus to the search for more
of the works of Edward Hicks of Newtown. Most likely there are still some
to be uncovered. Whatever the results of the search, Alice Ford has written
a book, and her publisher magnificently executed its publication, that will
be a discovery for those interested in the American primitive.

Overbrook, Pa.                      Richmond P. Miller

The World of Eli Whitney. By Jeannette Mirsky & Allan Nevins. (New
York: The Macmillan Company, 1952. xviii, 346 p. Illustrations,
bibliography, index. $5.75.)

Every school child knows Eli Whitney as the inventor of the cotton gin;
but comparatively few people realize that his inventive genius was instru-
mental in paving the way for modern mass production, whose revolutioniz-
ing effects upon human history are no less noteworthy than those of the
cotton gin.

The volume under review, based primarily on the Whitney papers in the
Library of Yale University, is much the most detailed study of Whitney
that has yet appeared. But the present authors are not the first to exploit
this collection of manuscripts. In the course of the nineteenth century, three
different writers made sufficient use of this material to “present the major
outlines of Whitney’s achievements.” These studies, in the words of the
authors of the present volume, deprived “us of the excitement of unknown
surprises; it has remained our task to try to give the full texture and minor
relevant facets of Whitney’s life and work.” In the performance of this task
they have been eminently successful. If they have not changed Whitney’s
place in history, they have substantially strengthened his claim to the niche
previously accorded him.

After three brief chapters disposing of Whitney’s career to his graduation
from Yale, the authors relate in detail his sojourn in Georgia, which led to
the invention of the cotton gin; his plans for the manufacture of the gin in
New Haven; and his long, but losing, fight to protect his patent rights
against the encroachment of other and designing persons. Indeed, the one
part of the book which becomes somewhat dull is that which tells the dreary
story of his litigation in southern courts.

Whitney’s second career began in 1798, when he entered into a contract
with the government to manufacture 10,000 stand of muskets. According to
Whitney’s plan, these guns were to be made with standardized, inter-
changeable parts. It is, of course, the application, by Whitney and his suc-
cessors, of this concept of manufacture which has made possible the mass
production of our time. And this concept necessitated the development, in this country, beginning in Whitney's day, of the machine-tool industry. The vicissitudes of fortune experienced by Whitney in the execution of his contract are vividly told; and the reader is left in no doubt as to Whitney's part in the inception of the modern industrial era.

If Whitney, the man, is rather less evident in this volume than Whitney, the inventor, it is not the fault of the authors. As they make clear, his wife, to whom we are so greatly indebted for the preservation of his business papers and his mechanical drawings, may have been less interested in saving his personal letters.

*The World of Eli Whitney* includes three chapters of purely background material, dealing respectively with "The Emergence of the Machine," "Cotton and the Industrial Revolution," and "The Birth of the Machine-Tool Industry." To this reviewer the inclusion of this material would seem somewhat less forced and artificial if it were woven into the chapters dealing specifically with Whitney.

Some readers may feel that certain of the quoted passages are too long and could have been broken up or paraphrased to advantage.

Finally, the authors do something less than justice to a contemporary of Whitney who, working independently, had conceived the principle of manufacture by interchangeable parts. There is only the most passing reference to that Connecticut Yankee, Simeon North, who by 1808 had achieved a very substantial success in the manufacture of pistols by this method. And North's contract of 1813 for government pistols is the first one known to have required that the arms be made wholly with interchangeable parts. Simeon North was very much a part of *The World of Eli Whitney*.

*Brown University*  
JAMES B. HEDGES

---

The Diary of George Templeton Strong, 1835-1875. Four volumes. Edited by Allan Nevins and Milton Halsey Thomas. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1952. liv, 391; xiv, 517; xvi, 642; xiv, 603 p. Illustrations, genealogical note, indices. $35.00.)

"Old John Brown was hanged this morning," George Strong confided to his diary on December 2, 1859. "Justly say I, but his name may be a word of power for the next half-century." A day or two later Strong added some further reflections:

Old Brown's demeanor has undoubtedly made a great impression. Many heroes of the Newgate Calendar have died game, as he did; but his simplicity and consistency, the absence of fuss, parade and bravado, the strength and clearness of his letters, all indicate a depth of conviction that one does not expect in an Abolitionist (who is apt to be a mere talker and sophist), and that tends to dignify and to ennoble in popular repute the very questionable church of which he is the protomartyr. Slavery
has received no such blow in my time as his strangulation. There must be a revolu-
tion in feeling even in the terrified State of Virginia. . . . One's faith in anything is
terribly shaken by anybody who is ready to go to the gallows condemning and
denouncing it.

This single extract from the massive personal record kept by George
Templeton Strong for forty years and now brought to light and published
suggests the qualities of the great Diary as a whole. There is, first, the sense
of nearness to the event—the sense of impact—that makes the reading of
such a journal the next best thing to witnessing historical events with one's
own eyes. Second, there is the play of intelligence on the event recorded. As
a well-educated New York lawyer, Episcopalian, and man of taste, Strong
disliked all forms of political extremism. Up to this point he had usually
characterized the abolitionists as “maudlin philanthropists” and “Quaker
Bravos.” But the conduct of John Brown and the panic he caused among
the “chivalry” of the South opened his eyes, and he set down the prescient
observations here quoted.

Finally, there is the crispness and pace of Strong’s style. Though he had
no literary aspirations and published nothing except an occasional report or
pamphlet, Strong had high competence as an observer and narrator, and his
Diary should at once give him permanent rank among nineteenth-century
American writers. It is a literary as well as a historical discovery of great
magnitude.

The story of how the Diary came to light cannot be told here, though it is
fully told by the editors. And within the limits of a review only the meager-
est hints can be given of the variety and importance of its contents. Strong
began his private record while he was a Columbia undergraduate in 1835
and kept it, with only negligible interruptions, until within a month of his
death in 1875. All of these years he lived in New York City, entering his
father's law office after graduation and in due time becoming a moderately
prosperous and very highly respected lawyer. The Diary provides a detailed
record of the expansion of the metropolis northward; of the difficulties—
even as early as 1850—of getting out to the country on week ends; of the
fires, financial panics, and plagues that pock-marked the city’s history; of
the riots that sprang from racial and political tensions in a population
growing at a fantastic rate. The chronicle is especially rich and full on the
city’s cultural life, which steadily expanded and improved despite the
violence that so often boiled to the surface and the municipal corruption
that was virtually a constant. In 1853 Strong was elected a trustee of
Columbia College and he devoted much of his time thereafter to its affairs.
He was one of the best trustees that any college could ever have had, always
on the progressive side of every issue, contending mightily with the “fogey-
ism” of his older colleagues, whose slumbers in their “Castle of Indolence”
Strong rudely disturbed with proposals (which he succeeded in carrying out)
for graduate schools in law and science. He played a somewhat similar role as a member of the vestry of that citadel of respectability, Trinity Church. And he was for many years probably the leading supporter of musical activities in the city. Many pages of the Diary are devoted to enthusiastic or caustic, but always perceptive, criticism of concert and operatic performances.

These contributions and others that could be added were substantial, but like many other Americans Strong rose to his full stature in the Civil War. Though but one eighth of the time-span of the Diary as a whole, the five years of the War take up the largest of the four volumes in the printed record, and it is probably to this third volume that readers and scholars will most often recur.

The Christmas following John Brown’s raid and execution, the tree in the Strongs’ front hall was surmounted by a flag on which Mrs. Strong had “with great care and labor inscribed ‘THE UNION FOREVER.’ ” Though moderate by nature and attached to no party, Strong grew increasingly disgusted with the supineness of President Buchanan (“the Old Pennsylvania Fossil”) in the presence of crisis. When the fighting came on he was braced for it, and his description of the wave of emotional unity that swept the North when Fort Sumter was attacked is reporting of the very highest order, as stirring as great poetry.

Strong found his place as treasurer of the Sanitary Commission, which saved the lives and health of hundreds of thousands of Union troops by collecting some five million dollars and procuring and distributing medical supplies. He took his duties so seriously that he more or less wrecked both his fortune and his health in discharging them, and among those who handled large funds in that frenzied era Strong was one of the few against whom not even a whispered accusation of inefficiency or dishonesty was ever uttered. The post, of course, greatly enriched Strong’s journal, for the Commission frequently met in Washington and had to deal with President Lincoln, Secretary of War Stanton (“a born tyrant”), and many of the commanders in the field. Strong’s appraisals of these men and many lesser ones do great credit to his discernment and make exceedingly lively reading.

The Diary as now published does great credit not only to its author, but to its editors as well. Messrs. Nevins and Thomas have provided a great deal of commentary and annotation, but it is always helpful, unobtrusive, and readable. Nor should the publishers be overlooked in these congratulations. At a time when manufacturing costs for books are devastatingly high, it required courage and imagination even to issue for general sale a work of this kind. To have done so in so handsome a format and with a wealth of illustrations, admirably chosen and reproduced, deserves a citation for distinguished public service.

Institute of Early American History and Culture

L. H. Butterfield
"The historian must not try to know what is truth," wrote Henry Adams in the *Education*, "if he realizes his honesty; for, if he cares for his truths, he is certain to falsify his facts." For a long generation students of history, some of them in consternation, have been asking whether Adams is sincere or ironical in this statement; and no answer has been more satisfying than that made by the late William A. Dunning only a few months after the *Education* appeared. "In fact he is both," Dunning remarked, "for he is writing as one who has a philosophy of history, and to such a one paradox and the synthesis of contradictions is the very breath of life."

In these few words there is more understanding of the genius of Henry Adams than in many of the learned and elaborate studies dealing with the historian and his ideas. It is reassuring to discover early in the pages of William Jordy's book that he has not been confused by his paradoxical subject. Or perhaps it would be more accurate to say that he seems only occasionally to be confused. Certainly, he has given us the most exciting analysis of Henry Adams' thinking about history and historical method that has yet been written. One may smile at the neat preciseness of some of his categories, when he is distinguishing between "Parkman's literary attitude" and "Adams' scientific attitude" (p. 22), but there is no escaping the compelling reasonableness of his appraisal of the *History*. That particular job need never be done again.

Here Adams appears as more nearly akin to a "disillusioned Comtist" than to any of the exemplars of "scientific history" in his own or a later generation. Mr. Jordy is sure that the influence of Comte was central so far as the *History* is concerned, and that the French philosopher was largely responsible for the optimistic tone which made this early work "the greatest moral history ever produced in America." The pessimistic years came after the Comtian hopes for a positive science of society had faded.

The evidence of this early and primary influence of Comte is far more convincing than the casual dismissal of the effect of Brooks Adams' thinking on the thought of Henry. A footnote suffices to brush aside the fascinating intellectual relations of the two brothers, which the late Charles A. Beard described in his introduction to Brooks Adams' *The Law of Civilization and Decay*. Jordy seems sure that Beard is inaccurate when he states that "Henry's later ideas on history derived from Brooks' volume." Whatever the facts may be about the reciprocal intellectual influences, there can be little doubt that the views set forth in Henry's *The Degradation of the Democratic Dogma* owed much to the sharpness of Brooks' perception.

Central in Mr. Jordy's study is his examination of Adams' "science" of history in the chapters entitled "The Curve of Degradation," "The Decrease of Energy," and "The Limit of Thought." If at times he seems to
treat "scientific history" and "philosophy of history" as if they represented the same concept, he is impressive, comprehensive, and devastating in his conclusions. But did he need to marshal such an array of evidence to prove what he must have known before he started his research, namely, that Henry Adams, for all his easy use of scientific labels had never become more than an interested observer in any of the natural or physical sciences? For all the pretension that some contemporaries thought they detected in the "Letter," for example, Adams never pretended to a knowledge which he did not possess. How much of the Degradation is an exercise in paradox? To what degree are its wit and erudition merely ironic? Mr. Jordy treats Adams' "science" of history very seriously and destroys its basis very thoroughly. This reader at least, is inclined to ask: Was the result worth the effort?

Professional historians have been loath to concede that Adams' greatness "lies beyond historical thinking and historical method." They may be stubbornly wrong. One of the impressive qualities of this book, so richly furnished with the stuff of historical analysis, is the sense that it gives the reader of the aesthetic side of Adams. Mr. Jordy teaches the history of art at Yale. He must have been tempted often to break through the limitations of his subtitle, "Scientific Historian," and engage in the great search for the essential genius of the man whose every failure, by his own standards, has become something like a triumph in the historians' ledger. For all his penetrating analysis, Mr. Jordy does not tell us why.

Columbia University


Dr. Stanley Pargellis of the Newberry Library used to forecast some years ago that history would be more and more taught by means of fiction. And surely our appreciation of the American past has been heightened by the writings of Kenneth Roberts, Willa Cather, and Walter Edmonds, to name but a few. On the other hand, professional historians, such as Louis C. Hunter, Allan Nevins, and Oscar Handlin, have given us an understanding of the past by analyses of events or trends in particular segments of historical change.

Dr. Bridges' volume on Charlemagne Tower falls between these two extremes. The author tells a story. Presumably, most of it is based on discovered fact. However, sometimes he seems to embroider as, at the start of chapters, he matches the repertorial style of Time with such allegations as "Charlemagne perched on his sister's music stool and wrote in his diary" or "George Stone had a stitch in his back. The weather was bad." Moreover, Dr. Bridges appears to have aimed at a lively style of writing, which, unhappily, results all too often in stereotyped phrases that try the reader's patience.
Finally, and most seriously, the author rarely asks "Why" of his materials and, when he does, often fails to give adequate supporting data. "Why" did Tower put money-making so high in his scale of values? "Why" was a man of Tower's peculiar talents important in opening up the Minnesota iron deposits? "Why," after one bankruptcy, if he was allegedly able to make more than one "long-foreseen, carefully thought-out, and neatly executed move on his business chessboard," did he get himself into a position soon of having to beg an old lady for money to keep him out of a second financial crash? "Why" should the reader approve or disapprove of Tower's particular career? Even though Professor Nevins in his Introduction extols the volume as "a study of the character of an eminent entrepreneur" and "a chapter in the economic history of the Northwest," as well as "a story of business adventure," I am inclined to view the book as chiefly the last. It is a sort of romanticized history, and as such does not help us greatly to understand the business America of the nineteenth century.

Tower spent a number of his years in Philadelphia, where he died, and was a benefactor of The Historical Society of Pennsylvania through the bequest of his outstanding collection of colonial laws.

*Harvard University*  
Arthur H. Cole


The Bucks County Historical Society is always enterprising and generous, and certainly in publishing this book it gives the readers good measure. The four hundred and seventy-five well-printed pages are crowded with history, genealogy, statistics and copies of court documents pertaining to the Doane brothers.

The volume purports to be a reprint of a narrative of the career of the famous (or infamous) brigands who terrorized the Delaware Valley during and after the Revolution. The story of the Doanes might convey a suggestion of Robin Hood and his outlaws of Sherwood Forest except that the Doanes went wrong and spied for Sir William Howe, thus betraying their country during the War for Independence. So perhaps a more fitting parallel for our Doanes is to be found in the lives of the Doone outlaws immortalized in Blackmore's much-read novel, *Lorna Doone*. There is also a certain flavor of Cooper's novel, *The Spy*, only the hero of *The Spy*, Harvey Birch, very properly toiled for his own people.

The collation of this book seems to give the reader every possible source of information as to the Doanes, their times, the countryside where they lived and even their forebears. For the price of this volume we are given a summary of the causes of the Revolutionary War, mostly drawn from
secondary authorities, a mass of biography, mostly repetetive, concerning Lord Sterling, Arnold, Mercer, Lydia Darragh and others, and a bewildering collection of genealogical notes. Indeed, the reader has perused fifty-four pages before he comes directly to the Doanes themselves. And the last fifty pages are given over to copies of documents and court records. The subject, while interesting, hardly seems to warrant so much labor of assembly and collation.

This book—or reprint, for such it mostly is—should be of great interest to the dwellers in the present Bucks County where the bandit gang once flourished in their life of crime, although the Doanes lived for a time in Lancaster County. There is always a certain romantic appeal in outlawry, and the picture of the last of the Doanes being murdered by a Philadelphia mob years after the proclamation of amnesty which should have protected him evokes our sympathy.

From a typographical point of view the volume is well gotten up and the authorities and sources well marshaled. The illustrations and copies of old woodcuts are clearly and admirably executed.

Reading, Pa. J. BENNETT NOLAN

On Freedom's Altar. The Martyr Complex in the Abolition Movement. By HAZEL CATHERINE WOLF. (Madison, Wis.: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1952. xvi, 195 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. $3.75.)

The theme of this study is that the abolitionists were for the most part fanatics who capitalized on the Christian concept of martyrdom as an effective means of enlisting popular support for an unpopular cause. After its beginnings in 1831, the basis of the abolition argument shifted between the religio-moral position of Weld and Garrison and the political-legal position of Birney and others, until, by seizing on the martyr tradition, abolitionist leaders were able to gain public approval of their crusade. Paralleling the experiences of the early Christians, abolitionists evolved a clearly defined pattern of martyrdom, of indifference followed by conversion, a life of asceticism, forgiveness of one's enemies, willingness to suffer, sacrifice of personal ambition, and complete dedication to a cause.

The martyr complex, as Miss Wolf explains in her opening chapters, was already well developed in the United States by the early nineteenth century. New England colonists, who regarded Foxe's Book of Martyrs as a necessary adjunct to the Bible, provided a number of early martyrs in the persons of maltreated missionaries to the Indians, religious dissidents such as Roger Williams and Anne Hutchinson, imprisoned English Puritans, and suffering settlers. Colonial troubles with Britain provided more—the Boston Massacre victims, the Valley Forge soldiers, and of course Nathan Hale. Reinforced by early nineteenth-century humanitarianism and evangelistic
religion (particularly Finney’s “perfectionism”) the native tradition of martyrdom was firmly established by the time that Garrison fired the opening gun of the abolition crusade in 1831. Chiefly under Garrisonian influence, abolitionism became integrated with the martyr complex. By constant struggle and consistent suffering, abolitionists succeeded in identifying their cause with cherished American traditions of free speech, free press, right of petition, right of jury trial, and right to personal liberty. Eventually, those abolitionists first regarded as troublemakers came to be revered as martyrs, able to say with St. Paul, “If God be for us, who can be against us?” Their position was, as the author points out, a sincerely held one, not a conscious nor a cynical exploitation of an emotionally loaded concept.

The major portion of Miss Wolf’s study is concerned with an analysis of the abolition movement and its personnel, intended to illustrate how martyrdom became an increasingly effective weapon in the hands of a group of shrewd, sincere leaders. Garrison, who was paraded through the streets of Boston with a noose about his neck, set the pattern. Elijah Lovejoy, who died defending his press in Illinois, gave the crusade its first martyred hero, followed by Prudence Crandall, Charles Torrey, Theodore Weld, and dozens of fugitive slaves, editors, speakers and agents. With the execution of John Brown, humanitarianism and abolitionism merged into a new antislavery synthesis, moving into the realm of a sacred Christian mission. The war that followed was in many ways an extension of it. With Lincoln’s assassination the martyr tradition entered party politics as the Radical Republicans claimed it for their own and maneuvered it for their partisan purposes. He who defied the Republican Party, it was assumed, opposed Lincoln, the moral foundations of abolitionism, and the great American and Christian tradition of death for a righteous cause.

Long regarded as saints or devils, as holy crusaders or irresponsible fanatics, the abolitionist movement and its leaders are slowly being brought into proper historical focus by means of studies such as this one. By reassessing the issues that moved events from 1830 to 1865, the author has done much to establish the fact that one of the reasons for the success of the abolitionist crusade was its successful merger with the American tradition of freedom and the Christian concept of martyrdom. No other reform movement in American history has been so packed with emotional, humanitarian, and religious connotations. The value of this study lies in the fact that by analyzing and documenting an important aspect of the abolition controversy, Miss Wolf has clarified one of its most puzzling problems—how could an unpopular idea, initially suppressed and almost universally condemned by the public, eventually gain wide support, absorb the energies of numbers of able men and women, and even provide part of the motivation for a civil war? There were, of course, other factors operative in the process; abolitionism also became identified with unionism, with political control and party politics, with economic and legal issues. But by untangling a neglected
psychological thread from the tangled skein of events that preceded the Civil War, Miss Wolf has made a valuable contribution to the historical scholarship of the period.

_Michigan State College_  

**Russe B. Nye**

---


A bibliography published in 1945 listed 3,958 books and pamphlets “concerned in major part with Lincoln’s life.” A steady outpour of writings in the past seven years has raised the aggregate of Lincoln books to a figure that must now be well over 4,000. And still they come. Indeed, if the new ten-volume _Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln_ now ready for publication be included, 1952 must go down as a banner year in writings devoted to the Great Emancipator. The Rail Splitter from Illinois who thrilled a skeptical New York audience at Cooper Union in 1860 continues across the years to have tremendous appeal to people everywhere.

Among the more important publications of 1952 was the third volume of James G. Randall’s definitive work on _Lincoln the President_, the third volume of Kenneth P. Williams’ interesting military study, _Lincoln Finds A General_, and the highly popular one-volume work, _Lincoln and His Generals_, by T. Harry Williams.

In a class by itself is Benjamin Thomas’s short but comprehensive biography of Lincoln. Mr. Thomas claims to have made no startling discoveries, but he has produced a balanced and vivid portrait based on all the important writings by and about Lincoln. The fact of his having used the yet unpublished _Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln_ is indicative of the up-to-dateness of his investigations.

The work combines thorough research with richness of interpretation—and the interpretation is fresh, judicious, and convincing. Another outstanding quality is the style. The author resorts to no sensationalism or trickery. He demonstrates clearly a fact too often forgotten by would-be popular writers, that remarkably satisfying results may be obtained by straightforward, unadorned good writing.

In a recent interview the author was asked his major impression of Lincoln after twenty years of study. “He was no accident,” was the ready response; “he continually grew.” This concept of continual development is plainly evident in Mr. Thomas’s interpretation. The Gettysburg Address and the Second Inaugural, as he points out, were not sudden swells of inspiration, but the normal fruit of a good mind enriched by years of varied experience and profound application.

The Lincoln who emerges at the end of this intriguing story was by no means a demigod, but he was unquestionably great—in patience, kindliness,
wisdom and character. He was a man of light and shadow, simplicity and complexity, elegance and earthiness. But he was always honest, always humble, and always devoted to democratic principle. To his quiet strength in crisis the United States will ever owe a tremendous debt.

Thomas's *Lincoln* unquestionably becomes the best one-volume biography of the Civil War president. It accomplishes admirably the difficult feat of pleasing the specialist and delighting the general reader.

*Emory University*  
Bell Irvin Wiley

*Divided We Fought. A Pictorial History of the War, 1861-1865.* Edited by David Donald, Hirst D. Milhollen, Milton Kaplan, and Hulen Stuart. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1952. xii, 452 p. $10.00.)

The recent trend in pictorial histories of the Civil War goes marching on, the latest bearing the intriguing title *Divided We Fought* and intended to combine the best photographs and sketches available on that conflict from all sources that could be reached. These have been placed in chronological order with a text from selected books on the war.

Many sources have been tapped to gather this material, but like an anthology, the result cannot please every reader. In the main, however, the pictures are well selected, many of them unfamiliar to this reviewer; the sketches, mostly by Waud and Forbes, are also well done.

It is to be regretted that an alphabetical index of the pictures is not included, as this would be of value to the student in looking up a particular general or battle. The editors frankly admit in the preface that the "parent" of this book is the ten-volume *The Photographic History of the Civil War*, published in 1911 by the Review of Reviews Company. Of the five hundred photographs in *Divided We Fought* a large proportion come from that source, while the Brady collection in the Library of Congress, the collection in the National Archives, the collection of the Handy Studios and the Cook Collection in Richmond account for many of the remaining pictures. Modern photographic reproduction has sharpened and improved many pictures which are familiar to Civil War students.

While an index has been omitted, the pictures and text do follow the war as it develops, a great improvement over *The Photographic History* in which the reader jumps from one section of the war to another without continuity.

Several years were taken in assembling the photographs and sketches used, and after the best of these had been selected by Hirst D. Milhollen and Milton Kaplan (of the Prints and Photographs Division of the Library of Congress) they found themselves with a splendid collection, but with no adequate text or captions for the illustrations. It was then that they turned to David Donald of Columbia University who agreed to handle the difficult problem of the text. His solution was a book of fourteen chapters, with a
text supplied by eye-witness accounts or quotations from standard works woven together into a continuous story, of interest alike to the Civil War tyro and the advanced student.

It is a long cry from the crude drawings of Harper's Weekly or Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper of the sixties to Divided We Fought, but there has been a build-up over the years of student interest in books which are mainly illustrations of the war as it was. Shortly after Appomattox, Gardner's Sketch Book, which was misnamed since it contains about two hundred actual photographs inserted in the pages as a frame, appeared in the finest form available at that period. It was a financial failure and so few copies were issued that today it is a rare-book item, but it contains many photographs of surprising clearness and interest, some of which are reproduced in Divided We Fought. Gardner was one of Brady's assistants, and in his book we may read on a photograph, "Positive by Gardner" or "Negative by Brady" or by various other assistants.

In the eighties, when Battles and Leaders of the Civil War came out in four volumes, engravings and sketches were profuse and were by far the best war illustrations to date (the Brady collection not being available at that time).

Within the past few years we have had two books by Meredith of Brady pictures, A Pictorial History of the Confederacy by Buchanan, published in 1951, and others, and as the flow of books on the absorbing topic of "the War" never ceases, we may expect more photographic histories to appear and adorn the shelves of the Civil War student.

Divided We Fought is the best of its kind issued so far, in the opinion of this reviewer, and any collection of books on this period should certainly include this volume.

Paoli, Pa.  

Kent Packard

The Northern Railroads in the Civil War, 1861–1865. By Thomas Weber. (New York: King's Crown Press of Columbia University, 1952. xii, 318 p. Bibliography, index. $4.00.)

This book, like its complement, Railroads of the Confederacy by Robert C. Black III (Chapel Hill, 1952), was inspired by that prodigious scholar, Allan Nevins, and both volumes will probably make their contribution to his work-in-progress, Ordeal of the Union. Mr. Weber has brought together in a brief narrative—232 pages of text—much material that was hitherto available only in scattered articles and in chapters in railroad and local histories, and Mr. Nevins and other Civil War historians will be grateful to the author for presenting the information in this compact form.

The book covers two divergent topics, the effect of the war upon the overall operations of the railroads and the problems involved in the operation of the railroads for military purposes, excluding any discussion of the effects of the railroads on the conduct of the war. The first of these subjects does
not lend itself to satisfactory treatment in the organization which the author has adopted, a road-by-road, year-by-year, summary of the experience of the lines in each section of the country. The substitution of generalizations for the uncorrelated statistics here presented would have produced a clearer picture and left space for a more extended treatment of the major theme of the book.

This reader, for example, would like to have learned more about railroad rivalries during the war. The Baltimore and Ohio was hampered in the early years of the conflict by the hostility of Secretary of War Simon Cameron, who was interested in the Northern Central, and Assistant Secretary of War Thomas A. Scott, vice-president of the Pennsylvania. There is a tantalizing glimpse of what was apparently a scheme of Cameron’s to get two million dollars from the government to bring the Northern Central into Washington by means of the Metropolitan Railroad Company. This proposal was successfully blocked by the B. & O. lobbyists, as was a later attempt by the Pennsylvania to circumvent Maryland opposition by getting a Federal charter for a similar route. Both these ideas received support in Congress because of the demand for a second line between New York and Washington, a line which was eventually to be created in the 1880’s as the result of rivalry between the Pennsylvania and the B. & O.

In the section devoted to the military operation of the railroads that neglected Pennsylvanian, Herman Haupt, gets his due. As chief of the U. S. Military Railroads, Haupt was the first man in history to work out a system for the use of the railroads to supply an army in the field. Applying the military principles of efficiency and discipline, he ran his trains on a strict schedule and even forced the generals to unload his cars according to his schedule. He set up a construction corps to restore the track torn up by the retreating enemy and to destroy bridges and rolling stock when the Union army itself was compelled to retreat. In nine days his men built a bridge four hundred feet long and eighty feet high out of “beanpoles and cornstalks,” as Lincoln described it. Improved techniques produced prefabricated bridge units, which could be thrown into place immediately behind the advancing army. The efficiency of the construction corps reached such heights that Confederates joked that there was no use blowing up tunnels, since Sherman carried spare tunnels with him.

It is to be regretted that the author has been restricted to an essentially superficial view of his subject by the nature of his sources, which, with one exception, consist entirely of printed material. The reviewer had hoped that the recent activity of the Lexington Group had persuaded the railroads to open their files to scholars. The use of railroad records and of such private collections as the Garrett Papers in the Library of Congress would have greatly increased the value of this study.

The typography of the book is excellent, considering the limitations imposed for reasons of economy by the King’s Crown Press. The most conspicuous economies are the absence of maps and the relegation of the notes
to the back. The author, required to do his own copy-editing, has eliminated almost all of those infelicities of style which plague the writer and has overlooked only the normal quota of typographical errors. A Virginian may perhaps be forgiven for complaining about the consistently doubled "p" in Culpeper, since this reviewer has detected no other evidence of carelessness.

Longwood College

MARVIN W. SCHLEGEL


Evan John's lively account of the Trent affair in Atlantic Impact, 1861 will not appeal primarily to the scholar in diplomatic history, despite the author's claim to have discovered "facts which seemed to contradict, in many particulars, the text-books provided for those who teach. . . ." Not only does it lack footnotes and bibliography, so essential for professional approval, but it scarcely seems to challenge the versions in the standard American texts at least. Actually, the book appears to be intended for the British public, for why else would the author refer to "Red Indian Territory," attempt to explain Seward's personality by describing him as Welsh, and call members of the United States cabinet "ministers"? Judged on that basis he does a first-rate job. But since Mr. John (actually Captain E. J. Simpson) is himself an English biographer and novelist, the historically-trained American will wonder at once about his method, his knowledge of this country, and his prejudices in the three-way pull between North, South, and Britain.

First, let us concede immediately that the author writes with a vividness and sprightliness seldom found in academic monographs. Much of this results from his device of treating the entire episode through the eyes of the leading personalities of the time. Not only does he give incisive portrayals of the principal political and diplomatic leaders like Lincoln, Jefferson Davis, and Lord Palmerston, but a rewarding freshness of approach leads him to include less obvious figures, such as Julia Ward Howe, Judah Benjamin, the war correspondent W. H. Russell, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Anthony Trollope and even Karl Marx. Mr. John has an enviable knack of getting into an individual's mind and outlining his assumptions and opinions in a few paragraphs. Of all the persons he discusses, he is perhaps least fair to Wendell Phillips, the most favorable to Lee and Lincoln. A number of excellent photographs form a valuable addition to the text.

But although this biographical technique naturally makes for interesting reading, it tends to attribute historical developments too much to the influence of individuals. Thus, in England the Prince Consort emerges as the unappreciated hero, not too startling a denouement for those who have seen Victoria Regina. Searching for the figure in this country who influenced
Lincoln's decision for peace, he settles on William H. Seward. Unfortunately, such an approach often minimizes equally important underlying forces whose impersonal nature does not encourage easy dramatization.

As for knowledge of this side of the ocean, on the whole Mr. John displays a sound grasp of American history and an ability to explain complicated issues in simple yet essentially correct fashion. Occasionally, small errors do reveal a lack of detailed familiarity with the American scene. Mrs. Stowe was not a native of Massachusetts, nor would there still have been slaves in that state at the time of her childhood; Henry Adams' younger brother was not named "Brooke," and Edward Everett never ran for the Presidency against Lincoln. A curiously casual and inexact map of the United States on the inside covers will somewhat amuse American readers.

Though Mr. John's sympathies tend, understandably enough, to lie with Great Britain during this dispute, he also shows excellent understanding of the viewpoints of both North and South and carefully maintains an objective balance between them. The general American reader, as well as the British one, can enjoy and profit from this examination of the question, "Why do the people of America and England, with common traditions and a common language, so frequently misunderstand each other's motives and wound each other's pride?"

University of Pennsylvania

Wallace Evan Davies


The use and misuse of anthologies is a major problem in history nowadays. Books of readings seem to come out every month. They used to be only teaching aids, but now they aim at the general reader, even appear in paper-back, two-bit editions, keeping company with the most lurid books a free press can produce. Perhaps it is a good thing. Certainly, we are now making more use of source materials than ever before, and with care we can avoid the error of confusing a knowledge of sources with an understanding of history.

This particular anthology is a superior example of the genre, and fully worth the five-dollar cost. It is limited in time to the period between the Revolution and the Civil War; it is limited in subject to documents "expressing the democratic aspirations of the common man." It is orderly in arrangement, divided into eleven subject headings—Civil Rights, Fraternal Aid to Common Men of Other Nations, Negro Equality, Free Public Education, Right to Earn a Living, for example. Each section is prefaced by an introductory essay, and each starts with 1790 and goes through the period
to 1860. The editors divide these seventy years into four eras: The Founding of the Republic, 1790–1800; Jeffersonian Democracy, 1801–1823; Jacksonian Democracy, 1824–1840; and Democracy at Stake, 1841–1860.

Now the local ground rules of book reviewing forbid us to quarrel with any anthologist’s selections. It is too easy to do so. The editors' choice in this volume is not entirely above question or criticism. For example, Elihu Burritt might well have been represented in the international brotherhood of workingmen. But on the whole, the selections successfully illustrate the democratic faith, "a tradition of struggle and not of self-congratulation." The materials are fresh, usually little known. References are not always clearly given, and unhappily there is no index, which certainly should have been provided. But the volume is useful. It can start many a sudden thought, and it broadens the historian’s sense of what his material is.

*Philadelphia*  
J. H. Powell