
"A memoir of Nicholas Biddle," said James Parton a century ago in his Life of Andrew Jackson, "if honestly written, would be a most valuable contribution to the history of the country." When this statement was made in 1860, less than twenty years had elapsed since the failure of the Pennsylvania Bank of the United States, the circumstances of which, Parton said, were "lost in a chaos of figures, statements, counter-statements, and vituperation." This partly explains why a century passed before a biography of Nicholas Biddle was produced. The chaos was first traversed by R. C. H. Catterall, whose monograph, The Second Bank of the United States, appeared in 1903. A few other historians have braved the chaos in recent years, but also with attention chiefly on the Bank, secondarily on the man who presided over it. The first book-length biography of Nicholas Biddle himself, who died in 1844, is Mr. Govan's, although Professor McGrane's valuable selection of the Biddle correspondence, in 1919, showed that appreciative attention was being given him. Mr. Govan's study, coming now, is the thorough, devoted study of a man long left to neglect and misunderstanding but gaining at last the presentation warranted by his prominent and public-spirited career.

I doubt if any other American of comparable importance with Nicholas Biddle has gone so long unchronicled in his own right. No other has fallen from fame so hard and so far, nor in circumstances whose complexity makes rehabilitation so difficult. It is not, as Parton implied, a matter mainly of writing "honestly." It is a matter where honesty alone is not enough. Honesty has impelled some historians to respect Nicholas Biddle as a man of ability overwhelmed in misfortune, and it has impelled others to write him down as an enemy of mankind who escaped what he deserved. Judgment must be understanding as well as honest, and to form an understanding judgment of Nicholas Biddle one must understand the business of banking, which is something few persons do. At the same time, relatively few people who do understand the business of banking have a professional interest in writing history or in reviewing the career of a banker whom it is easy to condemn and laborious to justify. To condemn him one need only say that he defied Andrew Jackson and that his bank collapsed. These are the obvious, incontrovertible facts. To defend him conclusively one must make some order of Mr. Parton's "chaos of figures, statements, counter-
statements, and vituperation." One must explain one tedious transaction after another, allowing for error here, pretense there, mishance throughout. One must balance intelligence, energy, personal ability, and the gift of leadership against overconfidence, excessive fluency, and maladroitness in politics. And though one may readily believe Nicholas Biddle to have been sincere, honest, and devoted to the public interest, one must hesitate long over the difficult question of whether Biddle's failures should be ascribed to his own errors of judgment, or to misfortune, or to the greater dexterity and strength of his adversaries.

After the final collapse in 1841, the Bank of the United States and Nicholas Biddle declined into something almost legendary, in the sense that what was known about them and agreed upon among historians was remarkably little. The Bank War was recognized to be, as Andrew Jackson himself considered it, the outstanding episode in an outstanding period, and yet there remained at the bottom of it what Parton had called "an incredible mystery." As Professor John Ward observes in his study of Andrew Jackson as the cherished symbol of an age, "subjective attitudes can distort objective fact," and do. In American folklore Andrew Jackson became godlike; and Nicholas Biddle, more than any Indian, Spaniard, or Britisher, more than John Quincy Adams or John C. Calhoun, became the foil to the General's virtues, the dragon to his St. George. Both men offered to the hurried and indiscriminating a temptation to mystical oversimplification. For Jackson's admirers, Biddle's downfall required nothing more judicious than repeated assumption and assertion; for everyone else, it seemed so hard and unpromising a problem that the less said of it the better. When Salmon P. Chase, who never ceased to be a Jackson man at heart, in 1861 urged establishment of a national banking system, as little as possible was said or done to let it be thought that the proposed system had anything in common with the national bank which Jackson had destroyed. And again when another half-century had passed and the Democratic administration of Woodrow Wilson was preparing in 1913 to set up the Federal Reserve Banks, any hint that they derogated from Andrew Jackson's heroic defeat of Nicholas Biddle was hushed.

Meanwhile, James Parton's successors had approached the problem but gingerly, being perplexed and discouraged by it, as he had been, even when inclined to be generous to Biddle. William Graham Sumner declared in 1882 that "Jackson's administration unjustly, passionately, ignorantly, and without regard to truth, assailed a great and valuable financial institution and calumniated its management," but nevertheless respecting Biddle's sincerity he avowed misgivings which he did not resolve. McMaster, in 1906, confined himself to a recital of occurrences and no more than summarily doubted Nicholas Biddle's wisdom. Bassett, in 1911, as summarily, found Biddle "cautious and rash by turns" and his judgment bad. According to Channing, in 1921, Biddle "was not a good judge of men"; he "possessed the fatal gift of literary fluency"; as president of the state bank, he
threw caution to the wind and used the funds of the institution for speculative purposes." Catterall alone, in 1903, presented the case for Biddle extensively and favorably, finding his "prominent fault . . . an over-sanguine temper"; Jackson he suspected of disingenuousness and the reasoning of the great veto he asserted to be "beneath contempt." Professor Catterall's monograph, however, like most classics, grew old, and it was limited to an account of the Bank under federal charter. Yet it is the career of the federal bank's successor under Pennsylvania charter that is crucial in judgments of Biddle. The Pennsylvania bank failed, as the federal bank had not, and by doing so "proved" spectacularly to both the proto- and neo-Jacksonians that Andrew Jackson was right in destroying its predecessor. So, in any real defense of Biddle, the story of the successor bank, under state charter, cannot be omitted.

A century after the Bank War, two developments began to influence historical judgments of Biddle's career in quite different ways. One, in the nature of a rediscovery, was the economists' recognition that the business of banking, being the source of the bulk of the money supply, required what they call central bank control—something implicit in the work of the Bank of the United States in the nineteenth century and of the Federal Reserve Banks in the twentieth, but not until recently distinguished and emphasized duly. The effect of this recognition was to put Nicholas Biddle's primary purpose in a fresh light as something Jackson should have fostered, not destroyed. But simultaneously there arose the second and conflicting development—a wave of humanitarian feeling, intensified by the business depression of the early thirties—which invited an identification of Biddle with the money-changers and of Jackson with the common man. These two developments influenced both historiography and biography diversely: one favored the Bank, the other favored its enemies. On the one hand, writers on money and banking saw a significance in Biddle's purposes not clearly recognized before; they emphasized the beneficent function of the Bank of the United States and the error of having ended it in an economy in which regulation of the money supply through central bank action was of the first importance. On the other hand, political historians and biographers saw in Biddle and in the Bank simply the ancestors of contemporary "economic royalists" and pilfers of the worker's portion of the general income. It might be conceded, notably by Marquis James in his *Life of Andrew Jackson* and later by Professor Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., in his *Age of Jackson*, that the Bank of the United States was perhaps defensible in the narrow sense of an economic technique, but it was contended that it had certainly proved politically indefensible in the broad sense of human well-being. The result was that with the centenary of the Bank War, fresh controversy over it arose with emphasis upon new and timely issues. With this rejuvenation of an old conflict—one of the most intense civil conflicts in American history—has come recognition that it is also one that is seemingly perennial in the American economy, the conflict, namely, over infla-
tion, in which, though first on one side and then on the other, Nicholas Biddle was active throughout his career as central banker.

Mr. Govan, though the first to concentrate upon his subject in a full-scale biography, is not the first to decry the neglect and misapprehension that have long kept Nicholas Biddle in shadow. He also commits himself, however, to a more sweeping approbation of Biddle's efforts than any earlier apologist. "Even those historians," he says (naming in particular Catterall, Fritz Redlich, Walter B. Smith, and myself), "who have been generally favorable in their interpretation of Biddle and his policies as head of the national bank have found in him some weakness, some mistake in judgment or act, some fault of character that was serious enough to be the effective cause of his political defeat and financial failure." Mr. Govan says that his own study would, he knows, be more credible if he could follow the example of these other writers. But this he could not do. "Biddle had faults and weaknesses," he concedes; "he did make mistakes." But these do not seem to Mr. Govan to account adequately for the final disaster. Of this, he says, "there probably can be no explanation."

Those of us who so far have been denounced for "whitewashing" Nicholas Biddle may feel relieved to find Mr. Govan taking a position so bold that it makes ours look timid; but still we may not be convinced that it is timid or that we should move out in front with him. Much as I admire Nicholas Biddle and little as I admire Andrew Jackson, the indiscretion and maladroitness of the one seem to me scarcely less evident than the pugnacious and almighty wrongheadedness of the other. Mr. Govan, in the end, "cannot help speculating what would have happened if those in control of American economic and financial policy in the years after 1839 had dared to follow Biddle's advice to expand currency and credit to counteract the deflationary forces and pressures that destroyed not only the United States Bank but also many other valuable economic enterprises." A good many other historians, I suspect, though kindly disposed to Mr. Biddle, cannot help thinking how much more wise and admirable it would have been for him and his country had he bowed to circumstances in 1836, dissolved the Bank, and retired to his fields, his gardens, and his books, letting the Jacksonian policies rush to their consequences. Instead, he defied the political authority and invited disaster. In doing so, he displayed courage, energy, intelligence, and patriotism; but he accomplished little beyond aggrandizement of his adversary.

However, I do not regret Mr. Govan's enthusiasm. On the contrary, I am pleased with it and hope it will go far to correct the legendary exaggerations of Andrew Jackson's heroism, curb the clichés about Nicholas Biddle's sinister cleverness, and make the conflict over the Bank of the United States a rational rather than mythological problem. Mr. Govan has presented his information comprehensively and forcefully. He has pursued and annotated Biddle's career with the Bank in exhaustive detail for which scholars must be obliged even when they disagree with him. I myself, at least, do not
draw exactly the same conclusions that he does from some of the evidence he offers, as when he extenuates certain of Biddle's errors, or when despite what I take to be evidence of New York's interest in fetching the Bank of the United States to its end as a Philadelphia institution, he finds New York mainly gracious toward its continuation. That Biddle himself thought New York friendly seems to me evidence of his own delusion; and that in the existing circumstances the New Yorkers tried to be quiet about their ambitions is not a sign of benevolence but of ordinary common sense. In this as in his relative underemphasis on Van Buren, Cambreleng, Taney and other Jackson men, on the interests of the state banks, and on the interests of state politicians, Mr. Govan seems to purpose throwing all the responsibility possible on Jackson for destroying the Bank, Kendall and Whitney being the only ones to share major responsibility. These are matters with respect to which differences of judgment may be reconciled eventually upon further reflection and discovery of fresh manuscript evidence. Meanwhile, they are not fundamental.

Incidentally, although one is grateful to Mr. Govan for putting a life of Nicholas Biddle on shelves that have been waiting for it more than a century, one may regret that more still needs to be said of Nicholas Biddle as a man of other interests than that of banking. The Bank is, to be sure, most important. But no other American in the business and political world of his day seems to have had the equal of Biddle's influence on the culture of the period. His account of the Lewis and Clark expedition and his work on the Port Folio made him a man of letters, potentially comparable to Prescott and Irving, though very different from Emerson, Hawthorne, Poe, Thoreau, and other younger contemporaries. His interest in architecture, strengthened by his pioneer visit to Greece, made him a leader in the Greek revival. More should be known of his observations and experiments in agriculture, animal husbandry, sericulture, and irrigation, and of his furtherance of the cult of manifest destiny. It is evidence of Nicholas Biddle's importance and not a fault of his biographer that his more general interests are not more fully covered in this volume.

A book is to be reviewed for what it is rather than what it is not; as it is—a comprehensive survey of Nicholas Biddle's banking career—Mr. Govan's has a near bearing on the present. For what many persons advocate for today's economy is what seems to impress Mr. Govan most in Biddle's efforts—namely, the easy money program of his later years. Biddle's objective in those years was to raise farm product prices, restore demand, and reanimate economic growth. Easy money is a standard specific for the ills he deplored, today as in 1837. At a time, therefore, when the merits of inflation and a stimulated economy are ranged against the merits of stable prices and more gradual growth, one's judgment of Nicholas Biddle's program after 1836 is bound to be influenced by one's convictions about the situation in 1960. By corollary, one's judgment of the courses to be pursued in our own times should be enlightened by consideration of the courses
pursued by Biddle in his. Mr. Govan's stand is a decided one; but readers
who disagree with some of his implications and conclusions may profit none-
theless from his account of the events themselves, the problems they
presented, and the efforts of a highly gifted and devoted man of America's
earlier years to cope with them.

Finally, it is significant that Nicholas Biddle's reputation, after suffering
long neglect and misapprehension, should be defended by a succession of
independent writers, of whom Mr. Govan is the latest, who though they
agree by no means on all points but often definitely disagree, nevertheless
are as one in demonstrating the real nature and importance of Nicholas
Biddle's career and the honest statesmanship of his purposes.

Thetford Hill, Vt.

BRAY HAMMOND

Early Maps of the Ohio Valley. A Selection of Maps, Plans, and Views made
by Indians and Colonials from 1673 to 1782. By Lloyd Arnold Brown.
(Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1959. xvi, 132 p. Illustra-
tions, bibliography. $12.00.)

This is a book which will appeal to all who enjoy the study of early
American maps and especially those who are interested in the development
of cartographical knowledge of the Ohio River and the Ohio Valley. As Mr.
Brown explains in the Foreword, the volume was originally begun by the
late Howard N. Eavenson of Pittsburgh and the research further developed
by Mrs. Lois Mulkearn of the Darlington Memorial Library at the Univer-
sity of Pittsburgh. It become Mr. Brown's task to prepare the book in its
final form: to make the final selections of the fifty-four maps to be repro-
duced (from more than five hundred available), to write a short introduc-
tory essay, and, finally, a commentary on each map.

As a book which is intended as a brief pictorial summation of the early
cartographic history of the Ohio and especially of the Upper Ohio region,
this volume has succeeded admirably. The Meriden Gravure Company has
reproduced the selected maps with its usual high skill. The awkwardness
which often results when large maps are reduced to a much smaller size
for reproduction has been largely overcome here by the use of a larger
format and, in some cases, of reproducing only an appropriate portion of the
map. The selections range from Marquette's map of c. 1674, to George
Washington's impressions of this region in 1753-1754, to the Thomas
Hutchins' map of 1778, and the Jefferson proposals for the division of the
Old Northwest of 1783-1784. Both printed and manuscript maps are repre-
sented, a number of them well known to those who have studied this region
and, also, a few comparatively little known but deserving of further study.

While the maps themselves form the most valuable portion of the book,
Mr. Brown's descriptions of these maps, in the section following, is almost
of equal importance. Since these maps were chosen on the basis of cartographic excellence, their artistic appeal is self-evident. To gain a greater understanding of their content one must know something of the history of their times, of the map makers themselves and how they achieved their creations and the difficulties under which they labored. By tracing, through these selected maps, the gradually developing accurate topographical awareness of the cartography of this vital Upper Ohio region, we begin to understand them as historical documents in their own right.

With its excellent reproductions, fine format, and informative text, Early Maps of the Ohio Valley is a book which is a credit to the Eavenson Cartography Trust which has underwritten its production and to all who assisted in its compilation, especially to Lloyd Brown who authored the final published version.

William L. Clements Library

CHRISTIAN BRUN


The four lectures which are presented in this volume were delivered in 1959 under the auspices of the Anson G. Phelps Lectureship on Early American History at New York University. Among the subjects chosen for earlier lectures were the colonial craftsman, and the golden age of colonial culture; it is not surprising, therefore, that the social history of medicine should have its turn, nor that Dr. Shryock should be selected for the task.

The word task is used advisedly, for it was no easy matter to cover in four lectures the entire story of the development of medicine in all its phases over a period of two centuries, and at the same time describe the cross influences of medicine and society upon each other.

Wisely, the author decided to present the subject topically in the first three lectures: "Origins of a Medical Profession," "Medical thought and Practice, 1660–1820," and "Health and Disease, 1660–1820." Then, in the final lecture, the three themes are followed into the mid-nineteenth century. Each lecture is a unit by itself, and can be read accordingly. In the first three chapters, there is inevitably some repetition and overlapping as Dr. Shryock admits in the preface; in each the same names and subjects must be mentioned, but, of course, from a different angle.

Dr. Shryock has accomplished his difficult task successfully. No doctor, even if he is not interested in the social implications, can fail to be fascinated by the slow advance of medicine throughout the world during these two centuries: slow everywhere, but especially so in this new country where it was handicapped by many local conditions. On the other hand, a reader
interested in social history will learn what an important effect medicine has on the whole social structure.

The two aspects of the subject have been interwoven into a readable book filled with facts and with useful references and index.

_Villanova_  
O. H. Perry Pepper


Almost a quarter of a century ago, the Caxton Printers of Caldwell, Idaho, published the three foundation volumes of Professor Gipson's magnum opus, and for many years these volumes have been out of print. Now Alfred Knopf is reissuing them, with extensive revisions by the author, in the more attractive format of Volumes IV to IX. The revised version of Volume III is scheduled for 1961, and Gipson promises an early completion of Volume X.

The book here reviewed is the second of the three original volumes to reappear and, like its predecessor, it is a marked improvement over the first edition, which was good. There is scarcely a page that has not undergone some change, and many pages have been added. The writing itself is more careful and easy-flowing, and the work is much enriched by the incorporation of a mass of new material on the subject, the fruit of others' research and of Gipson's own tireless and meticulous continued digging into the sources. I marvel at how he can do it, a man now in his eightieth year. His documentation is fuller and up to date. He has also chosen new mid-eighteenth century maps; there are fourteen of them scattered through the text at the appropriate places instead of the ten bunched together at the end of the first edition.

Here we have a masterly analytical survey of economic, social, religious, and political conditions in the southern British colonies, island as well as mainland, in the middle of the eighteenth century, the last period in which the old Empire was in a state of relative tranquillity and equilibrium. At first glance, it might seem that the diversities of history and character between Maryland, Virginia, the Carolinas, Georgia, the Caribbean colonies, Bermuda, the Bahamas, and the tiny posts on the Guinea coast of Africa were so great and various that they had little in common beyond their allegiance, their language, and (except the African posts) their governmental institutions, and that they therefore form an artificial group of widely scattered British possessions. Yet a closer examination reveals an important further unity. They were a complex of the plantation system using slaves from Africa to produce great staples for export, principally
tobacco, rice, and sugar. This is the main theme which, with variations, runs right through the book from the opening chapter on the Old Dominion to the closing one on the Guinea trade, but it is not the only theme.

The plantation system was most developed in Virginia and the sugar colonies. In this, however, there was a great difference between them, for the latter were already running down badly while the former was being built up strongly. Georgia was on the point of falling into line, as the humanitarian trusteeship was being abandoned, the prohibition of slavery was being repealed, and an assembly was being established. Maryland was already completely transformed from a refuge for Roman Catholics into a colony that legislated against them and had an Anglican establishment. The continental colonies south of Pennsylvania, Gipson points out, had so little consciousness of sectional unity that the term “southerner” was not yet applied to their people in 1750, whereas the name “West India planter” was already a stereotype. Moreover, the Caribbean colonies constituted a well-known sectional unit by reason of their common economic interest, particularly in opposition to the more northerly colonies and in competition with the more efficient production of the French sugar colonies. The one thing I missed in a study so concerned with slavery was a discussion of the harsher character of the institution in the English colonies than in the Latin American colonies, and the legal and religious reasons for this difference. But this omission is as dust in the balance when the worth of the volume is weighed.

University of Chicago

A. L. BURT


The tide of books calculated to restore Alexander Hamilton to his rightful place among the Founding Fathers is in full flow. It began in 1957, the year erroneously celebrated as the bicentenary of his birth. In that year, no less than four paperback volumes of extracts from his writings appeared on the newsstands, to make their way ultimately into innumerable college syllabi in American history and government. In the same year, Broadus Mitchell published the first half of his encyclopedically detailed biography (Alexander Hamilton: From Youth to Maturity). Not unnaturally, Columbia University, Hamilton’s alma mater, has contributed its share of books to swell the tide, with Professor Richard Morris’ massive anthology, Alexander Hamilton and the Founding of the Nation, Professor Louis Hacker’s interpretation of Hamilton in the American conservative tradition, and Professor Harold Syrett’s definitive edition of Hamilton’s works yet to come. Meanwhile, out of the West, from Stanford University, has come a book for
which I venture to predict a secure place on the narrow shelf of classic American political biographies alongside such books as Parton's *Jackson*, Schurz's *Clay*, Van Doren's *Franklin*, and Malone's *Jefferson*.

A classic by definition is a book which has stood the test of time. What is there about Professor Miller's *Hamilton* that encourages a rash reviewer to salute it prospectively as a classic? There are no striking novelties here, no startling revelations. To be sure, Miller presents a full account of Hamilton's adulterous relations with Mrs. Reynolds, but Hamilton himself, after all, gave the details of that impropriety to the public in 1797, and Miller simply sets it in its proper political context. Here are no remarkable new "finds" of biographical material and no brilliantly novel interpretations of the old. The footnotes and bibliography testify that the author has canvassed all the available primary and secondary sources and built his book on solid foundations of existing scholarship. Hamilton's rise from obscure West Indian origins, his creditable role in the Revolution, his social ambitions, his successful career as a New York lawyer, his persistent drive for an "energetic" government, his political and administrative triumphs as Secretary of the Treasury, his tiff with Washington and his feuds with Adams and Jefferson, his thwarted dreams of military glory in 1798, his death on the heights of Weehawken—the full story is here in sufficient detail, but all in perspective, every detail under the control of a judicious scholarly intelligence. If proportion and balance are the marks of a classic, they are present on every page.

The objectivity of Mr. Miller's judgments commands the greatest respect. He has emancipated himself from the anti-Hamilton bias of the Jeffersonian-Progressive tradition of Beard, Bowers, and Parrington without falling into the opposite error of uncritical apologetic to which the "new conservatism" of the 1950's was prone. His exposition of Hamilton's program as Secretary of the Treasury and his assessment of its significance are so lucid and persuasive that it is hard to imagine how they could be bettered. Nevertheless, he puts his finger accurately on Hamilton's weaknesses. As a politician, he understood the necessary art of compromise, but "he could not conciliate: it was not for him to hold a party together by bridging differences between divergent groups or sections" (p. 227). And so, distrustful of southern planters, he deliberately drove a wedge between the sections with his economic program, leaving it to Jefferson, a consummate politician, to create a national party based on the New York-Virginia axis. Distrustful of John Adams, he was personally responsible for the schism in his own party which so quickly destroyed it. As a statesman, possessed of a vision of America's greatness and the skill and power to materialize it, he lacked the capacity of a Jackson, a Webster, a Lincoln, even a Jefferson, to imbue the people with his own attachment to the union. "Hamilton's failure," writes Miller, "stemmed from the fact that he associated the national government with no great moral issue capable of capturing the popular imagination." In spite of his own humble origins (or perhaps, perversely, because of them), "he had nothing of the common touch. He
was a man who spoke to, not for, the people of America . . .” (p. 437). These are mature and balanced judgments with which it would be difficult to quarrel.

No work of history or biography deserves to be considered seriously as a candidate for permanence unless its author combines literary craftsmanship with broad learning and wise judgments. Here, too, Mr. Miller qualifies. He knows how to make a sentence flow, how to build a paragraph, how to subordinate detail to the sweep of his narrative. He is not afraid to lighten a serious work with sallies of his own kind of wit: after the repeal of the Judiciary Act of 1802 (which had relieved the Supreme Court of the onerous duty of traveling about the country to preside at circuit courts) the justices, he writes, “resumed their weary rounds, back in the saddle again”; and that, he adds, was just where Chief Justice Marshall wanted to be—“in the saddle, riding herd on President Jefferson and the Republican party” (p. 537). Unlike Douglas Freeman, who in his biography of Washington deliberately avoided using words and phrases unfamiliar in Washington’s time, Mr. Miller frequently adds a dash of piquancy to his style by resorting to contemporary slang (the British Navy—he is writing of 1793—“never had it so good”); it might be objected that this practice militates against the book’s permanence, but even Shakespeare, one recalls, did not hesitate to drop now and then into the popular lingo of his day.

The historical reputation of Alexander Hamilton and the output of books about him may continue to ebb and flow with the tides of American political opinion. But at what may be the peak of the current Hamiltonian tide Professor Miller has produced a classic of American political biography. Or this hungry critic will perform the required penance by eating his hat.

Swarthmore College

FREDERICK B. TOLLES


The industrious scholar-translator team of Tappert and Doberstein here provide a popular condensation of their monumental three-volume edition of The Journals of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg (Philadelphia, 1942–1958). Their object is “to put into the hands of the general reader only a few of the author’s observations and reflections which will furnish intimate glimpses into the life and manners of American colonists in the eighteenth century” (pp. v–vi). They have succeeded admirably in attaining their purpose.

Beginning their selection from Muhlenberg’s copious journal entries with his arrival in Charlestown in September, 1742, the editors have judiciously chosen excerpts in line with their objective from the entire journal (insofar
as it has been preserved) until Muhlenberg's death in 1787. They can even cite in justification of their labors Muhlenberg's wish (typical of his modesty, but also of his sense of the journal's importance for posterity) that it might later be revised to "winnow or sift it and separate from it the grain" (p. v). Consonant with the character of this edition, scholarly apparatus is lacking, and concise editorial comment is limited to that absolutely essential for continuity.

As is inherent in a work of this nature, there is a certain unevenness in progression, but it is noteworthy how smoothly the slight volume reads despite this. The translation is craftsmanlike and straightforward, and the editors have well coped with that annoying eighteenth-century practice of the learned of liberally strewing foreign phrases in their writings. This was complicated in Muhlenberg's case by his frequent use of English phrases for which there was no German equivalent.

Although the editors have rightly underscored the importance of Muhlenberg's careful observations of colonial doings, equally fascinating is the self-portrait of Muhlenberg which emerges through his reactions to church problems, household difficulties, legal headaches, and world affairs. The doughty Lutheran patriarch had a sharp, Pietistic-honed eye for sin in others, but at the same time felt keenly his own inadequacies. A man of strong opinions, he found cutting words for unworthy Lutheran colleagues, for rival Moravians, and for what he considered the cant and cunning of the Quakers and the sects. Occasional bouts with melancholy did not keep him from the most demanding journeys to Lutherans in the diaspora, so hungry for spiritual food and the blessing of the sacraments.

A continual strand in the journal is Muhlenberg's determination to have no active part in Pennsylvania politics. Faithful to the traditional Lutheran position based on Romans 13, he insisted that the clergy must busy themselves with the salvation of souls and accept whichever government has the "strongest arm and longest sword." This position was to cause him troubled days during the Revolution when his passive attitude was considered secret Toryism by the American patriots. Even the well-known exploits of his sons Peter and Frederick, the first as a general and the second as a politician, failed to shake his conviction that it would have been more pleasing to the Lord for them to have remained pastors.

Muhlenberg knew how to combine his Lutheran orthodoxy and Pietist strictness with dry humor and a gift for a well-turned phrase. For example, when enduring one of several miserable coastal journeys, he penned: "Because of my sickness I was unable to observe the latitude, the winds, and variations, which, I trust, will do no harm to the commonwealth, since, even without this contribution of mine, contrary and foul winds can be found in superabundance in Pierre Bayle's dictionary, in Voltaire's writings, and . . . are no less abundantly observed and communicated, at a price and according to taste, to the Christian world in all sorts of learned magazines, journals, newspapers, and reviews" (p. 140).
While serious students of Pennsylvania colonial history will continue to turn to the gold mine of material in the full edition of the journals, they may well wish to peruse for pleasure the present anthology. One hopes that this widely advertised, attractively printed, and sturdily bound volume will remind many and teach others of this very human but very faithful servant in the Pennsylvania vineyards.

Juniata College

DONALD F. DURBNAUGH


These two volumes, designed for the general reader, make readily available in convenient form one of the most notable correspondences in the history of the United States. The friendship between John Adams and Thomas Jefferson was, as the latter wrote, "co-eval with our government"—that is, it began at the Continental Congress of 1775, when the New Engander (then forty) and the Virginian (aged thirty-two) first met in Philadelphia. It continued, with but one significant interruption, until their deaths on the same day, July 4, 1826, the fiftieth anniversary of the Declaration in which both had had such an important share. The temporary estrangement—due more to the "partiality of friends" than to their own deepest feelings—and the subsequent reconciliation when both had retired from public life still further enhance the human interest of these letters. In this reconciliation Abigail Adams played her part, and it is appropriate that the letters exchanged between her and Jefferson should also be included in this "complete correspondence."

A grand total of three hundred and eight letters, extending from 1777 to 1826, are included in Mr. Cappon's two-volume edition. Most of these letters have been previously printed elsewhere, but they have been scattered throughout many volumes, and a reader seeking to survey the whole exchange has perforce had to be his own compiler. All of the letters, it should be added, have been or will be printed in the great repertories of Jefferson's writings and of Adams' writings, now in progress at Princeton and at Boston. While such encyclopedic series, by publishing in chronological sequence a man's total correspondence, encompass his day-by-day activities and preoccupations, the trivial and immediate as well as the continuing and long-ranging concerns, selections like The Adams-Jefferson Letters have the advantage of focusing attention on a single friendship and of presenting more forcibly the mutual impact of two individual minds. In this instance,
the quality of the two minds fully justifies the luxury of what at first glance might seem to be a duplication of editorial effort.

The present editor has grouped the letters into thirteen chapters, each with its own inner unity, and each preceded by an introduction which sketches the general historical background and thus obviates the necessity for detailed annotation of the individual letters. Indeed, Mr. Cappon’s admirable little introductory essays so skilfully summarize the significance and the interest of the letters that they leave little for a reviewer to add; they are in themselves the best possible review of the Adams-Jefferson correspondence.

There are but a handful of letters for the years 1777–1784; the sustained correspondence begins in 1785, when Adams and Jefferson, after having worked together for the better part of a year in Paris on the business of commercial treaties, were separated only by the English Channel—Adams as Minister to the Court of St. James and Jefferson as Minister to the Court of Versailles. The letters exchanged between Grosvenor Square and the Champs Elysées—to which those of Abigail Adams add a delightful accompaniment—form the bulk of the first volume of Mr. Cappon’s compilation. They are concerned to a great extent with the diplomatic problems of the two American ministers and with their continuing joint efforts to conclude commercial treaties—with Prussia, with Portugal, and with the Barbary States. This section of the correspondence provides a fine casebook in early American foreign relations, contributes to a better understanding of Jefferson’s later concern with “the shores of Tripoli,” and incidentally adds a timely footnote to North African problems in the twentieth century. Adams returned to America in 1788 and the next year became Vice-President of the United States; Jefferson returned in 1789 and became Secretary of State. With the decade of the 1790’s, their correspondence again becomes merely occasional—partly because they were both in personal touch when in Philadelphia—and then ceases entirely with Jefferson’s accession to the Presidency, following Adams, in 1801.

Except for Abigail Adams’ moving attempt to resume the correspondence in 1804, upon the occasion of the premature death of Jefferson’s daughter “Polly” (the same whom she had befriended in London in 1787), there were no letters exchanged between Adams and Jefferson until 1812, when the “reconciliation,” prepared by Benjamin Rush, was finally effected by Edward Coles, President Madison’s secretary. Henceforth, the correspondence—which constitutes the entire second volume of the edition under review—continued unabated until 1826.

Whereas the earlier letters, more topical in nature, lose something, perhaps, by being taken from the context of related correspondence, the correspondence between Quincy and Monticello forms a harmonious and self-contained exchange. The range of subjects is wide: retrospective comment and interpretation of the events in which both men had participated, their reading of history and of political economy, their thoughts on religion, on
life and death. If there is much concern with the basic verities, each man revealing his own beliefs and personality, there is also talk of their families and friends to add the human touch. Adams never visited Jefferson at Monticello and Jefferson never saw Adams at Quincy, but the correspondence between them remained a deep and sustaining bond. Younger emissaries brought news: the last letters mention Josiah Quincy's visit to Monticello and Thomas Jefferson Randolph's visit to Quincy; Adams, in speaking to Jefferson of his son, John Quincy Adams, then President of the United States, writes, "I call him our John, because when you was at Cul de sac at Paris, he appeared to be almost as much your boy as mine." Thus, the correspondence, while recording the remembrance of things past, also projects the reader into the future, reminding him of the continuing heritage of John Adams and Thomas Jefferson. "How shall We conjure this damnable Rivalry between Virginia, and Massachusetts?" Adams once wrote to his friend. As interpolated in a letter commenting on the events of 1813, this was merely a rhetorical question. But if the implications of it are extended, it is tempting to say that the answer is implicit in the entire Adams-Jefferson correspondence. Here, certainly, is the best of the two worlds, a remarkable meeting of two great minds, who can still stimulate, entertain, and enrich their descendants a century and a half later.

Princeton University Library

Howard C. Rice, Jr.


A modern newsman reports the battle of Lexington and Concord in the style of modern news coverage. Staying as close as possible to eyewitness accounts, he describes events as they unfolded—the sally of the British regulars into the countryside, the encounter on Lexington green, the convergence of the colonial militia on the British line of march, and the mounting tempo of battle until the British detachment is reinforced. The scene shifts rapidly to the environs of Boston, where the besieging colonists invest the heights above Charlestown. British efforts to dislodge them by frontal assault are twice hurled back with heavy casualties, but the regulars finally charge home and send the colonials scampering back across Charlestown neck. At Bunker Hill the British army lost blood but not honor. The book ends with Washington's taking command of the newly created Continental Army.

The author's purpose is to tell a dramatic story in terse, vivid prose. Much of the battle action is presented through the eyes of individuals who participated in it. From the quick, impressionistic sketches the author draws of their personal character, the life and family which each man put
aside, the tragedy or triumph of his particular fate, we approach the battle through the reactions of individuals. The result is an absorbing narrative.

The account is somewhat fictionalized, written for a popular audience, and not intended as a contribution to history. However, it gave me a new conception of the savagery of the opening encounters of the Revolution. The enraged British regulars gave no quarter, and the colonists fought them with sometimes reckless determination to kill. The underlying hatred of Britain which exploded in battle suggests how far Americans had ceased to be British and were becoming a nation.

University of Maryland

E. James Ferguson


This book is chiefly about spies, American and British, in America during the American Revolution. Goss’s Paul Revere, French’s General Gage’s Informers, Einstein’s Divided Loyalties, Pennypacker’s George Washington’s Spies on Long Island and in New York, Seymour’s Documentary Life of Nathan Hale and Van Doren’s Secret History of the American Revolution have dealt with particular aspects; Bakeless’ is the first substantial general work in the field.

The American spies whose activities are covered in considerable detail include Revere, Hale, and several less well known figures, such as Sergeant David Bissell of Connecticut; Sergeant Major John Champe of Virginia; Samuel Woodhull and Robert Townshend of New York, who worked together under the names of Culper, Sr., and Culper, Jr.; members of the Merserau family of New Jersey; and Lydia Darragh, a Philadelphia Quaker. Major John Clark of Pennsylvania and Major Benjamin Tallmadge of Connecticut, operating intelligence chains in Philadelphia and New York City during the British occupation of these cities, and Washington, who was closely in touch with them and other officers engaged in intelligence work, also receive attention.

The stories of Revere and Hale are retold in the chapters “The Paul Revere Gang” and “Nathan Hale—A Wasted Hero”; the stories of the others mentioned are scattered through the book, along with briefer accounts of many other Americans who furnished intelligence, some as professional spies sent into or left within the enemy lines, others as amateur volunteers eager to do their bit.

The principal traitors dealt with are Benedict Arnold, Dr. Benjamin Church of Boston, whose discovered treason cost him his life when the vessel on which he was banished disappeared while en route to the West Indies, and Thomas Hickey. The latter, a sergeant from Connecticut serv-
ing in the Guard at Washington's headquarters in New York City in 1776, was hanged for trying to get men to join him in a plot to destroy an important bridge and desert to the British, and perhaps to kidnap Washington.

The British spies to whom most space is given are Major André, Captain William Brown, Ensign (Second Lieutenant) Henry De Berniere and John Howe, who gathered important information for Gage before the day of Lexington and Concord; Samuel Wallis, a Quaker businessman of Philadelphia and Muncy, Pennsylvania, who furnished useful intelligence to General Howe in Philadelphia and General Clinton in New York; and Mrs. Ann Bates of Philadelphia, who was a valuable spy for Clinton in 1778 and 1779.

Considering the large numbers engaged in espionage, it is rather surprising so few spies were detected. A couple of Howe's spies in Connecticut were caught and hanged in 1777, and others on both sides were, now and then, discovered; but the catch was not great. Counterintelligence was apparently less well developed than espionage. It is difficult to appraise the value to either side of their spies' activities. The finding and destruction by Joshua and John Merserau of boats hidden by Tories on the New Jersey side of the Hudson, when the British were pursuing Washington across New Jersey in 1776, may have been of decisive importance in saving Washington's remaining forces and the American cause; but the Merseraus' later claim to having done this is not supported by any known contemporaneous evidence.

The present book is interesting and valuable, but, despite Bakeless' extensive research, is disappointing from the standpoint of a scholar because of the extensive use of reminiscences written years after the Revolution, of local tradition, and pension claims filed by patriots with the United States government and by loyalists with the British government long after the events on which they are based. Moreover, the use of such sources is coupled with the difficulty, in many cases, of disentangling the matter based on them from that based on contemporaneous evidence.

Chester, Conn. 

Bernhard Knollenberg

*The Congress Founds the Navy, 1787-1798. By Marshall Smelser. (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1959. x, 229 p. Appendices, bibliographical note, index. $5.00.)*

Although the Revolution had been decided by the command of the sea, and although the Constitution empowered Congress "to provide and maintain a Navy," no ships were authorized until 1794, and creation of a Navy Department waited until 1798. Since the problem of a naval armament raised fundamental issues for the new government, and indeed brought the whole theory of America in question, the story of its creation is one of
peculiar interest; since the Navy was founded not by sailors but by politi-
cians, the story is a political one.

In approaching this subject, Mr. Smelser takes his frame of reference
from the Sprouts' *The Rise of American Naval Policy*, and, in his own
words, steers the same headings that those authors did, while minutely
surveying the rocks and shoals along the way. Except for a prologue on
French spoliations, a chapter on problems of fitting out, and an epilogue
describing the first capture by a federal naval ship, that of the French
privateer *Croyable* by the elder Stephen Decatur, the narrative focuses on
the congressional scene. There is an interesting appendix on the influence
of naval considerations on the location of the national capital.

Such an account of the formulation of early naval policy helps to fill a
wide gap in the literature, and one may hope that the author will continue
his voyage through subsequent administrations. Detailed research in the*
Annals of Congress*, in Library of Congress papers, in newspapers, pamph-
lets, and in the limited secondary literature, provides much information
hitherto unavailable or difficult of access. The investigation, indeed, while
ostensibly amplifying the Sprouts' pioneer work, is so thorough as to seem
to call for revision of the sailing directions.

That the founding of the Navy was a political act of the Federalist party
can hardly be gainsaid, since it was accomplished, against Republican
opposition, under a Federalist administration and by a Federalist Congress.
Yet so blanket a conclusion begs questions as to the meaning of party
labels. One may doubt the propriety of the conventional linkage of the
generality of Federalists, busily engaged in milking the government cow,
with the imperial vision of Alexander Hamilton; equally, the identifica-
ton of Republican opposition to a naval establishment with the aspiring patri-
otism of Jefferson leads to distortion on the other side. Since naval and com-
mercial interest did not necessarily divide by party—witness the Smiths of
Baltimore and the Crowninshields of Salem—one could wish to see the
analysis pressed further, to deal less with parties than with politicians.

As with party, so with region. Accepting the geographical framework of
the Sprouts, the author tabulates Congressional votes by area—New Eng-
land, Middle States, the South, the West—and observes that naval senti-
ment weakens from north to south, describes a "typical" sectional align-
ment in which New England provided the strongest majority, and refers to
the pro-Navy "Massachusetts phalanx." But on the evidence presented,
these views seem doubtful. State for state, Delaware consistently led the
parade, while Maryland and New Jersey were at times more navalist than
Massachusetts. When private contributions were sought to help the con-
struction program, Baltimore and Philadelphia gave the most. The creation
of the Navy Department was in large degree the work of such Middle State
politicos as Samuel Smith (hardly, incidentally, a "quondam" Republican).
Of twelve congressional founders of the Navy listed by the author, six
hailed from below the Delaware River.
The politics of early navalism, in sum, appear to derive less from regional and party considerations than from local and individual interests. In this area, despite the merits of the present work, something remains to be done.

Swarthmore College

JAMES A. FIELD, JR.


With the publication of this volume Miss Sowerby brings to a close her great bio-bibliography of the books sold by Jefferson to Congress in 1815. The scope of her work and the method she has followed are described in earlier reviews in this magazine. Volumes I-III were reviewed by Marie Kimball in Volume 77 (1953), 216-218, and Volume 78 (1954), 237-238; Volume IV was reviewed by Edwin Wolf 2nd in Volume 80 (1956), 382-385.

Volume V includes the final chapters of the third part of the collection, that devoted to the Fine Arts—Dialogue-Epistolary, Logic (subdivided into Rhetoric and Orations), Criticism (subdivided into Theory, Bibliography, and Languages), and Polygraphical—and brings the total number of entries to 4,931. In these chapters, as in the other sections of the collection, we find Jefferson achieving a general representation of each subject, with special depth here in languages, in which he had a particular interest. Surely the most exciting entry in Volume V is that for the very "two Pieces of Homespun," the two volumes of John Quincy Adams' *Lectures on Rhetoric and Oratory* (No. 4659), presented to Jefferson by John Adams on their reconciliation in January, 1812.

The final chapters are followed by "Additions, Notes, and Corrections," in which the corrections suggested in at least one review are ignored, and by "Sources and Reference Books Used in This Catalogue." The latter gives a very helpful account of the two essential sources of the present work, Jefferson's manuscript catalogue of his library (the "1783" catalogue) and Watterston's printed catalogue of the collection published in 1815.

The volume concludes with the index to the entire catalogue, which has been long awaited. It makes at once exciting and disappointing reading. In it Miss Sowerby takes us by the hand and points out a score of interesting aspects of Jefferson the collector: his bindings, the bookplates in his volumes, the names of former owners, the booksellers with whom he dealt, his manuscripts and maps, and the works presented to him. The subheadings under Jefferson's name are equally rewarding. "Annotations or corrections by Jefferson," "Books in which reference is made to Jefferson," and "Subscribed to the following books" would each furnish material for an important monograph or paper.
The index answers very fully, by author and title, the reader who wants to know whether Jefferson owned a specific book. Unfortunately, it does not attempt, in a systematic way, to tell us what subjects were represented in the collection. That fact is obscured by the inclusion of a great many subjects. Some, but not all, of the subjects suggested by Jefferson in the “1783” catalogue under the heading “Technical Arts” are included. Bookkeeping, sugar, wine are omitted. Some, but not all, of the subjects of Jefferson’s chapters (or classes) are included indirectly, since his remarks on the subjects, which head the chapters, are indexed (e.g., Architecture, Jefferson on, IV, p. 358). Among others, astronomy, geography, equity, the common law do not appear. Although these general subjects can be come at through the tables of contents in each of the volumes, it would have been helpful to have had them appear in the index with the numbers of the books entered under them (e.g., Architecture, 4173-4224). Catchword entries are used, but not consistently. Charlevoix’s *Histoire du Paraguay* (No. 4141) is entered under “Paraguay, Histoire du,” but Leslie’s *Histoire de la Jamaïque* (No. 4154) is not treated in the same way. The references under some subject headings are incomplete; for example, No. 642 is not the only book on “Geology” Jefferson owned. Finally, there are entries which suggest a detailed indexing which has not been carried through. “Prison reform in the United States, 2364” refers not to Howard’s book on *The State of Prisons in England and Wales*, but to the remark in the note that it had a real influence on the improvement of prisons in this country. The question aside of our right to expect full indexing when so much has been done, one could wish that some of the time and space devoted to a number of the index entries had been used in another way. As it is, the user of the catalogue must often fall back on reading through Jefferson’s rather general classes to discover books on a particular subject.

But surely no review of this great work can in justice close on a note of regret. At the end of her Foreword, Miss Sowerby speaks of the delightful experience of close association with Mr. Jefferson himself which she has experienced in compiling this catalogue. Her scholarship and energy have opened a similar experience to all who will study closely the five volumes of her catalogue.

*The Free Library of Philadelphia*  
Howell J. Heaney


For most Americans—and for many historians—the pioneers advancing into the wilderness were a phalanx of ax-bearers opening the way for civilization. Daniel Boone strode gun in hand alone into the dark and
bloody ground of Kentucky and after him an army of men deployed themselves over the land, raising log cabins and planting crops among the stumps of half-cleared patches while Indians lurked threateningly in the skirt of nearby woods. Out of such bold single actions came the restless energy, the dominant individualism, the equality of opportunity, the political equality that made American democracy.

An exciting theory, but the actuality was not quite like that. In the beginning were the cities, Professor Wade makes abundantly clear in this original, fresh, and stimulating look at the urban frontier in the early West. The towns were the “spearheads of the frontier. Planted far in advance of the line of settlement, they held the West for the approaching population.” St. Louis, Pittsburgh, Lexington, Louisville, Cincinnati were laid out and settlement begun “before the surrounding area had fallen to the plow,” and by 1800 “the urban pattern of the West had been established.” From their earliest days, these cities were the “centers of economic activity for the whole region, the focuses of cultural life, and scenes of great social change.”

Though this pattern can also be seen in many lesser places, Professor Wade has concentrated on the five leading cities of the early West. Having shown in his opening chapter why and how they came to be founded, in the first half of his book he traces their rapid growth between 1790 and 1815. He begins by examining their economic base, for a city is “a place where people earn a living,” he says very sensibly. Pittsburgh almost immediately became an iron and glassmaking center; Lexington also developed as a manufacturing town; Cincinnati thrived on commerce; Louisville by reason of the Falls was important as a transshipping point; and St. Louis was both a fur and lead center and the supplier of the Far West and the North. With the surge of population into the West, with the prosperity stimulated by the War of 1812 emerged urban problems: town organization, control of local trade, water supply, health, sanitation, streets, police and fire protection, harbor facilities. The urban society, the author finds, was not egalitarian; it was characterized by a “surprisingly rich and diversified life” and “social lines [that] developed very quickly.” Finally, he notes the sprouting of the “seeds of culture”—the newspapers, the church, education, libraries, private and public, the theater, the arts, and literature.

The second half of the book continues this examination through the depression that followed the War of 1812 and the recovery and expansion of these towns. British trade policies hit manufacturing in Pittsburgh and Lexington damaging blows; in fact, Lexington never recovered its position as a manufacturing center. The other towns suffered setbacks, too, although St. Louis somewhat less than Cincinnati and Louisville. But with recovery and renewed growth, the changing social structure of these cities, with their sharpening class lines, the increasing urban problems, and the developing cultural life, is closely scrutinized.

Professor Wade does not deny the importance of the rural frontier, but he rightly asserts the significance of the cities in the development of the
West. By 1830, he concludes, "the West had produced two types of society—one rural and one urban . . . the cities represented the more aggressive and dynamic force. By spreading their economic power over the entire section, by bringing the fruits of civilization across the mountains, and by insinuating their ways into the countryside, they speeded up the transformation of the West from a gloomy wilderness to a richly diversified region. Any historical view which omits this dimension of Western life tells but part of the story."

It only remains to be added that in his research Mr. Wade has gone to the heart of the matter: his study is soundly based on public records, private papers of local persons, local newspapers, and travelers' accounts. His text is amply annotated wherever the reader turns. *The Urban Frontier* is a notable work.

Washington University

JOHN FRANCIS MCDERMOTT


Into these three brief lectures Professor Charvat of the Ohio State University department of English has compressed not only much that has been known, but also a surprisingly large mass of new material concerning sixty important years in the American book trade—years which saw the modern publishing industry grow out of the earlier inefficient and cumbersome network of printer-booksellers.

In his first essay, the author points to the extreme importance of river transportation in determining the publishing centers of the nation and to the decided geographical advantage which Philadelphia and New York experienced over other contemporary cities in this regard. Professor Charvat makes clear that the consideration of water transportation centered the publishing industry in the Philadelphia-New York "axis" until mid-century when railroads first "enabled Boston to mitigate its geographical isolation." In this reviewer's opinion, an understanding of this single fact is the most important lesson which can be learned from the book. This lecture should do much to dispel the popular notion that, since Boston could claim English America's first printing press and also a kind of literary floration two centuries later, it must therefore have enjoyed a continued cultural supremacy throughout the period.

In his second lecture, the author points to the impact of other economic factors upon the literary history of the period. Entitled "Author and Publisher," the essay discusses the several kinds of financial arrangements, both successful and unsuccessful, with which these two principals experimented
before the modern concept of publisher-author relations became established. The author had a product, and the publisher had the ability to market it, but in the absence of any established pattern of activity in this fledgling industry, neither party wholly trusted the other, and even after mutually beneficial contracts were evolved each watched the other with a jaundiced eye. Not the least useful portion of this chapter is the excellent summary of the complex machinery for book distribution in the first half of the nineteenth century.

Professor Charvat's third lecture concerns "Literary Genres and Artifacts." Publishers were concerned then, as are manufacturers today, with the "packaging of their product," and were anxious that the physical form in which a text was placed into the market was as prestigious as possible, in size, shape, binding, paper stock, type face, and, of course, price. These extraneous factors had a marked influence upon the literary production of the time. If, for example, the text of a novel was too short to make a "package" that the publisher felt would be salable, he would ask the author to expand it, regardless of whether the change would improve on or detract from its artistic quality. Again, it was economic considerations that tended to be overriding.

It is curious that in his preface Professor Charvat seems inclined to apologize for what may be his book's greatest strength. He wishes his study to concern primarily the shaping influence of publishing on literature, rather than the economics of authorship and publishing. While it must be admitted that his primary objective is admirably attained, it must also be pointed out that Professor Charvat has given us a very important chapter in the economic development of a billion-dollar industry—a chapter which makes a fresh contribution to a subject which has, at best, been unclearly understood in the past.

Two small complaints deserve to be lodged against this book. One is its lack of a bibliography, and the other is its price—$4.50 is a good bit to pay for ninety-four pages. Nonetheless, interested bookmen may well find here enough valuable information ensconced in pleasant format to warrant forgiving the author the first misdemeanor and his publisher the second.

Joint University Libraries
Nashville, Tenn.

David Kaser


Every once in a while there comes on the scene a person who is impelled to seek out an unselfish cause and make it his own. Julius R. Friedlander
was such a person. He was gifted with intellect and sensitivity. The motivations for altruistic behavior run deep. Perhaps Friedlander's stemmed from his basic nature, perhaps from the rejections experienced in his youth. Julius' father was a Jew, but Julius was converted to Christianity, and thereafter was not accepted fully either by his own or by his adopted people.

For a long time, there was a serious question in his mind as to which way his gifts would turn. In Europe in the 1820's, and later in America, a wave of humanitarian interest was sweeping away prejudices that blindness was a hopeless condition for which nothing could be done, and for which it was contrary to God's will that anything should be done. Methods of teaching the blind were being developed in Paris, Vienna, and London. There was also a spirit of unrest in Europe which caused many young men to seek in America the development that was denied them in the petty bickerings of the small states of Europe.

Julius R. Friedlander's plan to emigrate to America was carefully thought out and meticulously detailed. He had training in the teaching of the blind, and he had letters of introduction to prominent people in Philadelphia. He chose Philadelphia rationally, knowing the interest of Friends in humanitarian activities. How well he chose was not actually known until he had arrived in this city. Schools for the blind had already been established in Boston and New York, and his coming to Philadelphia was most appropriate.

Arriving in 1832, he immediately began to interest people in a project for a home and school for blind children. He brought a blind boy to his lodgings and taught him. The boy proved to be his chief exhibit. Needless to say, people who thought that blindness meant hopelessness saw almost a miracle in what Friedlander had done for this child. However, he had just put into practice principles learned through his association with his close friend Franz Müller at schools for the blind established at Mariahof and Bruchsal, and coupled them with his own inventive nature. Friedlander had been fortunate in Germany to have Prince Carol Egon of Fürstenburg as a patron, for through him he had been able also to study the methods practiced at the Institut des Jeunes Aveugles in Paris.

In Philadelphia, Friedlander awakened the interest of such men as Roberts Vaux, William Y. Birch, Abraham Marsh, John Vaughan, A. D. Bache, and many others. Early in 1833, at a meeting of citizens and contributors, a school was established under the name of the Pennsylvania Institute for the Instruction of the Blind. More than a century later, the name of the school was changed to the Overbrook School for the Blind. Friedlander was appointed principal instructor of the Pennsylvania Institute. Although never in good health, he worked with unflagging zeal. A victim of tuberculosis, he died six years after the establishment of the school, which, chiefly through his own efforts, was now housed in a fine building and had an enrollment of fifty-four pupils.

In that short period, Friedlander had established the basic principles of the education of the blind. He taught reading through the use of raised
Roman letters; braille had been invented some time before, but was not in its present improved state and was quite a cumbersome new language. The Pennsylvania Institute for the Instruction of the Blind became a center for the training of instructors who later went out to establish and serve in similar institutions in many other parts of the country.

The author is a descendant of Julius R. Friedlander's brother and used extensive family correspondence to tell the story of her great relative. This biography is told simply, and is illustrated frequently with quoted sections of correspondence which give it an antique polish that makes it an acceptable antidote to our hurrying ways. This chronicle should appeal both to those who are interested in the development of the education for the blind and to those who have an interest in the Philadelphia of one hundred and thirty years ago.

Board of Public Education
Philadelphia

HANS C. GORDON

The Military Legacy of the Civil War: The European Inheritance. By JAY LUVAAAS. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959. xii, 253 p. Illustrations, appendix, index. $5.95.)

Civil War enthusiasts with their interest whetted by the approaching centennial will discover a new facet of that war in this excellent volume. In keeping with other efforts to study American influence on Europe, the author combed the writings of English, French, and German observers of the Civil War for their opinion of the techniques of the war and the effect of their findings on military organization and tactics in their homelands. The European reaction to the Civil War is considered in four major parts: the foreign observers of the war period, views from England, France, and Germany from 1861 to 1914, biographies of the leading Northern and Southern generals written by Europeans, and the Old World reconsideration of the war after World War I.

From its beginning to its conclusion, the American war attracted three types of foreign observers. The tradition, begun with the Mexican and Crimean wars, of newspaper correspondents writing for their home journals was continued during the Civil War. European visitors and particularly professional soldiers who served in Union or Confederate armies penned their memoirs, but most important of all were the reports and articles written by official foreign military observers. All of these writings, together with American reports, furnished European authors with material for numerous commentaries and evaluations which appeared in magazines and military journals.

The author's conclusion that the Civil War never exerted a direct influence on military doctrine in Europe will come as a surprise to a generation
accustomed to reading biographies of Civil War generals by English authors. This conclusion, however, is well documented. European observers were keenly interested in the performance of new weapons, especially rifled cannon, and the behavior of citizen armies. They also realized the importance of railroads in military operations, but the larger implications of trench warfare, a war of attrition, industrial power, and total war were not comprehended. The use of mounted infantry failed to impress European military men wedded to the theory of a cavalry in force with flashing swords and onrushing horses. Also, the quick and relatively easy victories of Prussia in conflicts with Austria and France turned European attention to tactics employed on the Continent.

After 1918, European strategists sought answers to the perplexing developments in World War I by restudying the Civil War. Belatedly, these commentators discovered in the American war the forerunner of the recent global conflict. Following the earlier lead of Henderson's study, Stonewall Jackson and the American Civil War, and using new yardsticks established by World War I to judge generalship, English writers re-evaluated the leading Civil War generals. While their close scrutiny left Jackson to be admired, more and more he shared the spotlight with Lee, Grant, and Sherman. Praise came to Lee for his skill in the tactical use of trenches, to Sherman for his understanding of mobility and the moral factor in war, and to Grant for his skillful strategy and marshaling of Union resources for the destruction of the Confederacy. Even the often criticized Lincoln won belated applause for his perception of the duties of the higher command and for his support of Grant during the last year of the war. This praise, however, roused more historical interest than changes in European military strategy.

The subject selected by the author does not lend itself to a stimulating, popular account, but he has written clearly and with understanding. The perception demonstrated in this first of a planned three-volume study of the military legacy of the Civil War foretells other valuable contributions by the author.

University of Florida

Rembert W. Patrick


In the midst of this centennial of the American republic's most bewildering and tragic experience, it was to be hoped that Jefferson Davis might finally find the informed, perceptive, and balanced biographer able to present his life story in a fashion comparable to that already accorded Lincoln and Lee. The second of Hudson Strode's projected three volumes
on the Davis theme is sufficient to indicate that this hope is yet to be realized.

Reading Strode's work, it is difficult to remember that the Civil War has been over for almost a century. For this is polemical literature reminiscent of the passions of the 1860's rather than history, an apologia almost overwhelming in the simplicity of its acceptance of a god-like Davis. Worse, it is disputatious without offering much in the way of evidence to support its various assertions and implications. There has been no attempt to footnote this volume in accepted scholarly fashion; one must usually rely upon the author's intuitive reading of the mind and will of Davis and his contemporaries, or upon the frequent quotations from memoirs and diaries of pro-Davis adherents, generally either irrelevant, or relevant to matters of little consequence.

Despite the rather considerable length of this study, it is surprisingly limited in scope and shallow in depth. Throughout, however, there is a uniform tendency to demonstrate several basic themes, which manage to make themselves heard time and again in these pages.

In effect, they might be summarized as follows: (1) Jefferson Davis was, in truth, a paragon among men, patient, wise, unambitious, compassionate, learned in political, constitutional, and military lore, and capable of almost saintly forgiveness of his enemies, no matter how spiteful and petty; (2) these enemies were uniformly malicious, envious, stupid, or motivated by crass purposes of any number of varieties, though even they were unable to blind the good Southerners to the matchless virtues of Davis; (3) the Southern interpretation of the nature of the Federal Union "on a historical, constitutional basis" was "more accurate" than that of the North; (4) Lincoln was basically a morally illiterate schemer or bungler, directly responsible for what happened at Sumter; (5) most Northerners either had no convictions as to why the war was being fought, or realized that Union adherents were simply protecting a profitable exploitation of the South; (6) Albert Sidney Johnston was one of the Confederacy's truly great generals, and, in addition, a man whose flawless character and goodness of soul made him the inevitable admirer and strong supporter of the President; (7) only the human inability of Davis to do everything in the South saved the Union (had he commanded at First Manassas, for example, Confederate troops would certainly have poured immediately thereafter into a befuddled Washington); and (8) Davis was the greatest single strength of the South: the war would have probably ended soon after Gettysburg except for his "indomitable will and courage."

Regrettably, the whole is couched in a style which frequently approaches the precious, or tends toward the vulgar.

Surely history, the South, and Jefferson Davis deserve better than this.

*Louisiana State University in New Orleans*  
Joseph G. Tregle, Jr.

The appearance of Volume 71 of the Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society merits notice, and at the same time provides an opportunity also to consider Volume 70 issued in 1957 but not previously noticed in these pages. The two volumes together cover meetings of the Society from October, 1950, to May, 1957, inclusive. Each continues the practice of printing the papers together in the front of the volume, with memoirs and minutes of meetings transferred to the back of the book.

These minutes and memoirs, however, should not be ignored by outside readers. The latter are of biographical value and some, such as those by M. A. DeWolfe Howe and Walter Muir Whitehill, are of high literary quality; and worth-while material is found scattered through the minutes, particularly in the librarian’s reports.

Volume 70 was the last volume edited by Stewart Mitchell before his untimely death. It contains nineteen of the twenty-two papers presented at meetings from October, 1950, to May, 1953, and the continuation of the late F. Lauriston Bullard’s paper on Lincoln begun in Volume 69. Papers by Perry Miller and Douglas S. Freeman appeared elsewhere in books by these gentlemen. In the words of several of the authors, their papers constitute no more than footnotes to history. In fact, one questions why a number of them should appear in a publication with the high standards usually associated with the Proceedings, albeit they often make interesting reading.

Several papers should be cited, however, as valuable contributions to our historical literature: “Latin American Dictatorships and the United States,” by Clarence H. Haring; “Diplomacy and Popular Government,” by Dexter Perkins; “Congressional Immunity and Privilege,” by Claude Moore Fuess; “A Crucial Juncture in the Political Careers of Lodge and Long,” by Philip Putnam Chase; and “Malachi James at the Fall of Montreal, 1760,” by Henry Forbush Howe, primary material on New England’s maritime efforts in the final subjugation of Canada.

Walter Muir Whitehill’s “A Postscript to Fleet Admiral King: A Naval Record” forms a most desirable appendix to that outstanding work. “American Views of the Past,” by Oscar Handlin, is a thought-provoking historiographical essay which he has extended in his Chance and Destiny. The anecdotes contributed by Robert Lincoln O’Brien in “Grover Cleveland as Seen by his Stenographer” were fortunately preserved before the author’s sad death. Articles by Stephen T. Riley and Michael J. Walsh treat of some of the Society’s manuscripts and books.

Volume 71 of the Proceedings, edited by the Society’s new editor, Malcolm Freiberg, contains eighteen of the twenty-eight papers presented at meetings of the Society from October, 1953, to May, 1957. Papers by S. E.
Morison on W. H. Prescott, Frederick Merk on Daniel Webster, and A. M. Schlesinger on Edward Eggleston have appeared elsewhere.

The Adames are prominently to the fore in this volume with Lyman H. Butterfield's "The Papers of the Adams Family: Some Account of Their History"—a valuable account of the country's greatest manuscript collection (and incidentally of many facets of the family itself); and with C. Waller Barrett's "The Making of a History"—an extensive collection of the letters of Henry Adams and his literary assistant relative to the completion and publication of his History of the United States. One could wish that there had been more explanatory editing of these letters. Yet another paper, "Boston during the Civil War," by Edward C. Kirkland, is concerned with the family in that it is based on material in the Adams Papers.

There are other papers which should be mentioned. "Benjamin Blyth, of Salem: Eighteenth-Century Artist," by Henry Wilder Foote, with its detailed descriptive catalogue of Blyth's work is a valuable contribution to early American art. There are two interesting papers by Edward Pierce Hamilton: "The Diary of a Colonial Clergyman: Peter Thacher of Milton" and "Early Industry of the Neponset and the Charles"; and also two by Richard W. Hale, Jr.: "The Forgotten Maine Boundary Commission" and "New Light on the Naval Side of Yorktown."

One paper in the first volume—"Steps Toward Federation in Europe," by Sidney Bradshaw Fay—and three in the second—"The Law Codes of Athens," by Sterling Dow; "The Anglo-Saxon Invasions Reconsidered," by George C. Homans; and "The Universities in Latin America," by Clarence H. Haring—although among the best in the volumes, are certainly not concerned with "the collection and preservation of materials for a political and natural history of the United States," the purpose set forth in the Society's charter. Perhaps the Society is guilty of ultra vires acts!

It is only natural that much of the material in the Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society is for local consumption in Massachusetts and is not of major interest to readers of The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography.

Hartland, Vt.  

HAMILTON VAUGHAN BAIL


The richness of the collections of the Library Company of Philadelphia becomes more evident each year as its Librarian, Edwin Wolf, 2nd, discovers and evaluates new treasures that have gathered dust on its shelves for many generations. In relating these books to their times, Mr. Wolf has
come to the conclusion, one which he has emphasized time and again, that the Library Company was "no pioneer outpost of Anglo-Saxon culture; here was the mature expression of a highly civilized, metropolitan environment."

One manifestation of this cultural maturity is found in the Library Company's collection of "Books Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and British America and of English Books Printed in Other Countries, 1641-1700," books for which Donald Wing has published a short-title catalogue. The Library Company's collection of them is not one of the largest in existence, but, as it then stood, was the largest in America at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Moreover, the books were accumulated rather than collected, bought to be read by members of the Library Company or by private owners. That the books were "old," published fifty to a hundred years before, was not a factor to these eighteenth-century readers: "In an age when next year's automobile is outdated before it is sold, we forget that during the groping period when man was feeling his way in new areas of thought and religion and science and government neither facts nor ideas obsolesced rapidly." Additional Wing titles were added to the collection in the nineteenth century through gifts of book collectors.

Mr. Wolf has compiled a check list of these books as they are listed in or are supplementary to Wing's Short-Title Catalogue, using Wing's form of entry. While the bibliographical section has a specialized interest for scholars, Mr. Wolf's introduction will have a wider appeal. In it he has discussed how the books came into the Library Company (there is a separate provenance index), and has placed them in the complex of their times, ownership, and use. It is a delightful essay on the "book culture" of early Philadelphia.

*The Historical Society of Pennsylvania*  
**Lois V. Given**
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