BOOK REVIEWS

The Jefferson Image in the American Mind. By MERRILL D. PETERSON.
(New York: Oxford University Press, 1960. x, 548 p. Bibliography, index. $8.50.)

Some future historian of American historical writing, looking over the work of the 1950's for dominant trends, will undoubtedly devote a chapter to the vogue of the historical ghost-story. Historians in this period, he will point out, seemed less concerned with the "real" Franklin, Washington, Jackson, or Lincoln than with the "American image" of Franklin, the Washington "legend," the Jackson "symbol," the "cult" of Lincoln. Not only the figures who populate the historical landscape but the landscape itself became ghostly: historians dealt not so much with the facts of westward expansion or the actual significance of the frontier, for example, as with the West as "symbol and myth." The concept of "symbol" or "myth" became indeed the password, the "Open sesame," of historical interpretation. Our historiographer will unquestionably single out Henry Nash Smith's Virgin Land (1950) as the herald of the new school, though he will have to seek its remoter intellectual origins in the writings of the philosophers, sociologists, and literary critics who first shaped the concept and handed it to the historians. Perhaps he will see this preoccupation with "ghosts" as a revelation of something deep in the mid-century American psyche.

Professor Peterson of Brandeis, the latest practitioner of this method, has a well-developed rationale for it. Every society, he affirms, following A. N. Whitehead, "needs a sense of continuity with its history, a set of commonly diffused symbols rooted out of the past to manifest its modes of action and evoke its ideals." But the symbols, he adds, must be "constantly revised to meet the tests of an ever-changing national life" (p. 332). No symbol or myth, of course, corresponds precisely with objective reality, but, says Mr. Peterson, "this does not diminish the importance of its shaping power in history, which is 'determined no more by what is true than by what men believe to be true' " (p. 70). The complex image of Thomas Jefferson, whose history he traces, is "a mixed product of memory and hope, fact and myth, love and hate, of the politician's strategy, the patriot's veneration, and the scholar's quest" (p. vii). It has been a continuing fact of American experience ever since July 4, 1826, the jubilee of the Declaration of Independence, that date, almost too symbolic for belief, when Jefferson passed into history, and the American mythopoetic faculty went to work. But the image has never been static or constant; in its mutability and adaptiveness it has been
"a sensitive reflector . . . of America's troubled search for the image of itself" (p. vii).

To the study of this chameleonic, almost kaleidoscopic, image Professor Peterson brings enviable gifts—scholarship both broad and deep, perceptiveness and sensitiveness of a high order, clarity and eloquence of expression. The result is a triumphant vindication of this technique of historical analysis. The changing faces of the Jefferson image which he records are too multiform to permit of any summary here. One can only hint at the reveling complexities and contradictions he finds as he pursues his explorations through an enormous mass of evidence—the writings of successive generations of statesmen, politicians, publicists, orators, novelists, poets, historians, editors, biographers, ordinary citizens.

Every student of American history knows how the ante-bellum South segregated the states-rights portion of the Jefferson heritage and made it a cover for the defense of slavery, while the Jacksonians erected the egalitarian element into the panoply of a new democracy. But it was not as simple as that, for the anti-Jackson conservatives, too, had their image of Jefferson, a curious bifocal image of the visionary philosopher who was also a practical, earthy demagogue, and the later Whigs had theirs—the defender of legislative as against executive power. To the abolitionists, meanwhile, Jefferson was an ambiguous, flickering image—now the draftsman of the immortal Declaration with its ringing affirmation of the inalienable rights of man, now the architect of the sinister Slave Power, who fostered the myth of Negro inferiority. Yet the Republicans of 1860 contrived to quote Jeffersonian scripture for almost every major plank on their platform.

The uses of the Jefferson myth in the twentieth century have been even more varied. One has only to recall the Presidential election of 1936, when both the Liberty League and the Communist Party claimed Jefferson as their own, while the New Dealers, having buried the Jefferson philosophy of government, nevertheless staked out and made good their claim to be rightful heirs of the Jeffersonian faith in the capacity of an informed people to work out their own salvation. Already by 1936, however, according to Peterson, the political image was in process of being transformed into a patriotic symbol that transcended partisan politics. It was not just the democrat or the Democrat, who was enshrined in the Jefferson Memorial in 1943, but the Culture Hero—the scholar, architect, man of letters, musician, scientist, in short, the "civilized man." Dumas Malone's unpolemic and scholarly biography, E. Millicent Sowerby's definitive catalogue of his books, Julian P. Boyd's magisterial edition of his papers are putting the finishing touches on this apotheosis.

Whether the Jefferson image is indefinitely viable, whether it still has capacities for growth and change and new inspiration in the atomic age, Mr. Peterson, being a historian, not a prophet, cannot say. He notes that Robert Penn Warren in his gruesome dramatic poem Brother to Dragons (1953) disclosed a possible weakness—the reluctance of the "prophet of human perfectibility" to look steadily at the fact of evil, to come to terms
with the actual human condition. Still, even when many of Jefferson's values have slipped away, Mr. Peterson believes, "he may yet go on vindicating his power in the national life as the heroic voice of imperishable freedoms" (p. 457). One wishes that all the ghosts who walk through American history were as inspiring as Jefferson's.

Swarthmore College

FREDERICK B. TOLLES

Benjamin Franklin & Polly Baker: The History of a Literary Deception. By MAX HALL. (Chapel Hill, N. C.: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture by the University of North Carolina Press, 1960. xii, 193 p. Illustrations, appendix, bibliography, index. $5.00.)

It is pleasant to have Polly back among us again, so brightly arrayed, with a red jacket covering the grey of her dress, and the dress decorated, with seemly appropriateness, in scarlet. She has long been a favorite, her pervasive popularity certified by the greater number who know her story than have read it. The jacket of this chronicle of her escapades at home and abroad calls her a "hapless lass," but those who know her best know better. She was a mettlesome, productive girl, in word and deed attesting to the independent free spirit of the New World, and pretty sensible, also. Men in wigs failed to subdue her to anything but—and even this is not quite clear—a convenient marriage; whippings never kept her from her appointed course: the wonder is that no one has quite taken seriously her suggestion to "have a statue erected in my Memory."

One of the best services which Mr. Hall performs for Miss Baker is the tracing of her pedigree. Thirty-five years before she burst to public notice on April 15, 1747, her ancestresses were talked about in London by Richard Steele and Joseph Addison—in fact, the latter it was who suggested that women of their sort be sent "into our American Colonies, in order to People those Parts of her Majesty's Dominions where there is want of inhabitants." Moll Flanders, whose first name, like Polly's, was a corruption of Mary, was another of her kinfolk, as was the more fortunate Roxana. Mr. Hall also supposes that Polly Peachum of The Beggar's Opera was related, but he cannot be right, for the American girl would not have taken up with a highwayman. Sixteen years before Polly appeared, a young man, himself named Baker, and who was to become a son-in-law of Daniel DeFoe, introduced a trio of unmarried ladies who mourned in chorus that they did not fulfill "God's first Command, increase and multiply, which they believe their indispensible and bounden Duty."

Polly, an American girl, was of more practical mind. Even the example of the chaste Pamela, seven years older than she, did not deter her from her duty. No wonder her story was immediately picked up by more than a dozen papers in England (and Ireland, even Scotland)—everything from Old England: or, The Broadbottom's Journal to the Gentleman's Magazine,
itself said to have been "the fruitful mother" of many periodical descend-
ants. So good a story inevitably invited improvement, and variants ap-
peared, which Mr. Hall traces with painstaking skill. It may even have been
Dr. Johnson who linked her ancestry in a footnote to Adam and Eve through
Milton's assertion:

Our maker bids increase; who bids abstain
But our destroyer, foe to God and man?

But certainly it could not have been he who in impish mood or with com-
pletely un-Johnsonian, Paul Bunyanish extravagance changed from five to
fifteen the number of children who were clinging, says Mr. Hall, to Polly's
apron.

Every reader will know from the start that Benjamin Franklin is Polly's
sire, but Mr. Hall will keep him off balance, expecting the worst—that,
after all, the hoax is that she was not his—until chapter seven where the
author is revealed. Before that, he will discover how the American girl, from
"Connecticut near Boston," was kidnapped by the foreign radicals Diderot
and Raynal: "With a little French tailoring they worked her speech into the
revolutionary message they were preaching to their age." And then how
she got to Sweden and Soviet Russia. Later, he will learn how Voltaire
discredited her, what Jefferson had to say, and John Adams, Philip
Mazzei, and many another.

What he will not discover, because Mr. Hall has not either, is how she
got abroad in the first place, exactly why Franklin allowed her to make her
debut in the London Daily Advertiser in 1747 instead of in Philadelphia
years before, and if it was he who wrote a letter to an English editor explain-
ing that Polly really married a real judge in Roxbury, near Boston. He will
be puzzled also, in checking through Mr. Hall's "Chronological List of [59]
Printed Texts of Polly Baker's Speech," to find that it has only once ap-
peared in a collegiate anthology of American literature. Surely, our young
men and women need to know it and her better. Polly is one of the more
radiant characters in our literature—livelier than Hester Prynne, brighter
than Sister Carrie, more human by far than a dozen Marjorie Morningstars.
And she has certainly been around. It is good to join Mr. Hall in welcoming
her once more home, becomingly attired and presented with thoroughness
and taste.

Columbia University

LEWIS LEARY

Sources of Our Liberties. Documentary Origins of Individual Liberties in the
United States Constitution and Bill of Rights. Edited by RICHARD L.
PERRY under the general supervision of JOHN C. COOPER. (New York:
xxiv, 456 p. Appendix, bibliography, index. $5.00.)

It has long been obvious that American lawyers enjoy a fateful proclivity
for politics, but it should be equally obvious that lawyers also make pretty
good historians. Indeed, lawyers have to be historians in order to pursue
their profession with any degree of skill and assurance. Law is constantly
changing: what the Supreme Court says to be the law for one generation
may be entirely reversed for another. Lawyers need to know the past if they
are to find clues to future judicial revivalism. In fact, the pursuit of law is
largely one of the investigation and presentation of precedent, and precedent
in one form or another is the concern of the professional historian, too.

Thus, lawyers may not only make history, but they are peculiarly
equipped to write history as well. Richard L. Perry's *Sources of Our Liberties*
easily supports the contention that law and history constantly coincide. Mr.
Perry is himself a practicing lawyer and a very able historian. But he has
further demonstrated the intimate interrelationship of the two professions
by furnishing a most satisfyingly edited volume of legal documents where-
with past lawyers advanced Anglo-American liberties. Since Mr. Perry's
book appears under the aegis of the American Bar Association and the
American Bar Foundation, both bodies should share in the attendant
compliments.

This is, then, no hack job, but a magnificently convenient and attractive
handbook of documentary material which extends from Magna Charta to
the first ten amendments to the 1787 Constitution of the United States.
Mr. Perry has included the important liberty documents of seventeenth-
century England, the more significant colonial charters, samples of revolu-
tionary literature from the 1760's and 1770's, and several of the more
interesting state constitutions which supposedly reflect the objectives and
character of the American Revolution. In other words, the editor has lived
up to his announced purpose: he has supplied a selection of documents
which vividly describe within themselves the close Anglo-American political
and legal connection. Indeed, he has done much more: he has prefaced each
selection with a brief but stimulating essay in which the background and
antecedents of the document are brilliantly presented.

It is in these little essays that Mr. Perry has revealed his own considerable
merits as a historian as well as an editor; to read these introductory pieces
alone is to gain a most engaging glimpse of growing buttresses to liberty
built by and with English and American lawyers. Mr. Perry has done his
homework in exemplary style. He knows and communicates painlessly the
hstoriography of his source material, and ably eschews the many pitfalls
awaiting the careless student of such items as the Fundamental Orders of
Connecticut. On occasion, to be sure, this reviewer wishes for further
elucidation, as in the brief discussion of *Dr. Bonham's Case* in the essay on
the Confirmatio Cartarum, where Mr. Perry fails to make clear that Sir
Edward Coke based his decision not upon a similar higher law concept, but
upon statutory reinterpretation. But Coke thus did open the door for an
appeal to the priority of common law over statutory law and gave James
Otis his chance to attack the Writs of Assistance in 1761 as unconstitutional
and contrary to "natural equity."
There is also room for disagreement with the mildly jingoistic tone of John Cobb Cooper's Foreword, wherein there are several unhistorical assumptions about religious toleration in colonial America. But if Mr. Cooper is rather too reverent toward Englishmen in America as opposed to those foolish enough to stay home, at least his heart is in the right place. Like Mr. Perry, he is deeply aware of the derivative nature of present principles, and has effectively summed up the chief lesson of Sources of Our Liberties with the observation that "the colonists always sought unequivocal statements of the existence and extent of their liberties." Nothing could be less equivocal than the Habeas Corpus Act of 1679, or the famous Bill of Rights ten years later. Revolutions have never come easily to Englishmen, and resistance to encroachments upon legal rights proved the best and most justifiable course of action for a John Adams and a John Dickinson. The legal origin of colonial claims bears enormous relevance to an improved understanding of colonial behavior on the one hand and the true derivation of our present liberties on the other.

Indiana University

H. Trevor Colbourn


This is an unusual book in a number of ways. Two of its sections have appeared as articles in the Art Bulletin, another has been privately printed as a separate volume, a significant portion of yet another forms part of the catalogue of the Waldron Phoenix Belknap, Jr., Collection of Portraits and Silver, edited by John Marshall Phillips and others, and the remaining items have been compiled from notes left by Mr. Belknap touching on his researches in genealogy related to the history of early American painting. It may seem strange, in view of the accessibility of much of this material, that the present volume was deemed necessary, yet the reasons for its appearance are cogent. It is, on the one hand, a memorial to Mr. Belknap, edited and provided with a sensitive and informative introduction by Charles Coleman Sellers, commemorating the achievement of one who but for his untimely death would have augmented and confirmed the stature he had already attained in contributing to the history of early American painting. At the same time, it is a significant document in the history of scholarship in its field, adding the discipline of documentary and genealogical research to the concept of attribution and identification on aesthetic and stylistic grounds that is the basis of studies like those of the late William Sawitsky. So painstaking and meticulous was Belknap that the genealogical
material here presented can be assumed to be of immediate and practical value for other scholars in a consummation which he regrettably never saw.

The effectiveness of Mr. Belknap's method as he applied it is well illustrated in the essays dealing with Robert Feke who painted in Newport, Oyster Bay, and Philadelphia around the middle of the eighteenth century. Though full justice had been accorded Feke as an outstanding artist of his time by other writers, such as Henry Wilder Foote and James Thomas Flexner, Belknap's discussion at the same time clarified and strengthened his claim to distinction by making it possible to discard much of accepted legend and also to confirm much that had previously been only surmise. Belknap's achievement here makes all the more regrettable the incomplete state of his studies in early New York painting, though it may confidently be assumed that his notes will some day be the basis for ultimate clarification of its presently obscure and difficult problems.

Perhaps the most signal contribution to the scholarship of early American painting was Belknap's demonstration of the close relationship between English engravings and the portrait traditions of colonial painting in the eighteenth century. It has long been recognized that the fashionable mezzotint plates of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries circulated in the New World as well as in the old, and generic similarities between colonial portraits and English prototypes have often been noted. But it was Belknap's accomplishment to prove by painstaking comparisons, meticulous and sensitive observations, and the employment of more than a little common sense, that there are direct and objectively demonstrable relationships between specific examples in a model-copy association. The end result is a notable clarification and increase of understanding in a field of our cultural tradition previously marked more by amiable speculation and engaging anecdote than the values of scholarship. Mr. Belknap's contribution to scholarship in his field is unassailable; his development and demonstration of a sound method of scholarly research assures him an honored place in its annals.

University of Pennsylvania

DAVID M. ROBB


Professor Thayer has written an excellent biography of Nathanael Greene. Such a biography has long been needed because the biographies by Francis V. Greene and George Washington Greene are out of date and probably too laudatory.

Professor Thayer's book begins with a brief account of the family background and early life of Nathanael Greene. It portrays Greene as a hard-
working Rhode Island Quaker who achieved considerable success as an ironmaster and merchant despite the fact that he had had but little formal education. Greene might have become wealthy had he remained a businessman, but he left his ironworks in 1775 to take up arms against the British.

Greene was expelled from Quaker meetings when he joined the Rhode Island militia. However, he felt obliged to forsake his Quaker principles in order to bear arms in defense of colonial rights against what seemed to him to be British oppression. He was appointed brigadier general of Rhode Island militia shortly after war broke out and was promoted to major general in the Continental Army in the summer of 1776.

General Greene played an important part in the siege of Boston in 1775–1776. He participated in the New York-New Jersey campaign during the fall of 1776, but was absent from the fighting on Long Island because of illness. He participated in the winter campaign of 1776–1777 and distinguished himself in the battle at Trenton. In the fall of 1777, he fought in the Philadelphia area and played a prominent part in the battles of Brandywine and Germantown. The stand made by his troops at Brandywine probably saved General Washington's army from a crushing defeat.

Greene retired from the "line" to become quartermaster general during the campaigns of 1778, 1779, and 1780. Professor Thayer gives Greene credit for saving the army from starvation or dissolution on several occasions during 1778 and 1779. However, he makes it clear that Greene profited from commissions on army contracts and came under adverse criticism from some members of Congress.

A field command was more attractive to Greene than was the office of quartermaster general, and his opportunity to command an army came in the fall of 1780 when Washington appointed him to lead the American troops which were charged with the defense of the Carolinas. Greene accepted his appointment with reluctance, knowing as he did that the army which he was to command had suffered a shattering defeat at Camden, South Carolina, in mid-August. However, he succeeded in rebuilding the southern army until it was a formidable fighting force. He then succeeded in driving the British out of North Carolina after some hard marching and harder fighting. The British army finally marched northward to Virginia, where it was trapped and captured by a French fleet and a Franco-American army. Meanwhile, Greene invaded South Carolina, captured the garrisons of many British forts there, and forced the remaining British forces in South Carolina and Georgia to retreat to the vicinity of Charleston and Savannah.

Professor Thayer's fine book is a most welcome addition to our growing library of volumes dealing with the War for American Independence. However, the reviewer has the feeling that Professor Thayer would have been justified in giving but light coverage to the campaigns of 1776 and 1777 because they have already been so thoroughly treated in the books written by such authorities as John R. Alden, North Callahan, Douglas S. Freeman, and Willard Wallace. Somewhat more detailed treatment could then have
been given to the campaigns in the Carolinas—and the reviewer is of the opinion that Greene reached the zenith of his career during 1781 when he succeeded in driving the British out of an area of more than 100,000 square miles of the interior of Georgia and the Carolinas. In any case, Professor Thayer has given us an excellent biography of Nathanael Greene and has made important contributions to our knowledge of Greene's life, of the inner workings of the quartermaster corps during the years 1778–1780, and of the campaign in which Greene outmaneuvered and outgeneraled Charles, Lord Cornwallis, would-be conqueror of North Carolina.

Lehigh University

George W. Kyte


The subtitle to this volume indicates its contents: a transcription of the correspondence between Anthony Wayne and the three Secretaries of War for the 1792–1796 years of the Indian wars in the Old Northwest. It needs to be pointed out, however, that this body of correspondence is not "definitive" in the sense that it contains all the letter communications between Wayne and the secretaries. It is noted that each letter in this collection is transcribed from the Wayne Papers in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania; although this is the principal collection of Wayne materials, there are others to be found elsewhere, which apparently were not consulted in the preparation of this work.

For example, there is Wayne's letter of October 17, 1794, incomplete in this collection, which can be finished from another copy. Lacking from the letter of August 28, 1794, is an "N.B." which reports further information. More important, however, is Wayne's entire letter to Knox, August 14, 1794, which is absent from this volume. It tells of the building of Fort Adams, taking possession of the site of and erecting Fort Defiance, and other significant information. Although Pickering's instructions of April 8 and 14, 1795, for holding a treaty are included, the important antecedent instructions from Knox of April 4, 1794, are missing. And finally, there is the letter of July 11, 1794, in which Knox virtually grants plenary powers to Wayne. These omissions were discovered by the reviewer as the result of a very incomplete survey.

In addition to transcription, the materials of the volume are edited with an introduction, footnotes, bibliography, and index. The brief introduction contains assertions and interpretations that many will not subscribe to. For
example, it is stated that "with few exceptions, American history texts omit it [the Wayne campaign] completely. Others pass it off with a bare mention" (p. 1). Assuming that this refers to general survey textbooks, very seldom is the campaign omitted entirely. In most, balance and perspective are maintained by an explanation of the Wayne phase and how it is related to the Indian wars and how they in turn are related to the general picture of American history. In other texts, such as those of Morison and Commager, Harlow, Hicks, and Wellborn, even more adequate treatment is given.

Wayne has not been relegated to oblivion by historians. That the transcriber as research historian of the Anthony Wayne Parkway Board is a partisan of Wayne and desires to enhance the position of this important figure is understandable. His concentration on Wayne, however, leads him to some questionable statements. Assertion, for example, that the Whiskey Rebellion was "little more than a taxpayers' riot" (p. 1) is hardly a satisfactory appraisal of this event by an American historian. And again, the claim that "the securing and ultimate maintenance of American nationalism was primarily established in the West in this critical period" (p. 2) raises doubts as to fact and syntax.

Nearly half of the footnotes of this volume locate the letters in the Wayne Papers. Approximately half of the others are identifications taken, without credit, except for a brief statement in the bibliography, from Heitman's *Historical Register and Dictionary of the United States Army*. Some contain sketches of several persons; one, for example, contains fifteen. In general, the complete military biographical data of the Heitman notes is of little consequence to this volume. Further, there is no need to identify such men as Knox, Wayne, and McHenry, leading figures in the book. That Aaron Burr was Vice-President and George Rogers Clark a military hero are superfluous bits. It is hardly necessary to explain that "'instant' means the current month" and "'ultimo' means the month just past."

Instead of the location notes (essentially covered by the general concluding paragraph of the Introduction) and other superfluous notes, editorial annotation and commentary to give context and to indicate the relation of the letters to each other and to other source material would be more appropriate.

Rather than a list of all the materials used in the preparation of this volume, the bibliography is composed of selected items which concern the Wayne campaign in general. The index is not analytical. There are, for example, 101 entries for Pittsburgh, 56 for United States Congress, and 155 for George Washington, without a single modification to help the reader find what he may be looking for.

The contribution of this volume is a reliable transcription of a selected portion of the Wayne Papers. Correspondence to be found elsewhere might well be added. Editing in depth would also increase its value.

*Miami University*  

**Dwight L. Smith**

Tocqueville's Democracy in America, published in 1835, was based on conversations and impressions which he kept in fourteen notebooks during his travels in America in 1831-1832. These notes, often repetitious but charmingly fresh and vivid, have been edited from the original manuscript for the Oeuvres Complètes and are now available in an English version by George Lawrence. Also reproduced is the Journey to Lake Oneida, translated in 1861 by Mrs. Simpson (daughter of Nassau William Senior), and A Fortnight in the Wilderness, most if not all of which was translated in 1938 by Professor Pierson for his study of Tocqueville's travels. Dr. Mayer in his introduction to the Journey states that "only faulty and incomplete transcriptions" were earlier available to scholars. There seems no reason to doubt the accuracy of the learned editor and compiler of the Oeuvres, but prospective readers of a delightful and illuminating book should realize that profitable use of the information which it contains cannot be made without constant reference to what Dr. Mayer calls the "authoritative" Tocqueville and Beaumont in America (New York, 1938) by George Wilson Pierson.

In this volume Professor Pierson traced the chronology of the travels of the two Frenchmen, provided a map of their itinerary, and identified the persons with whom they consorted. He translated and quoted extensively from transcripts of the notebooks as well as from other sources. This reviewer has checked only a few passages in Pierson's translation against the present version, but in these has found only insignificant variations. Dr. Mayer has used Pierson in his notes, and, since he provides a very indifferent index, which contains almost no proper names, the reader is forced to refer back to Pierson continually. For example, John Vaughan is referred to in the text as "Franklin's disciple," but to find his Christian name and his dates some other authority must be consulted. For those items which do appear in the index, there still remain hazards for the impatient scholar. For material about the Walnut Street Prison—Tocqueville and Beaumont came, it must be remembered, to investigate the American prison system for the government of Louis Philippe—the reader can turn to prison, from that to law and crime, and far down a long list of subentries to penitentiary systems, after which he must wade through the eleven (should be twelve) entries until Walnut Street is discovered in the text. Surely the additional effort and expense of a better index and at least dates and first names of persons would have made this book very much more valuable.

Many before Tocqueville had traveled in the United States, and some of these, like Liancourt, had written about the prisons; others, like Thomas Cooper, about society and institutions. None has ever surpassed the Democracy in penetration and wisdom. Tocqueville limited his observations;
he paid little attention to historical background; he misinterpreted the inheritance law and neglected the problems of city life and commercial expansion. These notebooks, now published in the *Journey*, reveal gaps and shortcomings but emphasize the virtues all have long recognized. Tocqueville interviewed lawyers and prisoners, Indians and frontiersmen. He wanted to understand not only the penitentiaries he came to inspect, but the society of the New World and those circumstances which made this extraordinary experiment successful. The *Journey* enables the reader to see him at work, to catch his first vivid reports and impressions, and to trace the process by which he arrived at his conclusions about America and developed his own political philosophy.

The two friends worked hard. They prepared questions, talked or corresponded with persons they thought might be helpful. They read extensively, and they moved in the society of each town they visited. There were adventures on the Mississippi, there was the excitement of the frontier and the interest of meeting Indians about whom Tocqueville's uncle, Chateaubriand, had woven his romantic narrative. Slavery was observed and information collected about its effects, not only on the enslaved, but upon the character of the employers. Of course, long hours were spent in prisons like Sing Sing, Auburn, Eastern Penitentiary, and Walnut Street. Though it was tiresome at times, this work was conscientiously performed for the report jointly made to the French Government. As magistrates, Tocqueville and Beaumont naturally were interested in law. The notes on Kent (Chapter IX) are as interesting as any in the volume. Though they did not visit the aging Madison, they did interview Charles Carroll, Signer of the Declaration (p. 85). They took advantage of the learning of Jared Sparks, historian and collector. In Philadelphia, they consorted with Roberts Vaux, John Vaughan, Robert Walsh and Henry Gilpin, among a host of others. In Baltimore, J. H. B. Labtrobe, and in Massachusetts, Francis Gray, as well as Sparks and Joseph Coolidge, assisted their inquiries.

The reported conversations sparkle. Besides throwing light upon the genesis of *Democracy*, they illuminate contemporary American opinion in the circles in which the Frenchmen moved. Religion and education immensely interested Tocqueville; so did social stratification and racial prejudice. Many inquiries were made about universal suffrage and the rule of the majority, and a good many comments may be found on the kind of person likely to be selected by popular vote. Tocqueville felt that the great men of the Revolutionary period were unlikely to be equaled in the coming century. He heard little but criticism of General Jackson.

Much of the matter in the notebooks is familiar in a different form, but the delightful *Fortnight in the Wilderness*, though it has long been available, is probably less well known and contains many descriptions of dwellings in the wilderness and the solitudes of the forest. One could almost wish when reading this that Tocqueville had written a traveler's book in addition to the *Democracy*. Accounts of Ohio and Cincinnati, Kentucky and Tennessee
reveal him as a first-class reporter not only of society and people, but of places and of products. There is a delightfully factual note on page 209, given by a young Scottish doctor on ways of cultivating virgin lands. Readers will discover many more to consider as they read the notebooks reproduced here.

Tocqueville was a more serious student than other travelers, but as he describes the character of the Americans and their activities he confirms many previous observers: the restlessness; the desire to get rich; the absence of a caste system; the acceptance of diversity in religion; the casual endurance of the hardship of the frontier; the persistent and prevalent idea of progress and of the possibility of successive and continuous betterment of the social condition. Tocqueville's genius sought, in addition to these familiar facts, the explanation of this new democratic society and republican government. The Journey helps us to follow him as he pursued his investigation.

Bryn Mawr College

CAROLINE ROBBINS

The Autobiography of James Monroe. Edited, and with an Introduction by STUART GERRY BROWN with the assistance of DONALD G. BAKER. (Syracuse, N. Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1959. xii, 236 p. Illustrations, index. $6.00.)

For many years, these important autobiographical fragments left by the fifth President of the United States have lain, little used and known only to a small group of specialists, among the rich resources of the New York Public Library. Writing late in life, James Monroe here attempted a memoir which he never finished. After a short allusion to his ancestry and birth, and a general comment on his education, Monroe, writing in the third person, describes his role in the American Revolution. He then reviews his early political career beginning with his study of the law under Thomas Jefferson, then governor of Virginia. By the use of care, discretion, and ability, Monroe's career progressed through the Virginia legislature, the Continental Congress, the Annapolis Convention, the Virginia Assembly, and the Virginia Ratifying Convention. After a brief return to the practice of law, he was chosen Senator from Virginia.

At this point the longest part of the Autobiography begins, dealing with Monroe's first mission to France. It was a particularly difficult ministry, and certainly all of the mistakes were not of Monroe's making. The tone of his writing here, as elsewhere in this memoir, is significant. Part of his purpose was to conciliate. Monroe's finances were in a deplorable state, and, apparently, a part of the original intention of the Autobiography was to seek repayment for the financial losses of this period, from which he had never been able to recover. The first mission to France, while John Jay was in England negotiating a treaty which the French were bound to oppose,
was doomed from the beginning, and it ended with a humiliating recall from which Monroe never completely recovered. As he wrote, although mellowed with years, it is obvious that his mind still rankled at the memory.

After the ignominy of the recall, Monroe went into brief retirement, soon to be "drafted" to the governorship of Virginia, albeit not without some maneuvering of his own which he fails to mention. The next large part of the reminiscence deals with the second ministry to France and the Louisiana Purchase. He concludes with a briefer discussion of his duties as minister to Great Britain and envoy extraordinary to Spain.

Taken as a whole, this work is a remarkable performance. Obviously, it was intended for the public, and there is much of the apologia in it. Stuart Gerry Brown, the editor, in his able and perceptive introduction has appraised Monroe's narrative. "The whole account is written with great political skill, uncorrected draft though it is. No reader was likely to be offended by it; no reader was likely to receive the impression that Monroe was at all arrogant; yet any reader would see that Monroe's mission was of the first importance to his country, and that his role had been central in acquiring both of the great recent additions of territory" (p. 11).

More important than the actual factual content of this Autobiography is the insight it provides about Monroe's attitudes and state of mind in his last years. One can only regret that, ponderous and often labored as the style is, there is not more, and that the aging former President had not finished it, giving posterity his impressions of his later political activities. For this is, above all, the statement of a professional politician. Professor Brown begins his introduction by calling Monroe the first important professional politician of the United States. Only on this basis can his choice of the busy Jefferson as his legal master in 1780 be understood. His entire life, with the exception of a few periods of enforced retirement, was engaged in the pursuit of public office. His few political mistakes he masterfully turned to his advantage. The Autobiography can be understood as the final step in such a life.

Colorado State University

Carlos R. Allen, Jr.

The Papers of Henry Clay. Volume I: The Rising Statesman, 1794-1814. JAMES F. HOPKINS, Editor; MARY W. M. HARGREAVES, Associate Editor. (Lexington, Ky.: University of Kentucky Press, 1959. xvi, 1040 p. Illustrations, index. $15.00.)

Henry Clay, unlike most of the contemporaries with whom he shared political leadership in the United States, was a self-educated, a "self-made" man, and his papers reflect this fact. His interests and concerns were those of a lawyer, a businessman, and a politician in a newly settled region, but this did not mean that he was narrow, parochial, or unintelligent. It did mean, however, that he wrote only about the practical, day-to-day problems with which he was concerned, and if a reader comes to his papers
seeking philosophical discourses on the law, politics, or the western frontier, he will be grievously disappointed. Clay also was reticent about his personal emotions, and the few letters to and from his family and friends here published give no clues as to the relationships between them. In other words, what is to be had from this initial volume of the ten to be published containing all the surviving papers of Henry Clay, is the exterior record of his early life, the businesses he was engaged in, the legal matters he attended to, and the details of his beginning political career.

At first reading the papers seem dull, and their only virtue the clarity and forcefulness of the writing, but this first impression is an erroneous one, for hidden within these bare statements is the life of a man who was a lawyer, a land speculator, a legislator, an educator, a friend, a husband, a brother, a citizen, a political partisan, a statesman, a reformer, a political philosopher, a demagogue, a bill collector, a philanthropist, a horse racer, and a gambler. In short, he was a man, more interesting and more active than most men, and, because of the positions he occupied and the particular environment from which he came, one that it is very important to understand and know. The editors, by including these seemingly casual and irrelevant documents, have done even more than given us this introduction to a particular man, they have enabled us to learn something useful about that group of men called Americans, especially those whose chief interest is the practical life. For here in Clay is to be seen to what great heights men can rise who begin with concern for tawdry, everyday, commonplace things, and how out of this concern can come as effective and creative political action, perhaps even more effective and creative political action, as comes from those who begin with political principles and theory.

The years covered in this volume are from 1797 to 1814, and the final section contains what is perhaps the fullest account of the negotiations at Ghent that ended the second war with Great Britain. Here in Europe, Clay’s education was completed, his Americanism was matured, and the stage was set for him to abandon the simple, individualistic, antinational Jeffersonianism with which he had begun his political career.

The papers of Henry Clay in this first volume have been competently edited and annotated. The general editorial procedure measures up well to the high standards set by the numerous great papers projects.

National Council, Protestant Episcopal Church

Thomas P. Govan

(New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1960. xii, 416 p. Illustrations, bibliographical note, index. $6.95.)

It is absorbing to read a lively biography of an exceptional man. It can be downright fascinating when the man typifies a colorful span of years in the development of an exciting nation.
Edwin Forrest (1806–1872), first great star of the American theater, was born and died in Philadelphia. He earned great fame, and, for his day, a fortune. Both were royally deserved. On and off the stage he was a mountain of physical strength, a dynamo of will power and mental energy (Forrest's heroic dimensions invite the mixed metaphor), and a deep well of that indefinable theatrical magic which "compelled so many Americans to pay so much for a tempestuous evening in the theatre." Besides touring extensively in his own country, he played in England and Scotland, and in Ireland to the wildest ovations. As a tourist he traveled on the Continent, including Russia, where his diary reports frustrations at the hands of Russian bureaucrats which read like this morning's newspaper.

A poor boy determined to act, Forrest suddenly scored a sensational success as Othello in 1826, and from then on he never stopped till infirmities felled him in his sixty-seventh year, while his namesake Edwin Booth was taking over as America's greatest actor. Sully's portrait of Forrest completed in 1839, which now hangs in the Garrick Club of London, shows a youth of great beauty; in his later photographs he looks like a veteran Senator. For forty years the public worshipped this powerhouse of a man. The adulation of the mid-nineteenth-century audience is hard to grasp today—despite Hollywood and television. When the Bowery B'hoys became incensed at a running feud between their idol Forrest and the English star Macready, they invaded a Macready performance at the Astor Place Opera House in New York and started a riot which finally involved one hundred and twenty-five police, more than two hundred infantrymen, fifty cavalry, and a general, the mayor, chief of police, and sheriff of the city, and the governor of the state. Thirty-one were reported dead and forty-eight were treated for injuries. The Opera House was a shambles. Ten rioters were jailed. Quite a theatrical performance.

Quotations from Forrest's speech and letters show that when he spoke he literally "said a mouthful." For instance: "Where does labor go to his toil with an alerter step [than in the United States], or an erecter brow, effulgent with the heart-reflected light of conscious independence?" "You damned whipper-snapper, have you come here to bark at my heels or to lick my boots?" "The air is filled with fragrance drawn by the warm sun from balsamic trees, while the autumnal wild flowers waft their incense to the glorious day." "Miss Lehman is a whore as well as a liar and a cheat."

His divorce proceedings were a hair-raising shocker during which neither side spared lurid details in countercharges of flamboyant adultery; yet he obviously never really cared for another woman but his wife. Childless, he was a devoted family man, supported his mother and sisters in great comfort, was heartbroken at their deaths and at that of his brother. His will established at his country place the Edwin Forrest Home for retired actors and actresses, which he richly endowed and which flourishes today at another location, 4849 Parkside Avenue, Philadelphia, fulfilling his noble intent.
Here was an outstanding American, as admirable as he was attractive, a highlighted focus of his teeming times. Fortunately for us, his present biographer makes it a joy to read about him. Because Richard Moody loves and knows the theater, because his heart and his humor have collaborated with his scholarly mind, the result is much more than the history of a departed actor. Even though, were Forrest suddenly alive again, his ample style might “appear grotesque to a twentieth-century playgoer accustomed to Marlon Brando’s mumbling or Gary Cooper’s polite whispers,” I can imagine no one above comic-book mentality who would not delight in this lusty story. One feels the lights going up again in forgotten playhouses from New York to New Orleans to San Francisco where Forrest once shook the rafters with his roars, where audiences rose, shouted, and rioted for their idol. As I regretfully closed the back cover, my palms seemed to tingle from their share in the frenzied applause. Thank you, Mr. Moody.

Philadelphia

Edgar Scott


A. Hunter Dupree has written a most interesting and informative account of one of the great figures of nineteenth-century science in the United States. He considers not only Asa Gray the man, but includes much on the history of science, American intellectual and social history, theology, and world figures in biology.

Asa Gray, son of a journeyman tanner, was born in 1810 in the village of Sauquoit, New York. He was trained, so far as training went in those days, as a physician, received his medical degree at the age of twenty, and began practice in the village of Bridgewater, New York. However, after a few months as a country doctor his interest in medicine flagged, and his desires led him back to a love of botany, a subject he pursued wholeheartedly for the balance of a long life.

What impelled him to do this? Why did Gray abandon medicine and become a devoted botanist? Was it his early life in a semirural environment; an article on botany in the Edinburgh Encyclopaedia; the effect of collecting a spring flower and identifying it (wrongly) with Eaton’s Manual; the influence of James Hadley, admired teacher and trusted friend; correspondence with Lewis C. Beck, botanist at Albany; encouragement from John Torrey; the simple determination to “make a noise in the world” which he could better do in botany than as a country doctor? Who can say what really determines the direction of a young man’s ambition.

At any rate, it was not easy for Gray to make a career in botany in the United States in the 1830’s. Fellowships, assistantships, instructorships,
civil service appointments and other aids and opportunities were not as freely available then as now. And yet, Gray, at the age of twenty-eight, had declined an advantageous opportunity to accompany the Wilkes expedition to the South Seas (we wonder what effect such an experience might have had on his later career) and accepted an appointment at the University of Michigan, which, though it lasted but one year, sent him to Europe where he made acquaintances with botanists invaluable for his later development. And at thirty-two he was appointed professor at Harvard University where he remained until his death in 1888. Few today have such opportunities at the same age.

Once established at Harvard, Gray, aided by field collectors throughout the country, became immersed in a study of the flora of the United States, in the writing of books, in extensive correspondence with botanists in this country and abroad, and with the obligations of his post at Harvard. He is perhaps most widely known for his books, such as his Lessons and his Manual, but the reader of Dupree's biography whether he be scholar or layman will find of particular interest Gray's relations with Charles Darwin, his disagreements with Agassiz, his attitudes on theology and vitalism, and his general philosophy.

The appearance of this biography in the centennial year of the publication of The Origin of Species is especially timely because of the intimate personal relations between Gray and Darwin and the support Gray gave Darwin. His correspondence with Darwin led to what Dupree considers Gray's greatest contribution—an explanation for the similarity between the flora of eastern Asia and the eastern United States on the basis of a sundering of a common flora by advancing glaciation.

As one reads of Gray's disagreements with Agassiz, one cannot help but speculate on whether Gray would have been so vigorous a supporter of Darwin if Agassiz had taken the same position, and whether Agassiz was quite as black as Dupree has painted him.

It is intriguing and somewhat puzzling to follow Gray in his early enthusiasm for Sir William Lawrence's Lectures on Physiology, Zoology, and the Natural History of Man, Delivered at the Royal College of Surgeons, with its materialistic tenor, its assumptions that man was a part of nature and the human species a unit, and the concept of geographical isolation as a mechanism leading to new varieties; his bitter criticisms of John W. Draper, G. J. Müller, and the Vestiges by Robert Chambers, to his acceptance in the main of Darwin's Origin of Species.

Gray was very ambitious, a hard worker and extremely sure of himself (see his dispute with Eaton when Gray was twenty-five). He was inclined to indulge in sarcasm and was not always diplomatic in his dealings with others. There can be no doubt, however, of his stature as a scientist which might have been greater had he been less driven by the need to make a living and by the magnitude of the task he had set for himself. To one familiar with the clarity and conciseness of Gray's Lessons, it is surprising
that he was not an inspiring teacher and trained no disciples, at least for his first fifteen years at Harvard.

The book is well presented, but exhibits the irritating modern custom of placing footnotes by chapters at the back. A chronology would have been a useful addition. A few errors were noted: Pelham, Massachusetts, is placed in New Hampshire; botany is misspelled more than once, odd in a book devoted to one of the greatest botanists of the nineteenth century.

We are indebted to Dr. Dupree for a book which will long be treasured by all those interested in the history of science and the development of a man.

*American Philosophical Society*  

William J. Robbins

---

The Leopard's Spots: Scientific Attitudes Toward Race In America, 1815-59.  
By William Stanton. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960. x, 245 p. Index. $4.00.)

The title for this short book of nearly two hundred text pages is taken from a biographical memoir in the *Charleston Medical Journal* of 1851: "We believe the time is not far distant, when it will be universally admitted that neither can the 'leopard change his spots, nor the Ethiopian his skin.' " The core of the book deals with an American controversy which occurred before the Civil War and before the impact of Darwin's publications on evolution. Briefly, the debate reported here took place between Samuel George Morton, George Gliddon, Ephraim George Squier and Josiah Clark Nott on one side and John Bachman as the principal opponent on the other. Although these are the men whose views take up most of the main text, the author manages to catalogue nearly three hundred individuals usually with brief biographical highlights. Because of these interruptions which would have been better left to the appended notes, some readers are apt to lose their way following the argument.

The argument involved such issues as the unity of mankind, theories accounting for the varieties of mankind, the monogenetic versus polygenetic origin of mankind, the facts of hybridization, and the definition of and criteria for species. Nott and Gliddon devoted their energy principally to popularizing the work of Morton and others who argued for the polygenetic origin of mankind and fixed different species of man. In addition, Squier's investigation of Indian mounds, the European work done in Egyptian archaeology, and the evidence for their antiquity allowed them also to question scriptural ethnology, orthodox chronology, and theories of descent from a single pair. John Bachman, on the other hand, led those who argued for the unity of mankind and for the monogenetic origin of man; according to him, environmental and social conditions accounted for the varieties of men who were but one species.
From this account, the views of Nott and Gliddon rather than Bachman were, both North and South, shared by, but limited to, members of the scientific community. Polygenesis, to Northern public opinion, seemed to support Southern views on slavery. Moreover, abolitionists regarded the issue as a moral rather than a scientific one. In the North, consequently, the doctrine did not make much headway. Southern public opinion, on its part, saw in the doctrine of multiple origins an attack on orthodox religion and already they had been using, and continued to use, the Bible as their major weapon in the defense of slavery. Yet both sides in the scientific controversy agreed that Negroes were innately inferior and that the leopard could not change his spots. Curiously enough, John Bachman, the Charleston minister who defended the scriptural view and the institutions of the South, came closer to approaching a theory of evolution. Nonetheless, in nearly every case, the scientific participants were too easily influenced by their political and religious views.

The author has made good use of original sources, particularly the correspondence among the members of the scientific community. He has gathered his references along with his annotations and listed them in forty pages at the end of the book. Stanton exposes an area which has been little explored—the influence of early nineteenth-century American science on racial attitudes. This alone should recommend the work.

Temple University

Michael Lalli

*Meade of Gettysburg.* By Freeman Cleaves. (Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 1960. xii, 386 p. Illustrations, maps, appendix, bibliography, index. $5.00.)

Among Union generals, George Gordon Meade long has been a rather shadowy and ill-defined figure. His reputation has suffered for a variety of reasons. Rather dour and at times irascible, he lacked the personal glamor that helped bring fame to some of his contemporaries. A conservative in his political views, he stood none too well with the Radical Republicans on the Committee on the Conduct of the War, who were inclined to exalt Radical-minded officers at his expense. Accompanied on the campaigns of 1864–1865 by his general in chief, he was practically forgotten as commander of the Army of the Potomac. Vexed by irresponsible newsmen, he antagonized those makers and breakers of Civil War reputations. His worst mistake (June 8, 1864) was to punish an offending reporter, Edward Cropsey of the Philadelphia Inquirer, by having him mounted backwards on a mule and ridden out of camp to the jeers of the troops. Thereafter, the war correspondents as a group ignored Meade except now and then to mention him unfavorably.
Even his greatest achievement, the repulse of Lee at Gettysburg, has been clouded by counterclaims and criticisms. Claims were made on behalf of his lieutenants, Winfield Scott Hancock and others, for the decision to take a stand on the line of Culp’s Hill, Cemetery Ridge, and the Round Tops, and for the movements that saved the Union position on the first three days of July, 1863. Yet the responsibility for all the tactical decisions was Meade’s, and he did not evade it. He was criticized, particularly by President Lincoln, for his failure to capture Lee’s army and for his satisfaction with having driven the invader from “our soil.” (The whole country, North and South, was our soil, Lincoln thought.) Yet Meade’s attitudes and actions are understandable, even justifiable, when one takes into account the shaken and exhausted state of his army and the serious risks in a headlong assault upon the wary though retreating Lee.

From the summer of 1863 to the spring of 1864, Meade conducted a series of inconclusive and futile operations. In his defense, however, it can be pointed out that he was not free to carry on the more aggressive kind of campaign he would have liked. Dissenting from the now prevalent view that Lincoln was the military genius of the war, Freeman Cleaves writes that the President “had in Meade a dissatisfied general seldom in accord with administration strategy. In the West, Grant had been allowed to conduct the Vicksburg campaign in his own way. . . . In the East, the army leader could act only if plans were approved. Above all, Meade [on orders from above] had to keep his army between the enemy and Washington.”

After Grant joined Meade, the latter was by no means reduced to an errand boy. Even the reporter Cropsey, before his fall from grace, observed of Meade: “He is as much the Commander of the Army of the Potomac as he ever was. Grant plans and exercises a supervisory control . . . but to Meade belongs everything of detail.” He co-operated with Grant as perhaps few generals, in the same situation, could have done. And Grant repeatedly testified to his reliance upon him.

Lincoln, too, despite his impatience with him at the time of Lee’s withdrawal from Gettysburg, again and again indicated his satisfaction with Meade. He once referred to him as “a brave and skillful officer and a true man.” That was hardly extravagant praise, but certainly Meade was and is entitled to at least that much.

Meade at last gets his just due from Freeman Cleaves, member of the editorial staff of Financial World and previous author of significant lives of William Henry Harrison and George H. Thomas. Meade of Gettysburg is no one-sided brief. Rather, it is a thoroughly researched, well-written, objective study of the man’s entire military career, including his part in the Mexican War, his peacetime work with the topographical engineers, and his short postwar role as an army commander in the occupied South.

*University of Wisconsin*  
Richard N. Current
Hancock the Superb. By GLENN TUCKER. (Indianapolis, Ind.: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1960. 368 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. $5.00.)

In this biography of Winfield Scott Hancock, Glenn Tucker contributes significantly to filling a long-standing gap in Civil War historiography. Yet this book does not deserve to rank with Douglas Freeman's monumental study of Robert E. Lee (what military biography does?), or with recent studies of other Civil War commanders from the pens of T. Harry Williams, Frank Vandiver, Warren Hassler, Bruce Catton, and Lloyd Lewis. In the opinion of this reviewer, Hancock the Superb hardly matches the unquestioned excellence of Mr. Tucker's High Tide at Gettysburg.

This is not to say that this is not a welcome addition to anyone's Civil War bookshelf. In telling his story, the author manages to keep it uncluttered by the minutiae and military jargon that often confuses all but the professional soldier. His many years as a journalist are reflected in the lucid prose which characterizes the book. Yet, Mr. Tucker so respects and almost reveres his subject that the book is overly laudatory. He finds little to criticize, other than Hancock's occasional harshness toward his subordinates and perhaps his addiction to profanity.

Like Grant, a contemporary at West Point, Hancock enrolled at the Academy almost by accident. He was not a superior student, although he won the respect and friendship of other contemporaries there like Sherman, Buell, and McClellan. Future Confederate generals who recalled Hancock with admiration at the Academy included Longstreet, Wilcox, and Stonewall Jackson.

Hancock's part in the Mexican War was not distinguished, although he was slightly wounded at Churubusco and was brevetted for gallantry. A postwar routine assignment to a western post was broken only by a spectacular march overland to California. Garrison duty in California was pleasant and uneventful until the outbreak of the Civil War. Hancock was rescued from rear echelon duty by McClellan, who assigned him to a combat command where Hancock contributed his share in revitalizing the demoralized Union forces gathered at Washington during the summer and fall of 1861.

At Williamsburg, in May, 1862, Hancock and his brigade received their baptism of fire. The gallantry and efficiency of their performance earned from McClellan the statement that "Hancock was superb today," and the adjective stuck. McClellan's admiration for Hancock was enduring and was warmly reciprocated. At Antietam, McClellan raised him to division command at a critical moment and spot. Later, at Fredericksburg, Hancock led his division farthest in advance toward the stone wall fronting Marye's Heights. The dubious honor of covering the Union retreat at Chancellorsville was also his.

In many respects, Gettysburg marked the peak of Hancock's military career. Meade, like McClellan, relied upon him at a crucial moment in the
battle. In what General Hunt called a “happy inspiration,” Hancock sent reinforcements to Howard’s Eleventh Corps on the evening of July 2, saving not only Cemetery Hill but, in Tucker’s judgment, the battle as well. Tucker understandably upholds Hancock’s side in the famous controversy with Hunt over the employment of Union artillery. “Hancock was indeed the individual,” his biographer insists, “who more than any other gave the Union the victory at Gettysburg.”

Although the remainder of the story seems almost anticlimax, Hancock played a prominent part in Grant’s Wilderness Campaign. The Second Corps broke Lee’s defensive line at Spotsylvania, was in the forefront of the bloody and fruitless charge at Cold Harbor, and just missed seizing the Petersburg defenses in June, which if accomplished might have ended the war then and there. The ten-month siege at Petersburg failed to add significantly to Hancock’s military fame and was marred by a needless quarrel with his able subordinate John Gibbon. Perhaps the persistently troublesome wound suffered at Gettysburg was a handicap. He was not even present at the great denouement at Appomattox.

One would wish that this book contained more details of his impartial administration of the Louisiana and Texas Military District in the South during reconstruction, or of his venture into presidential politics in 1880. Despite his admirable war record, Hancock failed, with the exception of McClellan, to obtain the support of Grant and other Union generals. Yet, a shift of 12,000 votes in New York would have given him the election.

In February, 1886, Hancock’s death came just short of his sixty-second birthday. Escaping most of the post-Civil War controversies over military operations, he was universally honored by superiors and subordinates alike. “They buried yesterday my old commander—the ideal soldier—the pure patriot—the noblest man...,” declared the Reverend John R. Paxton. Many a Union veteran who could not match the clergyman’s eloquence sincerely echoed the sentiment.

Gettysburg College

Robert L. Bloom


It is difficult to be at all critical of a book as well conceived and documented as is Mr. Condit’s American Building Art, an important addition to the historical record of the past century. However, there is a very real difference between technological advances and the buildings of which they form a part. This book is primarily a history of the progress in structural techniques of the last century, particularly as expressed in railroading structures and similar problems, and they are impressive. The title, how-
ever, is misleading since the art of building is concerned with much more than structure.

The building arts apply to many and various types of structure, and include as a basic consideration the planning of the building for its uses. The master, call him what you will, must consider many problems and techniques, not only those of structural engineering, but all of the various elements which are a part of the building. The architect or master planner must provide for, in their proper place, the various mechanical trades, no small problem in itself, the structure, the uses of the building, and not least of all its cost. The problems of the construction are but one of these many considerations.

We live at a time in which the public, or a large part of it, has been led to believe that the solution of our problems is the function of those who have mastered techniques of one kind or another, and that these alone will provide the answer to all of our difficulties. Reaction to this is increasingly apparent.

It was possible for Leonardo da Vinci to be both an “engineer” of inquiring mind, and a painter of surpassing skill. The architects of the Renaissance could absorb the principles of construction as well as the theories of architectural composition and those of mural decoration. Vitruvius, back in the first century, well defined the qualifications of the architect or master builder, and these qualifications have not changed. Today, however, it is impossible for one man to be completely informed on all the techniques involved in constructing a building. In every building of any consequence, therefore, we find the collaboration of a number of men, each one a master of his particular field and all looking to the architect as the master planner.

Thornton, Strickland, Latrobe, Mills, and their disciples were able to solve the structural problems inherent in their building; and they were also able to resolve satisfactorily all of the many other questions before them. The techniques they employed were subordinated to the conception of an architectural entity. The serenity of their buildings is evidence of their skill in considering all of these matters in their proper proportion.

We seem to have lost this sense of proportion. Largely in the guise of a false economy, and abetted by immature theories of design, we have produced glass boxes such as the United Nations building, or boxes with little or no glass, in the belief that these were adequate for their purposes and constituted a contemporary architecture. These buildings illustrate the current overemphasis on techniques that have been insufficiently studied.

In the beginnings of the nineteenth century and in the preceding eras, structures, however utilitarian, were conceived as buildings. There was concern for the mass of the edifice, for its functions and appearance, however simple it might be. The Fairmount Water Works here in Philadelphia, which seems to have escaped the notice of the author, might serve as an example. Certainly the only purpose of the water works was to provide an adequate water supply to a city of some importance. Philadelphia was the
first city in this country where such a public project was undertaken. Frederick Graff and Robert Mills not only met the technical aspects of this new problem, but created a composition that still is recognized as an important embellishment of a great city.

The train sheds, to which so much attention is given by Mr. Condit, probably because of the structural problem of the roof loads over wide spans, were, on the contrary, badly planned. Their abandonment, in later years, and the substitution of platform sheds, which serve apparently as well, without the expense of supporting and maintaining wide-span construction, clearly show this. Either these great sheds were built to demonstrate the technical abilities of those concerned or else their form was dictated by men inadequately informed.

The art of building, whether in America or elsewhere, has to do with all kinds of structures from simple homes to multistoried structures. None of these can be designed without consideration of all the pertinent techniques, whether structural or those relating to design and arrangement of the several facilities of the building. Applied science has contributed to the growth of these approaches, but technology cannot be substituted for broad judgment and informed understanding.

Nevertheless, Mr. Condit's dissertations should be of interest to everyone even remotely concerned with construction. The book presents no problem to the lay reader and provides him with a fascinating chapter in American history. The notes offer an authoritative record of accomplishment, ranging from the definition of a simple beam to the brief history of well-known buildings. Mr. Condit's bibliography is large, and his book is well illustrated and indexed, a matter of importance if it is put aside for reference, as it should be.

Philadelphia

Grant M. Simon

"Sunset" Cox, Irrepressible Democrat. By David Lindsey. (Detroit, Mich.: Wayne State University Press, 1959. xx, 323 p. Frontispiece, bibliography, index. $5.00.)

Every period of American history produces men of importance in their time whose names somehow die with them. When Samuel Sullivan Cox died in 1889 friends in both the great political parties, journalists, scholars, and others paid him glowing tribute, but these eulogies were buried with him. Now, Professor Lindsey has produced the first biography of "Sunset" Cox, a man who was an editor, lawyer, Congressman, traveler, diplomat, writer and wit.

Cox was born in Zanesville, Ohio, in 1824, and named Samuel Sullivan in honor of his grandfather. The initials, according to someone's recollections in a Columbus newspaper in 1933, suggested the nickname "Sunset" when
Cox, then twenty-nine and editor of the Democratic Ohio Statesman, wrote a highly embellished description of a setting sun as a storm swept over his city—but the sobriquet was a natural that could hardly have been escaped by a humorist. The young editor-lawyer soon turned to politics. Elected to Congress in 1856, he served from 1857 to 1865. Defeated in the disturbed fall elections of 1864, the Ohio State Journal wrote: “The sun has verily set upon our friend of the pensive hour. So goodnight, Mr. Cox.” Mr. Cox went off to New York to practice law and play Tammany politics, and was back in Congress from 1869 to 1873. Thereafter, until his death on September 10, 1889, he was a prominent figure on the floor of the House of Representatives. He tilted swords with the giants of his day, he gave the eulogy for Stephen A. Douglas in the House, he held many positions of honor, and he was not without influence in his party. His Congressional service had only one major interruption—the year and a half he spent as envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Turkey in 1885–1886.

Though handicapped by the purely chronological order of his narrative, the author tells in a straightforward story the opposition of his hero to the coming of the war, of his work during the war years, of his objections to radical reconstruction, of his advocacy of resumption, and something of his fight for tariff reform. He relates pleasantly his relation to the distinguished men of literature of his day, his travels, his diplomatic experience, and his place, in general, in American politics. His bibliography is impressive, and his footnotes extensive. But the book is, nevertheless, disappointing. The basic reason for this is perhaps a lack of clear purpose on the part of the writer. It is hardly possible that Professor Lindsey in a brief book about a man who, though prominent, never approached greatness, could make an outstanding contribution to the interpretation of the coming of the war, the war itself, reconstruction, and the industrial course of the nation in the postwar years. He could have explained Mr. Cox and made him real. Attempting both, he achieved neither. There is little analysis, there is no explanation of the origins of Cox’s ideas, and there is no compact story of any battle he ever fought—and Cox was deeply interested in the tariff fight. If such controversial subjects, for instance, as reconstruction were to be emphasized in the volume, the author should have consulted recent scholarly studies; if the Congressman was to be the center of the story, there should have been more research on his life. What experience and thought went into his opinions? Did he have a basic philosophy? How did he reveal a “thorough knowledge” of politics? How did he get elected in New York, where he had lived only a short time, from a district so foreign to him? Who kept him in office? What did he think of the “Gulliver-snail of politics” that was the Congress in the eighties, according to Henry Watterson? How much did his humor hurt him? There is too little evidence to support the praise heaped upon the man. It is not only that he did not make the White House, as pointed out by the author, he did not even make the much-coveted Speakership. One has only to read some of Cox’s speeches to
sense that they have more form than substance, more surface than depth. Cox should perhaps have taken more to heart the words of his rhetoric teacher who, in college after a speech, rebuked him on subject matter but praised him on manner of delivery. Since the final division of the book, "Sunset," covers twelve active years (more than a third of Cox's political life), one suspects that even in bookmaking form played a part.

"Sunset" Cox is in ways a useful book; some one of the distinguished scholars who advised the author could have helped him make it a good book. There is a bibliography, an index, and a foreword by Sam Rayburn.

Temple University

JAMES A. BARNES

Woodrow Wilson at Princeton. By HARDIN CRAIG. (Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 1960. xii, 175 p. Illustrations, index. $3.75.)

Biographers of Wilson usually skip rapidly over his years at Princeton. They always dramatize his fight with the trustees that began with his attempt to abolish the upper-class eating clubs through the establishment of residential quadrangles, and ended in his total discomfiture at failing to locate the Graduate College at the heart of the campus. However, his solid accomplishments there are barely mentioned and hardly ever analyzed. Even Professor Link, who is engaged in covering his political career in seven encyclopedic volumes, has been content to allot only two chapters of the first to his presidency of the university. Yet Wilson was for twenty years an outstanding leader of the academic profession, before his opportunity suddenly arose to forsake the gown for the toga.

Professor Craig has made a definite contribution toward filling the gap in our understanding of Wilson the educator. Furthermore, his thoughtful little book is the fruit of personal experience. The author was a graduate student and instructor in English under President Patton, Wilson's predecessor, and was one of "those preceptor guys" whom Wilson selected to inaugurate his radical system of college teaching in 1905. He remained at Princeton until Wilson resigned to run for governor of New Jersey in 1910, and afterward taught at Minnesota, Iowa, Stanford, North Carolina and Missouri. He was an actual participant in the Second Battle of Princeton, and has enjoyed an opportunity to view it in retrospect for a full half-century from various academic points of vantage.

The result is a very fair and accurate appraisal of the situation—so far as it goes. For Professor Craig hastens to declare that his purpose is simply "to identify and explain Woodrow Wilson's opinions and principles in the field of university education," not to write a history of Princeton. "As president of Princeton from 1902 to 1910, Wilson saw that Princeton and other American universities of his time, with their emphasis on specialization and the new scientific methods, were not producing the dedicated leaders necessary to the preservation of American democracy. He consequently utilized
his great leadership, wisdom and ability for the purpose of recasting university education at Princeton, his principal goals being breadth in each individual field of study and intimate relations between teachers and pupils in the preceptorial system (a sort of tutorial system).” Professor Craig gives a lucid and detailed explanation of the origins and development of Wilson’s magnificent plan for “Princeton in the Nation’s Service,” which he considers a logical outgrowth of the Scottish common-sense philosophy, so ably expounded by Wilson’s old teacher James McCosh. He concludes with an impassioned plea for its adoption as the basis for modern university education in the United States, in place of the current craze for specialization and advancement by simply accumulating credits. He deplores the present system which he believes is aimed merely to enable the student to adjust himself to the life he finds about him. College education seems to him content to provide youth with a purely selfish opportunity to increase its earning power, rather than to prepare itself to lead the nation and the world to a higher destiny, in the unselfish dedication of spirit envisaged by the deeply religious and patriotic Wilson. Professor Craig makes out a strong case, but one feels that he is arguing a cause already lost.

When it comes to the club and graduate college controversies, the author furnishes nothing really new. In fact, this reviewer feels that he overemphasizes the club issue, which was settled fairly amicably in a little over three months, at the expense of the real battle over the graduate college, which lasted nearly three years and ended with most of the antagonists barely on speaking terms. Professor Craig, however, displays a commendable absence of partisanship in dealing with these matters. He spares the personalities involved in what became such a bitter personal fight that not a building, professorship, scholarship, or even a street in the town of Princeton was named after Wilson for the next thirty-five years! At the same time he gives a plausible explanation of Wilson’s motives, as well as those of his opponents, in what really degenerated into a struggle for sheer power. His analysis of Wilson’s character is by no means conventional: he thinks Wilson sometimes compromised too readily! Anyone interested in Wilson should by no means overlook this book, especially as it deals with certain of his activities which have received little attention elsewhere, and reveals qualities which are unfamiliar to most Americans.

Princeton, N. J. C. Pardee Foulke


For all the detailed scholarship and criticism lavished on twentieth-century American authors in recent years, it comes as a distinct surprise to realize that this is the first literary history designed specifically to cover the
period. It does the job in a workmanlike manner, and it is sure to become a standard reference in the field. It is a valuable contribution to the group of studies of which it is a part, the Library of Congress Series in American Civilization.

If judged as a capstone to previous partial efforts—for example, Alfred Kazin’s *On Native Grounds* (for prose fiction), Louise Bogan’s *Achievement in American Poetry*, Stanley Edgar Hyman’s *The Armed Vision* (for criticism)—the book, aimed at comprehensiveness, falls short, though it does have a chapter on drama, for which there is no good single study. If judged in comparison with a book devoted to the single most important decade—Frederick J. Hoffman’s *The Twenties*—it still falls short, and for the same reason, the scanting of depth for the sake of breadth. Yet such caveats merely point out the difficulty of the task of trying to deal with a subject of such magnitude in the scope of fewer than three hundred and fifty pages of text. Under such circumstances, any reader will find a favorite author slighted, some slow spots where his interest flags, numerous places where he, of course, would have done it differently. Some readers may prefer a thesis underlying the narrative and will be chagrined to find a factual, unvarnished account here—factual in the best sense of the word as a reasoned, defensible opinion on the accomplishment of various writers, not the anatomy of genres, not a theory of literature, not biographies of writers, not social history seen dimly through the glass of imaginative literature.

The truism still holds that the biggest single problem in constructing a book about literature so recent is deciding not what to include but what to leave out. Nearly as troublesome is deciding the relative weight to give each author; if Eliot is assuredly in, Pound probably is not out; if Wallace Stevens is coming up, is William Carlos Williams slipping down? The author, Professor of English at Princeton, is no novice in solving such problems. As an editor and contributor for the standard three-volume *Literary History of the United States*, he has grappled with such problems before. It is of interest to see how he solves them here.

In eight chapters, he treats of novels, poetry, plays, and literary criticism. Of these, two chapters are devoted exclusively to novels, attesting to the importance of the novel in the period; and one each exclusively to poetry and plays. The first two chapters stress fiction but also deal with poetry, the last is wholly concerned with criticism, and one chapter touches on all the forms of expression in the special regional context of the South. The order of chapters and the line of development within each are roughly chronological. This appears to be a judicious balance, with only the short story not given special attention. Within this over-all scheme, nine major authors (Robinson, Frost, Cather, O'Neill, Dos Passos, Hemingway, Stevens, Faulkner, and Eliot) are singled out at the ends of appropriate chapters for critical detail. Despite Professor Thorp’s modest prefatory statement that the plan of the book is simple, his is a sophisticated solution to a complicated problem in the logistics of literary history.
Not one to be trammeled even by the sweet reasonableness of his own scheme of organization, the author occasionally departs from sound, but dull, received opinion and follows the dictates of his own healthy enthusiasms. Another historian might easily have omitted the discussion of Conrad Aiken as novelist, or cut down the section allotted to Caroline Gordon, or even reshaped the whole chapter on the Southern Renaissance and subordinated it to something else. Some would hold that a rubric such as symbolism might better inform the chapter on the recent novel than the idea adopted, the persistence of naturalism. Yet, where the book is slightly quixotic it is at its sprightly best. It comes as a welcome addition to the small library of essential books on American literature.

*University of Pennsylvania*  
CHARLES BOEWE

_The Papers of Benjamin Franklin._ Volume II: January 1, 1735, through December 31, 1744. *Leonard W. Labaree,* Editor; *Whitfield J. Bell, Jr.*, Associate Editor; *Helen C. Boatfield* and *Helene H. Fineman,* Assistant Editors. (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1960. xxvi, 471 p. Illustrations, index. $10.00.)

The second volume of the Franklin Papers, following only a few months after the publication of the initial volume, confirms the fine historical and editorial performance already detailed and praised. It also confirms the variety of Franklin himself, as his talents and activities expanded and new interests developed. These years, 1735–1744, were important ones for Franklin. He matured as one of Philadelphia's major printers and booksellers, assumed his role as postmaster of Philadelphia, formed the Union Fire Company, invented his Pennsylvania fireplace, and played a leading role in organizing the American Philosophical Society.

One meets a widening circle of Franklin's friends as he participated more actively in public affairs and acquired a lifelong interest in science. His readiness to engage in controversy and his penchant for organization are both evidenced during these years. And through extracts from the _Pennsylvania Gazette_ and the *Poor Richard's Almanack*, samplings for each year of the decade covered in this volume, one gains an increasing appreciation of Franklin's humor and earthiness.

Among the illustrations is a useful map of "Franklin's Philadelphia, 1723–1776." The index provides an invaluable aid to the researcher and interested reader.