BOOK REVIEWS


The period of which Gertrude Z. Thomas writes in Richer Than Spices—those years when the treasures of the East Indies began to trickle, and then to flood into the western hemisphere—is perhaps the most fascinating (and certainly the most exotic) in the history of European decorative arts.

Although today one may imagine what the novelty of East India goods meant to the conventionally minded seventeenth-century citizen, it takes a writer of Mrs. Thomas' knowledge and skill to guide the modern reader through the intricacies of the political intrigue which formed the tangled background of the budding trade with China and the Indies. The Portuguese dowry of Catherine of Braganza, which contained among other riches the inestimable gift to England of Bombay and all its future trade potential, provides both a romantic and illuminating springboard for the story of England's gradual awakening to the "mysteries" of the Far East. It also provides the means of clarifying the dominant roles played by both Portugal and Holland in the early days of world exploration when their respective fleets were supreme in the trading ports of the world.

Leaving the historical background, which is ably covered in the three opening chapters, the author takes up in chronological sequence the major contributions which Eastern civilization made to European (and later to American) culture through the media of the great British and Dutch East India Companies. Painted cottons, caned and lacquered household furnishings, scented tea, and last but not least the dainty porcelain in which to serve it were the most far reaching innovations among the many brought from distant lands. Their introduction into Europe revolutionized the tastes of high society, and ultimately touched the everyday life of even the humblest citizen. Where, indeed, would we be today without our tea and its fragile porcelain accompaniment, both of which were relatively unknown to the average Englishman when Catherine became the bride of Charles II in 1662.

Mrs. Thomas is a sprightly writer and endows her subject with vitality and warmth. In addition, she has chosen an effective manner of presenting her material which gives it both authority and the immediacy that derives from well-chosen contemporary comment, both written and pictorial. Many
pertinent quotations enliven the text and these are fully annotated for those who may like to pursue the subject farther by turning to the end of the book. One could wish that these notes had been listed at the close of each chapter for more convenient reference, but the practical considerations of book making are unfortunately seldom within the control of an author. Many of the illustrations (annotated in a second list, this time at the front of the book) are also reproduced from contemporary sources and make in themselves an important contribution to our visual image of the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century scene.

For those basically interested in social history or decorative arts this book will provide a colorful historical background, happily abetted by a well constructed index. For the casual reader it should present a new and absorbing glimpse of the wonders which lay in store for the western world beyond the legendary "Northwest Passage" in the "Sea of China and the Indies."

Brookline, Mass. Nina Fletcher Little


First published in 1948 and out of print for several years, this work was written by Professor Savelle in an attempt to explain for laymen the origin of the American way of life: "when, why, and how the first pattern of American culture took the form and the design that it did." He sought, as he put it, "to draw together, in one integrated whole, the major threads and motifs that appeared in the tapestry of early American thought" (vii). In attempting to fulfill this difficult task—one requiring a command of a variety of sources and disciplines—Professor Savelle in successive chapters lucidly and skillfully traces colonial thinking on religion, science, philosophy, economics, society, government, literature, and the arts. His conclusions as to the cultural developments in American life parallel those of the "imperial" school of historians as to the trend of political and constitutional development. The first generations of settlers brought European civilization to a continent where no pre-existing culture absorbed or seriously influenced it. Consequently, the culture which emerged in the colonies by mid-eighteenth century varied significantly from that of the mother country; and the people of this new society were a new breed. In Crèvecoeur's often quoted words, the American was a "new man." The English cultural forms were relatively rigid, formal, aristocratic, and authoritarian, while the society which emerged in the colonies, although not completely free of rigidity, was distinguished by its malleability, rationality, tolerance, and fluidity, by its
freedom for change and growth. And to Savelle, liberal, egalitarian, democratic, and humanistic thought in colonial America was associated with the poor and the frontiersmen.

This thesis is familiar and in developing it, Savelle has revealed a broad knowledge of colonial cultural life. Yet certain objections occur to this reviewer. After the first years of colonization, American culture did not develop independently of European influences. After all, emigration did not stop after the initial settlers came from England, Holland, and Sweden. Indeed, during the last seventy-five years before the Revolution there occurred a massive, almost continuous influx of people, Germans, French, Scot-Irish, Scots, and English who brought with them the culture and mental outlook of the Old World. As Ian Graham, James Leyburn, and Duane Meyer, among others, have recently shown, these national groups tended for some time to retain their old ways and to cling tenaciously to their European customs. Indeed, the German speaking peoples went as far as to develop their own printing presses for German language newspapers and to import books from Germany. Crévecoeur’s “melting pot” may well have been more the fiction of an eighteenth-century romantic than of historical reality. If there was the sharp cultural break with the English mentality as Savelle concludes, why were so many volumes of Swift, Addison, Steele, and Pope, among others, to be found in colonial homes? Why were so many literary pieces from the English presses reprinted in colonial newspapers, and why, as Louis B. Wright has so often pointed out, did the Virginians consciously imitate English culture? Why could an American artist, Benjamin West, or an American scientist, Benjamin Thompson, so easily move to the British Isles?

Moreover, American culture at mid-eighteenth century may not have been as rational, free, tolerant, and malleable as Professor Savelle concludes. Leonard Levy has recently argued that despite professions to the contrary Americans did not reject the English common law and adopt a libertarian concept of freedom of speech and the press. Nor did the American governments after 1776 reject mercantilist statism in economics and politics and go over to the philosophy of economic freedom. Indeed, scholars in the last twenty years have become increasingly aware of the phenomenon of neo-mercantilism adopted by the American states after independence. Little was done for the slave or the indentured servant. The fluid, egalitarian society Savelle sees was perhaps more characteristic of the nineteenth rather than the eighteenth century, and it developed in Europe as well as in America. What was unique, but perhaps not decisive, in colonial society was the lack of an institutionalized, legally entrenched aristocracy (in the European sense) to retard change.

The reissuing of this book might have given Professor Savelle an opportunity to reconsider some of his conclusions in the light of the scholarship of the last generation of colonial historians. But, as it stands, his work re-
mains what it was when first published: the application to cultural history of the thinking of Bancroft, Turner, and Parrington.

*University of Nebraska*  
*Jack M. Sosin*


The mind of the Southern colonial has yet to be assessed in the manner and degree in which such scholars as Perry Miller and Edmund S. Morgan have measured the New England mind. Sermons and journals, and letters and uncollected poems still need to be brought together in print before a significant or comprehensive estimate of Southern thinking can be made. But the publication of *The Diary of Colonel Landon Carter, 1752–1778* is a most important step in the preliminaries of assessment. It takes its place at once beside the diaries of William Byrd II for its own region, and beside those of Samuel Sewall and Cotton Mather for the collective colonies. Covering most of the period from 1752 to 1778, it pictures social life, practical and theoretical agriculture, religion, politics leading to the Revolution, the day-by-day details of life of a Virginia planter, and above all a most singular and introspective mind, as stern, as tightly-tempered, as self-mortifying and as self-pitying as Mather's or any other New Englander's.

Professor Green discovered most of the materials he presents in the Alderman Library of the University of Virginia and one portion in the William L. Clements Library of the University of Michigan. Though he knew some of the diary had been printed, a brief check revealed that not more than five per cent of the total had appeared, and that frequently in inaccurate form. Here he has assembled in chronological order Carter's privately kept journal of the House of Burgesses (well worth comparing with the official journals printed elsewhere) and then the diaries for most of the years from 1756 to 1778. Unobtrusive yet useful footnotes, some of which could only have been produced after extensive searching, identify persons, places, medicines, family relationships, and other matters. A fifty-eight page introduction includes: "Vita," the absolutely essential facts about Landon Carter's kin, age, and property; "The Imperfection of Every Created Being," a close analysis of Carter's view of human nature generally, of himself in particular, of man's imperfections, his inherent weaknesses; "Virtue Is the Best Policy," concerning the diarist's pursuit of improvement in himself, his family, and his estate, his reliance on reason as guide, his conviction that greed for power was man's besetting sin, his personal attempts to improve man's condition by such things as establishing a
charity school, his thirst for knowledge, his real political contributions in
the House of Burgesses, and the use he made of his religion to serve his basic
convictions; "A Noble Struggle," more directly concerning his written con-
tributions in the movement towards independence, his distrust equally of
"aristocracy" and "popularity," his strong attachment to constitutional-
ism; and "Only Inward Satisfaction," the title phrase a translation of part
of a Latin quotation he several times mentioned as describing his feeling
that he was the first in America to advance the cause of independence and
yet had never received recognition for his work and had left no real imprint
on his generation.

The diaries indicate a dour, well-nigh humorless, disciplined, intellec-
tually curious, God-fearing and God-adoring mind. Carter is given to long
analyses of individual members of his family, his rector, and his neighbors,
as well as of himself, and no one emerges quite favorably under his scrutiny.
William Byrd's extant diaries reveal very little of their author's innermost
thoughts on even his wife's temper or his own overt sins. Byrd's methodical
and repetitive daily jottings of reading, eating, estate management, social
pleasures, medical matters, etc., are quite different from Carter's irregular
recordings, sometimes of a single line and again many pages for a day,
without mention of regular routines but full of long meditations, or observa-
tions in detail from his own experience on some authority's pronounce-
ments in agricultural procedure. Compelled like Byrd to practice medicine
on his kin and servants, he assiduously devoured every medical treatise he
could lay hands on, then formed his own opinion, and undoubtedly helped to
kill more than he cured (perhaps the professional physicians did no better).

Social life included frequent guests for dinner or overnight, birthday and
Twelfth Night parties, large neighborhood dances, and a great deal of
gambling, the last being Carter's particular abomination, practiced to his
face by his sons, grandson, and rector. Reading in what was apparently an
extensive library was both recreation and necessary instruction.

Anxious to make clear the materials and workings of Carter's mind as
revealed in the diaries, Professor Greene has perhaps devoted too little time
and space to a discussion of Carter's significant political writing. Proudly
claiming primacy among advocates of independence, and probably the
most prolific political writer of the pre-Revolutionary period south of Phila-
delphia, Carter wrote (he opposed the proposal of Paine's Common Sense)
that he preferred "to be compelled to Independency." The reader wants to
know more of the backgrounds of this and other pronouncements of Carter's
than the introduction or diary gives him, and even the essays Professor
Greene cites (including some good ones of his own) do not supply that
knowledge in full clarity or completeness.

Also, the reader wishes that maps, charts, or more complete footnotes had
shown the size, relative location, and topography of each of the estates
Carter possessed, for one must see these things all together if he is to com-
prehend this planter's peculiar agricultural situations and problems with
which he wrestled throughout the diary. But these are minor. In the two volumes of this diary the editor has made available, with meticulous text, useful notes, and genuinely thoughtful introduction another side of the colonial planter’s mind. This book must stand beside the diaries of Byrd and Washington on the Southern colonial shelf. In most respects it is more revelatory of life, character, and individuals than either of these others. With it our concept of the Virginia colonial mind is perceptibly broadened.

The University of Tennessee

Richard Beale Davis


This book represents a meticulous piece of historical research by a man who is thoroughly familiar with the place about which he writes, southeastern North Carolina, and who is completely conversant with its historical sources. From it the careful reader gains a considerable amount of specialized knowledge about an attractive and significant area, claimed by the Spanish since the sixteenth century but permanently settled by the English in 1726.

Climate and resources combined to make North Carolina an agreeable place for European settlers, but the lack of good harbors discouraged them. Of all the rivers of the province only one flowed directly into the Atlantic Ocean, the majestic Cape Fear, yet the treacherous sedimentary shoals at its mouth made entrance from the sea a hazardous process. The region surrounding the lower reaches of the river was, nevertheless, the scene of several attempted settlements before that of 1726; all of them have been brought into perspective by the author of this volume. In fact, not until the ninth chapter does the reader reach a discussion of the first permanent settlement. From that point on, the region is studied with respect to political and social development as well as economic growth. The book concludes with an analysis of the colonial conflict with the mother country and the winning of independence.

The first question that necessarily comes to the mind of the reader is: why a whole book on a region which is, by the author’s definition, quite limited in physical extent? The writer of the book has anticipated the question, calling the area a “classic example of the role the mother country expected her colonial possessions to play.” Or, to put it another way, he says that this book provides “a case study of the founding, development, and eventual freedom of a British possession.” In the opinion of this reviewer, based upon careful reading of the author’s evidence, he has overstated the case, and much of the significance attached to the area is achieved only in common with the whole of North Carolina. In fact, the author himself is constantly
at pains to relate the local developments of the Cape Fear area to what was happening in the rest of the colony. If the people of the Lower Cape Fear looked to naval stores "as the principal source of their economic well-being," so did the rest of the colony; and it was the whole coastal area that provided the mother country with the inferior, but vital, naval supplies which were needed to make the British Empire self-sufficient.

The structure of the book is good, but the style is undistinguished. It is factually rich, but it is not clear for what class of reader the book was intended. At times, by taking nothing for granted, the author gives the impression that he is writing a colonial history text for North Carolina college students. Did the reader need to be told the differences between a royal, proprietary, and charter colony, for instance? Or, was it necessary to go into detail about how New England was organized? However, for the very reason that it moves along clearly, logically, and methodically, defining all terms and analyzing all differentiating factors, this book would make useful supplementary reading for college courses, though the students might well be intimidated by the strong dose of geographical introduction to the area which has been given in the first chapter. However, the good map by an eighteenth-century draftsman, which constitutes the book's endpapers, should help to clarify the area for them. They should also find the chapter notes and the bibliography helpful.

St. Joseph's College for Women  SISTER JOAN DE LOURDES LEONARD

The Quest for Power. The Lower Houses of Assembly in the Southern Royal Colonies, 1689-1776. By JACK P. GREENE. (Chapel Hill: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture by the University of North Carolina Press, 1963. xvi, 528 p. Appendices, bibliographical essay, index. $8.50.)

That the lower houses of the colonial assemblies took the lead in the fight for American rights against the impositions and restraints of the mother country is certainly not news to a generation brought up on such classical historians as Andrews and Osgood. But The Quest for Power makes clearer than ever before just how the assemblies won the status that made them little parliaments to their local constituents.

Skillfully using a massive array of details, laboriously garnered from the printed and manuscript sources of the various colonies, the author has lucidly organized them into four major categories of powers for which the lower houses struggled: control over finance; over the civil list; over legislative proceedings; and over executive affairs. He shows how, in the realm of finance, the lower houses demanded and secured the sole right to initiate and amend money bills, a power which the British House of Commons had only succeeded in wrestling from the Lords at the end of the seventeenth century;
how they won the right to appropriate money specifically for all public expenditures as well as the choice of personnel for the administration of such funds, and the prerogative of auditing all monies; and, finally, how they enlarged their fiscal power through the emission of paper currency, despite royal prohibitions. In the area of the civil list, he shows them winning strength by refusing (except for Virginia's House of Burgesses) to provide permanent salaries for the royal officials and limiting their incomes by legally establishing all fees. In the matter of control over legislative proceedings, the author also produces a balance sheet in their favor; in fact, by not only determining the qualifications of their own members and those of the voters, but by the additional act of creating new constituencies and apportioning representation, they secured powers of which the House of Commons did not even dream. On the other hand, they were not so successful in exercising control over the time, place, and length of their meetings, and one main grievance after 1763 was the governor's power of dissolving them. Finally, with regard to their search for power over executive affairs, they also pushed their objectives beyond those of their proclaimed model and prototype when they attempted (not without success) to nominate and appoint certain local officials as well as a separate colonial agent. They enjoyed considerable satisfaction in wresting ecclesiastical jurisdiction from the hands of the governor and placing it in the parish vestries, but they attempted, largely in vain, to get judicial affairs under their control.

By 1763, then, the lower houses of assembly had become, in fact, the locally self-governing organs of British imperial government, or else were well on the way to becoming such. The author sees their indignation against the new British policy that followed the Seven Years' War, not as specious argumentation on behalf of mercenary self-interest, but as the explicit realization and articulation of the long-developing practices which had become for the colonists inherent parts of the British Constitution as they understood it. He therefore concludes that "the threat to assembly rights was of enormous importance in the coming of the Revolution," and that "the Declaration of Independence was a more realistic analysis of the causes of the Revolution than has generally been supposed."

On the basis of the author's voluminous concrete evidence one would have to agree that a "combination of British lethargy and colonial aggression virtually guaranteed the success of the lower houses' quest for power," but the situation is far too simply expressed by his summary statement that "institutional momentum was primarily responsible for the emergence of the lower houses." So saying, the author obscures the very complexity of forces and interplay of personalities that he has so well elaborated in his individual chapters. One wonders, too, if he has not somewhat neglected the part played by the upper houses of the colonial legislatures. Contemporaries, including George Grenville, placed much emphasis upon the weakness of the council as a major reason for the rapid growth of assembly powers, arguing that the balance of forces—monarchical, aristocratic, and democratic—had
been disrupted by "the want of an intermediate power to operate as a check, both on the misconduct of Governors, and on the democratical spirit which prevailed in the Assemblies." Rightly or wrongly conceived, this widespread contention deserves to be analyzed for the light it sheds on the success of the lower houses.

The author has deliberately confined himself to the four southern legislatures: Virginia, Georgia, North and South Carolina. One might ask if it was not a mistake to exclude proprietary Maryland whose economic and social conditions greatly resembled the others. Had he done so, he would have anticipated the question that necessarily arises in the mind of a reflective reader: how did the proprietary assemblies compare with the royal with respect to the increment of power? This is not to say that the author's perspective is a narrow one. Decidedly the contrary; he shows extensive familiarity with the Northern and West Indian assemblies and frequently includes them in his analysis. He is probably correct, too, in saying that the developments in other colonies did not differ radically from those he has studied.

What perhaps impresses the reader of this book more than anything else is the range of the author's reading, evidenced in many ways, but, markedly, in his choice of the apt and quotable excerpts which preface his sections and stud his chapters. They are so well chosen that the knowledgeable reader might well utilize them as convenient distillations of colonial thought on the subject at hand. His footnotes, too, with multiple citations for every fact, give ample indications of his complete familiarity with available sources, and his bibliographical essay is an excellent guide to both manuscript and printed materials for American colonial history. But he goes even beyond that, and provides the student with three useful appendices, listing, respectively: the chief executives of the southern royal colonies from 1660 to 1776; the speakers of the same; and the leaders of the lower house of assembly in each province, as determined by a programmed statistical approach suited to this age of computers!


The colonial American wilderness, governed by strict moralists and not very affluent, was during the eighteenth century transformed into a society which could and would sustain "one of the most important ornaments of civilized life, a repertory theater." Professor Rankin views the growth of a colonial culture in America from the stage; the main theme of his book is the struggle of the producers and performers of plays to attract audiences, to avoid the restrictions imposed by religious zealots, and to gain financial
success. The earliest beginnings of the American theater and the tours of the Murray-Kean, Hallam, American, and New American companies are chronicled in great detail. The story of the colonial theater is a tragedy; the infant culture was unable to support the luxury of a theater during the revolutionary crisis. Yet, as Rankin shows, plays were well received and the groundwork was laid for future development.

Rankin points out very thoroughly that the colonial theater, like the colonial culture in general, was derivative. He is more hesitant to conclude definitely that it was also an inferior by-product. Plenty of evidence is presented showing that the American theater, even more so than the English theater, cheapened itself to attempt to appeal to as large an audience as possible. The type of entertainment was reduced to the lowest common denominator. Shakespeare, most popular among Americans, was known only in versions chopped up by English hacks. Farcical afterpieces and even fireworks were presented to sweeten the diet of serious themes found in the main attraction. Moreover, the American theater lagged behind the English theater in quality of performance, in scenery, and in appreciative standards of the audience. Immigrant actors came to America because they did not quite make it in England, the style of acting in America had not been influenced by Garrick, and the colonial audience, anxious to be diverted from its harsh routine by any entertainment, did not always comprehend or discriminate. The colonial theater was, as Rankin quotes, often “full of sound and fury.” More direct comparisons with the English theater, to explain the cultural level of the colonial performances, would show just what it signified.

It is “difficult to discover a pervasive theme,” excepting the obvious one of struggle, Rankin notes. The reason for the difficulty is in part the scantiness of sources. From newspapers, court records, letters, and diaries, Rankin has assiduously and carefully uncovered many details concerning the personnel of the touring companies and the plays produced. He fills in the many gaps with shrewd speculation. Few contemporary critical analyses of the colonial theater exist. We know that Washington attended plays and presumably enjoyed them; we do not know enough concerning his and other Americans’ reactions to what they saw. The actors left few records. Their motives for taking to the stage and for coming to America thus remain somewhat obscure.

The author does not make it easy for the reader to discover themes for himself. At times the narrative becomes mired in details; too much of the material included is purely anecdotal and too many paragraphs recount fact after fact without attention to a central theme. Rankin should have left his vantage point, the stage, and viewed the struggle from the outside. He needs to explain what forces, besides the determination of the touring companies to succeed, broke down the religious and economic resistance of Americans and made the theater more acceptable. The meaning of the book would be clearer if the analysis of the plays performed appeared in chapters earlier than the Epilogue.
For specialists in colonial history and in cultural history the book will be very useful. Better attention by author and publisher to the requisites of scholarship would have made it more so. The interesting note on "clap-trap" belongs at the bottom of the page, as do all the others, not concealed at the back. Two notes are incorrect. Two illustrations are of English theaters; two noted ones, of the Southwark theater and of the interior of the John Street theater, are absent. Rankin should have shown, by including a critical bibliography, that his work will supplant in accuracy those of earlier writers. Criticism notwithstanding, the book is a solid piece of research with interesting and important conclusions.

Texas Technological College

Benjamin H. Newcomb


Increasingly, historians have been investigating the mass, for example George Rude's works on the crowd in England and France. Jackson Turner Main's account of American social structure, 1763-1788, is in that fine tradition. Many must be surprised at the few answers to apparently elementary questions about classes, incomes, occupations, costs of living, land-owning, etc. Now we have some very useful, sometimes impressionistic, answers. Possibly taking a tip from W. K. Jordan's use of English wills, Main has delved into "the most valuable and untouched source materials for the socio-economic history of early America . . . the probate records, especially the inventories of estates." Additions include "most of the tax lists," newspapers, travel accounts, and much else. The research is impressive, though documentation (perhaps inevitably) is not always given and many generalizations come on trust.

Generally avoiding sociological jargon, the author begins with a commonsense definition of classes: economic classes, the result of objective unequal distribution of property, and social classes depending upon prestige and public opinion. If definitions seem few and the book proceeds while taking for granted all sorts of terms, and it is not always clear whether economic or social classes are involved, later discussions, particularly chapter seven, do clarify matters.

Two opening chapters describe the economic class structures of North and South in terms of four basic groups, "frontier, subsistence farm, commercial farm, and urban." Next comes the income and property of different groups, from slaves to rich farmers, tailors to wealthy lawyers, and, despite great diversity, many generalizations are made. But income only has relevance when the basic cost of living and the desires (and their costs) of various people are considered. Chapter four does just that, from the bachelor who
could "survive" on £25 a year to the truly rich man with property worth at least £5,000. The conclusion is that "the great majority" of Americans lived "adequately."

The book then turns from description to change with an interesting examination of mobility in frontier and settled areas both from place to place and up and down the class scale (the first, of course, often resulted in the second) including the ability of the landless to acquire land and the possibilities for entering the upper class. Opportunity to obtain land was good, especially on the frontier, and in the towns skilled workers could expect to become property owners. Access to the upper class was more limited; the mercantile aristocracy was comparatively open but the landed aristocracy much less so, and in Virginia became "virtually a closed group."

The next two chapters turn from mobility in terms of economics to questions of prestige—how society valued itself, how contemporaries, native and foreign, viewed American classes. Great diversity, fluidity and imprecision are found—for example, Main cannot make very much of the American use of titles such as Esquire (but were property and class quite as synonymous as the author suggests?)—and a picture of social opportunity emerges. It is stressed that while farmers were theoretically exalted above all others the power structure showed a different reality, such as frequent leadership by lawyers, an often bitterly criticized group.

The penultimate chapter links classes and "culture patterns" (the extent and nature of reading, education, music, art, playgoing), concluding, not surprisingly, that "the quality of culture . . . varied with economic status" but did not exclude "cultural mobility." The conclusion is followed by a more stimulating appendix, "Needs and Resources," which also serves as a bibliography.

The descriptive part of the book, the great bulk, seems to me more convincing (the material is well presented though some tables in the text might have been useful) than some of the conclusions which are rarely surprising, sometimes doubtful, and occasionally very labored (see the discussion of classes, pp. 270–271, 302). Main seems to take it for granted that classes are bad, but his book will not lend much comfort to those committed to a classless colonial America.

Many standard factors in American history are stressed, such as the prosperity even of the humblest, the presence of Negro slaves who, sometimes acknowledgedly, upset many favorable judgments, the availability of land in the West, and general contrasts with Europe.

Very candidly, Main admits that his period is too short to permit discussion of social changes, but he shows interesting changes in the legislatures. He describes a society varying from rough economic democracy to aristocratic slavocracy. Historians will be grateful for this able, pioneering book, this most useful tool.

Brown University

WALLACE BROWN
Thirty years ago, Perry Miller's books on the New England mind in the colonial period opened a door of understanding which had been closed for centuries, ever since we ceased to read Calvin in the original Latin. Like all good books, they excited commentaries of greater bulk. We may reject Miller's theses, but no one in this century can write about the American mind of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries without taking them into consideration.

A dozen years ago, Miller's interest shifted from the colonial period to the nineteenth century, and thereafter he read, taught courses, and thought, in the later period. The hammering out of his ideas has thrown out some sparks in the form of monographs and essays, but these eleven chapters which now appear, edited by Elizabeth W. Miller, are the only completed work of this period of his life. Fortunately, he began by laying his foundation, and this is what we have here.

In Book One, The Evangelical Basis, Miller studies the Great Revival and demonstrates that by fixing the beliefs that "the people are the preacher," that churches should rest on the "voluntary principle" of support by the will and the contributions of the people, and that sectarian differences were immaterial, it effected a revolution in the American mind. The "voluntary principle" was indeed revolutionary in its application to so large a society, and it pointed out to the world the solution to the problems which had bedeviled the national churches of Europe since their creation. It was a typically American solution in that it turned religion from theology to an activist expression of universal benevolence. And, contemporaries felt, this combination of religious purpose with nationalism guaranteed the success of the American effort although all of the earlier empires had failed.

In these chapters it is obvious that Miller found no profound philosophy in the thinking of the religious leaders, but when he turns to the law, he encounters minds which command his admiration. The lawyers were the true successors of the clergy of the previous century in that now it was they who were preaching the social jeremiads; but more than that, it was the great minds among them which were trying to create a cosmic philosophy. Theirs was a difficult battle, for the same movement which had denatured theology by democratizing it, took as its ideal of law a sort of "Davy Crockett" justice, consisting of a great deal of common sense and a little law. Miller traces the struggle of this concept against Common Law, Civil Law, Equity and Biblical precepts, and the conflict between these forms of law. He describes the rise of the legal profession with a philosophy of law, and its success because its dramatic eloquence became the most popular form of public entertainment.
In Book Three, Science—Theoretical and Applied, Miller makes only a beginning of the work sketched in his outline. He demonstrates that at the commencement of the nineteenth century science was regarded chiefly as proof of the sublime work of God, but that with the publication of Dr. Jacob Bigelow’s *Elements of Technology* in 1829, the victory of utilitarianism over contemplative science was clearly forecast.

Is this the revolutionary work for which we had hoped? Does it add to the list of axioms of American history first demonstrated by Perry Miller and enumerated in Edmund S. Morgan’s sketch of him? The character of the sources makes it very hard to say. Instead of interpreting a relatively small handful of source material, he is handling comparative masses of print, but still only a selection of the available material. It is hard to tell how much of one’s difference of opinion with Miller is due to knowledge of different sources. His emphasis on the “voluntary principle,” a lay ministry, and a disregard of sectarian differences in theology, as the cornerstones of the life of the mind in the nineteenth-century America is amusing to those of us who have been telling him for years that he was ignoring just these facets of the colonial New England mind. More clearly, however, than any previous writer, he demonstrates that this was the way and this was the time in which the modern American concept of our international duty was shaped. European friends, irritated by our “benevolence,” will here find an explanation of those of our qualities which infuriate them. Even those familiar with our history will be struck by the manner in which Miller’s handling of Ruggles, the drunkard, and Kneeland, the atheist, throw light on Ann Hutchinson and on our modern school and segregation problems. The whole book is a fresh view, undisturbed by modern isms. The Marxist interpretation of our history gets short shrift even when Miller is demonstrating that law in the first half of the nineteenth century was preoccupied by property rights.

The outlined chapters which conclude the book reveal to us our great loss in Miller’s death; it would have been a joy to see his mind play upon the peaks of history which he enumerates.

*American Antiquarian Society*  
Clifford K. Shipton

*Poor Richard’s Politicks: Benjamin Franklin and his New American Order.*  

Finding that historical tinkerers have been entirely too successful in disassembling Franklin—leaving only an untidy heap of parts and some idealized remnants of myth, Paul W. Conner has set out to rebuild a large portion of the original Franklin design. The reconstruction of Franklin’s social and political ideas into an orderly, unified structure, that was both theory and
application, turns out to be an ingenious effort, worthy of Franklin and one that he, no doubt, would have admired.

Conner has no hesitation in declaring that Franklin did develop a social-political theory and that it was used or expressed in a very wide range of actions, ideas and responses. He establishes his thesis in two parts: the origins and composition of the theory, and then its application to the large number of personal, social, and political problems that confronted Franklin. The theory takes the form of a quest for "nothing less than a New Order" (p. 15) with its natural home in America and its object the pursuit of personal and social virtue. And virtue in turn is a composite of Benevolence, Happy Mediocrity, Productive Labor, and Simplicity. Politics, sustained by virtue, has for its goal the creation of a New Order in society using rules. With rules in hand, one could then prepare a strategy and apply skillful tactics to achieve a Virtuous New Order—harmonious and stable, but also dynamic and improving. This structure of thought, says Conner, draws its inspiration from the game of chess, a lawful, orderly game rewarding the wise and skillful player.

Multiplication of individual virtues, an enlightened self-interest advanced to a moral duty of selfless generosity in society, would bring out the latent propensity of men to do good. In spite of what he knew of man's capacity to act badly, Franklin was optimistic that individually and collectively, with the help of social discipline, men would produce a general benevolence. Happy Mediocrity meant the opportunity in America to enjoy a comfortable life through the exploitation of the country's resources, impeded by excesses of wealth and poverty. Achievement of the comfortable life required diligent labor. Work, however, was not an end in itself; it was the means to increased productivity for the benefit of all and, as a side benefit, to keep people safe from the seductions of sloth, infidelity, and the taste for expensive luxuries. Simplicity, as Franklin saw it, was the reduction of social relationships to their simplest and most orderly form. Whether one sought a new grammar or better forms of business and governments, clarity and simplicity in rules, and contracts carefully drawn, were the best ways to prevent confusion and corruption.

Franklin was not, of course, just a political theorist; he was always a man of affairs and an engaged citizen. Conner attempts, therefore, to show a direct relationship between the theory and Franklin's participation in society. There is, for instance, need for abundant room for the expanding society. Hence, Franklin develops grand schemes for empire, with or without England and preferably with Canada. After considering the various kinds of people who will best serve the New Order, Franklin concludes that they should be predominantly Anglo-Saxons. A prosperous, hard-working, comfortably endowed people would, in this happy, harmonious environment, undertake a cultural rebirth; their government, remodeled on scientific principles and benignly regulating and stimulating society, must preserve a "natural equality" without partisanship, selfishness, or tyranny.
There were innumerable ingredients in the New Order, and Franklin makes a judgment on each problem, from the proper treatment of Indians to the likely value of a new federal constitution. All express some aspect of the general social-political theory.

Yet, Conner is not entirely happy with the elasticity of the theory. In his comments on the personal and external influences upon Franklin's thought, Conner states, "The student of Franklin's politics cannot fail to be struck by the contradictions between Franklin the man and Franklin the theorist. He articulated a system of beliefs which barely resembled his known inclinations" (p. 212)—and, one might add, many of his actions. As political theory, much of Franklin's thought is a museum piece of the most extreme form of eighteenth-century mechanical optimism. Was all of this theorizing—a mixture of shrewd observations and appalling superficiality, plus a callous disregard for theory when it seemed to suit his purpose—simply, as Conner suggests is possible, Franklin, the consummate actor, playing a role? Or, were these ideas some private justification not for general application but created to wrap his actions and inclinations in an attractive garb? Perhaps it was Franklin's attempt to "seek absolution in political theory" for a "social guilt attaching to his ambiguous status" (p. 213) in colonial society.

Whether these questions can ever be answered or not, Conner's study is the best attempt to "see unity in Franklin's design" (p. 224). The book has style, it is knowledgeable and perceptive, and, while it may not be a perfect restoration of parts that still clash and refuse to fit together in Franklinian harmony, it may be truer to Franklin for all of that.

University of Oregon

WILLIAM S. HANNA


Heralded as "the first full-scale life of Franklin to be published since Carl Van Doren's in 1938," Mr. Aldridge's biography promises much. Since Van Doren's standard work was issued, eight volumes of the Yale edition of The Papers of Benjamin Franklin and the out-of-series Autobiography have appeared. Since then, numerous monographs have been written, among them a number of excellent ones by Mr. Aldridge. There has, indeed, in the last quarter century been added to our corpus of knowledge a considerable amount of substantial information about that always fascinating, never simple, historically important, and humanly appealing character, Benjamin Franklin. Unfortunately, this new work tells us little that is new.

Mr. Aldridge's biography does not replace or supplant that of Van Doren. It is not a study in depth such as that of Jefferson by Marie Kimball. A sen-
tence here and a sentence there tells us something new, but these are minor facts. There is no feeling that here is a mine of hitherto unrefined ore. One does not read with a sense of discovery, the discovery of a man or a period of history. The work is a smooth, basically well-written account. It is adequate for the general reader, and it will, probably, be popular. It is not for the specialist nor for the scholar. It was not so intended.

Franklin was one of the most famous men of his day. He was also a very complicated person. His most famous writings, the sayings of Poor Richard, are full of contradictions. He was at one time a Puritan and an Epicurean, publicly modest and privately boastful, a pillar of prudence in print and something less in practice, an idealist and simultaneously a pragmatist. Like most human beings, he recommended for himself and others what he was unwilling or unable to compose into a way of public or private life. And he was successful, even if the reasons for his success were not those solemnly set down as reasons in his autobiography. It is this Franklin, inconsistent, anxious to learn, able to change, willing to work, happy to laze, ambitious for himself and his country, intellectually curious, whom we seek to know. Mr. Aldridge does not give us the fullness of this Franklin.

The book suffers from one very basic fault. Perhaps, the author finds that the real Franklin has eluded him. Perhaps, he is seduced by the fashion of our times. He is obsessed with sex. From the unaesthetic and unrealistic parlor-bathroom scene on the dust-jacket through almost every chapter of the book, there is a reek of strained prurience. It is as though Mr. Aldridge had read the Franklinian canon and found a phallic symbol in every exclamation point. Bringing in “Lolita” Shipley is simply bad taste. Franklin was not a Don Juan. He may have been faithful to his Deborah, or he may not have been. It is extraordinary, however, that of one so prominently in the public eye for so long nothing—after his marriage—has survived in manuscript or print of a sexually derogatory nature. Mr. Aldridge apparently did not wish to differentiate between bed and badinage.

The historian will be somewhat surprised at the easy manner in which Mr. Aldridge disposes of the convolutions of Pennsylvania politics in the decade 1755–1764 when it was unbelievably complicated. It is really naive to depict the Penns as “baddies” and Franklin as a “goody.” And somehow we lose sight of the Franklin who recommended his good friend as Stampman for Pennsylvania as he merged into the effective proponent of the Stamp Act’s repeal. We are not sure that we see him as a scientist; yet it was as a scientist that he first became internationally famous. We do not even see him growing out of his Philadelphia environment, Franklin growing personally as the city grew commercially and culturally. Mr. Aldridge’s biography is not subtle enough to catch the interaction of place, time, and personality which made Franklin—and which Franklin helped make.

*The Library Company of Philadelphia*  
**Edwin Wolf 2nd**

This latest volume in a "needs and opportunity for study series" sponsored by the Institute of Early American History and Culture at Williamsburg consists of a lengthy essay on the study of the arts in America to 1826 and a selected bibliography of writings on that subject published, with a few exceptions, between 1876 and 1964. Preliminary drafts of the two sections were subjected to informed criticism at a conference held in Williamsburg in March, 1964, and a revised version of the work incorporating suggested improvements and additions was then published for the Institute in the present form.

Neither essay nor bibliography pretends to be a definitive treatment, yet each is a carefully stated and useful reminder of what could be and what has been done in the field of early American art studies. From his commanding position as Director and Librarian of the Boston Athenaeum and member of countless boards and committees, Walter Muir Whitehill brings authority and style to his survey of past and current researches. In spite of his dismaying finding that the Art Bulletin, the official American academic journal for art historians, has, in all of its forty-five volumes, published a total of eleven articles on the early American period, he does manage to cite a number of thorough studies, chiefly books, undertaken in this field.

It is useful to have another plea for an approach to the arts "as an element in human society" rather than as an exercise in connoisseurship. The view of early American art as an extension and modification of European, especially British, sources is also a point which cannot be overemphasized. Whitehill's plea for indiscriminate publication, however, may seem rather sweeping: "The greatest need in the field of this conference is for every institution possessing pertinent objects to publish promptly as many carefully prepared and liberally illustrated catalogues or picture books, or both, as their time and resources permit." This appears to verge on a call for publication for the sake of publication, a disease with which the history profession is already afflicted to a dangerous degree.

While the essay offers a number of useful suggestions for new and expanded research, the more formal bibliography's "silences automatically indicate needs and opportunities for study." Most of the items included are books, although a few particularly significant articles from historical, architectural, and art journals are mentioned. A final section, "Serial Publications," lists and describes several of the more important magazines which carry relevant articles. A useful introductory note explains the reasons for the scope chosen and for the many omissions which specialists will note. (Why, for instance, are there no references to McMurrtrie's work in the field
of early printing?) The bibliography's principal function, the compilers state, "is to point out the basic writings in a variety of fields and by its obvious gaps to single out the areas which need further work."

Arrangement is by twenty major subjects, including the introduction, General Works, and Serial Publications. Architecture, Painting, Furniture, and Silver each receive subheadings which are listed under general works, biographies, and regional or other specialized studies. The major value of the bibliography for the nonspecialist lies in its often extensive, occasionally subjective, but always informative annotations. These, together with a detailed table of contents which leads one through the various subjects and subheadings, and a thorough index, add much to the usefulness of the bibliography.

The Arts in Early American History is attractively printed and generally free from factual error. The essay is stimulating, and the bibliography, in spite of a certain inconsistency between the presentation of an admittedly selective listing and the claim that omissions indicate work that needs to be done, will be a valuable aid to teachers, historians, and curators.

Archives of American Art

Garnett McCoy


In the preface to this popular biography, the author deplores the fact that Lewis and Clark have been remembered only for their partnership in exploration rather than for their separate lives, although he acknowledges that "their joint adventure was definitely the high point in each man's career." Referring inappropriately to "this shotgun marriage of convenience" from which, he asserts, both explorers have suffered, Mr. Dillon offers a full-length biography of the commander of the expedition, with Clark as a "background figure" who "must wait his biographical turn." So slight, however, were Lewis' achievements before the expedition and so brief his life afterward that his biographer perforce has no alternative other than to dwell at length on the "corps of discovery" of 1804-1806. John Bakeless' approach in his Lewis and Clark, Partners in Discovery (1947) was the more realistic, for neither was background to the other and history is ill served by such a literary device.

If, then, almost two-thirds of the biography is, from the nature of the subject and the volume of records, to be devoted to the expedition, the author must develop some ingenuity in historical selectivity and interpretation as well as in character study amid an embarrassment of documentary riches. In one respect the author follows the documents too closely without historical perspective; in another, not closely enough in the matter of careful tran-
scription. As the *Original Journals*, rich in detail, are the chief primary source, so the author must free himself at times from the daily chronology to give the reader a wider view of events and an occasional assessment of historical problems that stem from those events. Often the author fails to see the woods for the trees, the Continental Divide for the mountains, indulging in long quotations rather than offering helpful interpretation. On July 16, 1805, Lewis, squatting on his haunches (so the author supposes), wolfs down a meal “of the small guts of the buffalo[el]” and “for dessert he had yellow or black currants” (p. 193). Actually he came upon the wild berries the following day and composed a lengthy scientific essay about them (Thwaites, *Original Journals*, II, 234, 238–239) which holds no significance for his biographer. However much the reader may be entertained and enlightened by personal incidents between members of the expedition or between man and nature, the author seldom rises above this plane. Geographical-historical concepts that challenge the reader of De Voto’s *Course of Empire* find no place among the recital of daily observations and experiences. It would be more enjoyable to read the original journals.

An author who eschews annotations almost inevitably loses his editorial integrity in free-style quotations, and Mr. Dillon is no exception. His direct quotations abound in inaccuracies and inconsistency of transcription. In some passages he retains the eighteenth-century spelling; in others he indulges in modernization and gratuitous correction of misspellings. Omissions are not always indicated. One finds careless errors in dates (pp. 102, 126, 258), faulty chronology (p. 129), and a quotation at the head of Chapter VII (The Advance Base of 1804) taken from Lewis’ Journal a year later at Fort Mandan concerning the “good health and excellent spirits [‘excellent health and spirits’ in the original]” of the exploring party. There are no maps to aid the reader.

After three chapters on Lewis’ indifferent career as territorial governor, 1806–1809, the author concludes with a “Post-Mortem” on the question whether death came by suicide or murder. In spite of Mr. Dillon’s laborious argument on behalf of the latter, in which he erroneously lists Donald Jackson among its proponents, the best historical and most judicious presentation of the case remains that of Dawson Phelps, supporting the suicide theory, in the *William and Mary Quarterly*.

*Institute of Early American History and Culture*  
LESTER J. CAPPON

**Yankee Theatre: The Image of America on the Stage, 1825–1850.** By FRANCIS HODGE. (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1964. 320 p. Illustrations, appendix, bibliography, index. $6.00.)

The Yankee was a man of his time, sharp, robust, a free-wheeler, courageous in word and action. He was a comic character, probably never taken
seriously in the sense that Daniel Boone or Marshall Dillon is taken seriously as a native hero. Beside Mike Fink or Paul Bunyan, Brother Jonathan, even in his lifetime, struck a pose, "the chip-on-the-shoulder American, proud, chary of his independence and freedom, and cocky in his attitude toward the rest of the world." As set forth on the nineteenth-century American stage by James H. Hackett, George Hill, Dan Marble, Joshua Silsbee, and others, he was a brash New England boy, a slick trader, good at swapping goods or yarns, a caricature who has not survived except in minor, slapstick roles in the theatre of our time—nor in moving pictures, nor television. The Yankee, one can say, is dead, except in hill-top farms of Vermont or Maine; even politics in Massachusetts has moved beyond him; and Connecticut, the home of the bumpkin, remembers him only as the builder of clapboard houses which sophisticated people now inhabit. But he had his day, as Irving's Ichabod, as Cooper's David Gamut, in an abbreviated sense as Melville's Captain Delano, and he had his day especially on the American stage. That is what Francis Hodge tells us about.

As Brother Jonathan or Uncle Sam, Deuteronomy Dutiful or Nimrod Wildfire, his lineaments were much the same—the American, Mr. Hodge explains, with the mask off, mendacious, sly, conniving, and appealing, "familiar, evil, obliging, simple, cunning, with imperturbable good humor, insatiable curiosity, and a spirit of inquiry which asks for all sorts of information," dominating the American stage before 1850, and outlining a cultural role which Negro, Irish, and Jewish comedians have in turn dominated since. To suggest that the Yankee is now dead is not to say, however, that his descendants do not remember him with affection nor cease in efforts to trace his genealogy. What is attractive about Mr. Hodge's book is that it sets forth a character whom we cherish as ancestor to us all—the sharp and canny trader whose giant mercantile counter stretched, as Leigh Hunt once said, from New England to Florida, the deceptively relaxed and patiently humorous bumpkin whom Mark Twain learned to love, and who could out-swap and under-cut any overdressed, pretentious city slicker; he was David Harum, Scattergood Baines, Will Rogers. How well he is remembered, admired, and mourned. Requiescat in pace.

Mr. Hodge sketches the career of this true-blue, daring, perky, honest and protective American from his first appearance in Royall Tyler's The Contrast in 1787 through the death of Joshua Silsbee in 1855 when the era of Yankee theatre came to a close. Confidently, sometimes arrogantly, emerging as an independent representative of a new and independent nation, self-conscious and self-congratulatory, he would in time give way to the simpler, strong-singing workmen presented by Whitman and Whittier, who would give place in turn to the defeated men of Steinbeck or Dos Passos, and the underground American of Ralph Ellison. But he had his day, this simple countryman, who even in outsmarting less worthy men was somehow humorous: America's shamefaced recognition perhaps of what it was or might seem to be. He who laughs first, even at himself, forfends that last laugh.
Though he focusses his examination of the Yankee character on four major nineteenth-century actors, Mr. Hodge nonetheless creates a sense and a chronology of a theatrical genre. He has been particularly successful in keeping distance between himself and the impersonations which he describes, resisting the temptation to which I have stooped of being carried away by interest in character from adherence to matters at hand. If to some minds that makes his book less compelling as narrative or socio-political speculation, it does insure it lasting life, for it sets forth what happened, and when, and sometimes how. Its impeccable solidity provides a firm base from which less caretaking men can spring. It is a good book, to which I certainly will often return, reading it from the back forward, grateful for its generous index.

*Columbia University*

*Lewis Leary*

*Here Come the Rebels!* By Wilbur Sturtevant Nye. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1965. xvi, 412 p. Maps, bibliography, index. $7.95.)

Studies in recent years relating to the Battle of Gettysburg have developed renewed interest in the broader phase of the Gettysburg story of which the action at Gettysburg is the culminating event. Very important factors in the early months of 1863, stemming from the favorable although costly battle of Fredericksburg in mid-December, 1862, and the Confederate successes on the Mississippi and Tennessee fronts, led to serious consideration of a great offensive movement. The matter of the relative merit of dividing General R. E. Lee's victorious Army of Northern Virginia, dispatching a part of it to re-enforce General Johnston in front of Vicksburg or General Bragg in Tennessee, or of leaving the army intact for the purpose of carrying the war to northern soil, was thoroughly discussed in Confederate cabinet sessions. The notable cabinet decision of mid-May, calling for a great offensive into Maryland and Pennsylvania, is directly traceable to deep concern over the loss of manpower, and of the lack of matériel and food. The best way to capitalize on the Confederate victory at Chancellorsville, Lee believed, was to carry the war into enemy territory.

Such a great military adventure called for extensive preparation. Colonel Nye has ably outlined the reasons for initiating the campaign and has covered in considerable detail the numerous engagements of varying size and importance in the northward progress of Lee's army. Especially well handled is the action at Winchester, the envelopment of General Milroy's retreating force at Stephenson's Depot, and the subsequent capture of Martinsburg. The cavalry skirmishes at Aldie, Middleburg and Upperville clearly point up the screening purpose of General J. E. B. Stuart's horsemen, and the persistent, though often ineffective, attempts of General Alfred
Pleasanton to break through in order to obtain information concerning the direction of the Confederate march. In his thorough coverage of the Federal cavalry actions against Stuart east of the Blue Ridge in the early stage of the campaign, and again in its final stages against General Knipe’s infantry defense of the approaches to Harrisburg, Colonel Nye’s handling of the story becomes almost laborious. On the other hand, the treatment of General Stuart’s ride around the Federal army, although somewhat brief, and the account of General Gordon’s attack on Wrightsville are indeed commendable. Certainly, the course of Stuart’s march is ably outlined and its unfortunate consequences in view of Lee’s overall plan, skillfully evaluated. It is important, as the author points out, to note the sharp change in General Ewell’s plan of crossing the Susquehanna. Considering Harrisburg as the point for a major crossing, Ewell instructed General Jubal Early on June 25, while the command was still at Chambersburg, to destroy the Wrightsville bridge. Learning at York of the “defenseless condition of the country,” he ordered Gordon on June 28 to secure the bridge, hoping thereby to cross the river, cut the Pennsylvania Central Railroad and march on Harrisburg from the east.

Certain errors have, unfortunately, crept into the story. John R. Cooke’s brigade did not join General Lee’s army (p. 19). The two brigades which were transferred from D. H. Hill’s James River command to Lee’s force were those led by Joseph R. Davis and Junius Daniel. The average weight of a Confederate 12-pounder Napoleon gun was 1,204 pounds, considerably less than the figure of 1,757 given on page 15. The march by General Early on June 22 should proceed from Boonsboro to Cavetown instead of Cash-town (p. 268). Monterey is located at the crest of South Mountain on the Fairfield-Waynesboro road, southwest of Gettysburg, instead of the Chambersburg pike (p. 271). The map on page 126 appears to show Early’s march on Gettysburg by way of Middletown instead of the Harrisburg Road by way of Heidersburg.

Colonel Nye’s volume is, indeed, a welcome addition to the list of sound studies on Gettysburg.

Gettysburg National Military Park

FREDERICK TILBERG


A little over a dozen years ago the name of Bruce Catton appeared for the first time on the growing list of writers of Civil War history. His contribution to the literature of this period was Mr. Lincoln’s Army, which introduced a three-volume saga of the famous Army of the Potomac. Public response to this book and the succeeding one showed only modest appreciation
of the author's worth as an unusually good narrator, but the appearance of the third volume of the trilogy brought forth loud acclaim and won for him the Pulitzer Prize and the National Book Award. With his reputation firmly established, Catton went on to become for some students the foremost historian of the Civil War. Certainly he deserves applause as an exceptionally graceful writer who possesses an acute sense of the dramatic and a keen ear for the apt phrase. His ability to recreate scenes of the past in broad strokes of the brush while etching the smallest significant detail in fine lines is almost uncanny; and his pen portraits are models of their kind.

In his latest book, *Never Call Retreat*, the superb artistry of his writing retains its flavor and vigor. At the same time the results of E. B. Long's exhaustive research into unknown or relatively unfamiliar sources of information have increased the depth and subtlety of Catton's perceptions and broadened the scope of his understanding of many of the complex forces which explain the character of the conflict. For the title of the book Catton has appropriately borrowed a phrase from "The Battle Hymn of the Republic" and made it the controlling theme. When Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation on January 1, 1863, he "sounded forth the trumpet that shall never call retreat." This momentous decision reflected the President's appreciation of the changing character of the war. Beginning as a fight to restore the Union, it became one to destroy slavery and finally to establish the equality of all men. The book describes this revolution in American society which took place in the twenty-seven months following December of 1862 and the great Union defeat at Fredericksburg. During this time the fury of the conflict reached a crescendo before finally fading away in the hush of silent guns.

Catton focuses his gaze on the two central figures in the drama, Lincoln and Davis, while recounting and analyzing the course of military and political developments in all their intricate patterns. The new material from Long's research has brought freshness to the narrative and modified traditional appraisals of people and events. In picturing Davis in better light than most writers Catton shows sympathetic understanding of the problems confronting the President of the Confederacy, many of which were already beyond solution by the end of 1863. Davis to him epitomizes the basic weakness of the South in its desire to return to the good old days, though the blood of battle had washed them away forever. Lincoln in Catton's eyes still towers above others as a leader of vision and imagination, who, as the conflict continued, kept changing his sights in preparation for the painful process of rebuilding a nation torn by war and revolution. Of the great moments of the war, Catton feels that the Battle of Gettysburg could have been fought at Pipe Creek or anywhere else near there and "the end result would probably have been much the same" (p. 181). Contrary to many accounts of the engagement, Catton shows due appreciation of Meade's generalship and moral fortitude. While somewhat exaggerating the battered condition of Lee's army, he accepts the interpretation that
Meade's forces were too exhausted by the hardships of the campaign to administer the coup de grace to their old enemies.

Though this book brilliantly presents the war as the accomplishment of a long and painful step toward the fulfillment of a more perfect democracy, it nevertheless offers the reader a lopsided picture of the struggle. Unquestionably, because of their great significance and glamour, military and political developments deserve the emphasis given them, but not to the virtual exclusion of other aspects of the conflict, at least not in the third and last volume of what is called *The Centennial History of the Civil War*. By paying little or no attention to such subjects as civilian life, financial and economic affairs, foreign relations, and the war on the sea, the book fails to develop the deeper meaning and the broader dimensions of the struggle. Perhaps what is needed is another three volumes.

*Lafayette College*  
EDWIN B. CODDINGTON


Wood Gray, a participant in this conference on economic change in the Civil War era, stated on its last day that “I have the feeling that the impact of the War itself has been undersold.” Only one of the speakers agreed with him: Louis Hartz, who argued in terms of ideology, not economics, that “the Civil War decade” and “the whole Lincoln symbolism,” by the exercise of “a peculiar American logic,” were crucial factors in the transformation of “the industrialist” into “a Jacobin.” “Economic power,” Professor Hartz said, “instead of coming to a Whig apex, is rationalized by the argument of a militant democracy. It is advanced—along the lines of Carnegie, Horatio Alger, and the Republican presidents—as within the reach, within the legitimate ambition, of all. The old gentilities are gone, and by an ironic paradox, the Hamiltonian Whig economic goal is attained amid enthusiasms wholly un-Whig in character.”

The other speakers gave little support to this attempt to salvage a remnant of the view advanced by Charles Beard and other historians a generation ago: that the Civil War, the second American Revolution, freed the bourgeois, business class of the North from the feudal, agrarian rule of the slaveholding planters of the South. Instead, they almost unanimously affirm that, with the exception of the national banking act (a reform engendered at least in part by the need to provide a market for government bonds), the War itself exercised little influence on the pattern of economic change in the United States.
The decisive date, according to George Rogers Taylor, was 1839, when "the per capita rate of American economic growth turned significantly upward," attaining the average rate of 1.6 per cent per annum, which it has maintained to the present day. Similar long-term trends, hardly influenced at all by the Civil War, were found in such varied fields as "Foreign Investment in American Enterprise," "The International Market for Agricultural Commodities," "Science and Technology," and "The Organization of Manufacturing and Transportation," by Harry H. Pierce, Morton Rothstein, A. Hunter Dupree, and Alfred D. Chandler, Jr., respectively; and Thomas C. Cochran, whose 1961 article, "Did the Civil War Retard Industrialization?" provided the theme for the conference, accurately summed up its results by saying:

During the course of the Conference I was afraid that we might find that there was an institutional factor which would lead me to decide that there was probably a great stimulus to economic development during the Civil War. . . . As I listened and you listened to the various speakers no such factor appeared. . . . The War seems to have sunk into the background very much. . . . I can't help but feel that this Conference has indicated that growth and change are of longer range, and the processes of institutional interactions are not usually violently disturbed by the events of four or five years.

New York University

Thomas P. Govan


The passage of new civil rights legislation in the form of the Voting Act of 1965 seems to substantiate the thesis of The Right to Vote, namely that the primary objective of the Fifteenth Amendment was to assure the right of Negroes to vote in the northern states. The preservation of already existing political rights for southern Negroes was its secondary objective. Unquestionably, the amendment did extend political rights over a reluctant North and the perpetuation of the new political status for Negroes, coupled with gradual disfranchisement in the South, created a major distinction between the sections in the matter of civil rights for nearly a century.

By 1867 the question of Negro suffrage was highly controversial in the northern states with public opinion running heavily in favor of it only in those states with a very small Negro population. Republicans who could unite under Lincoln's leadership to win the Civil War were divided on the suffrage issue. Many Southerners accepted the imposed practice and set out to drive a wedge between the Negro voters and their Republican patrons. Republican leaders could not assume the reliability of the southern Negro voter. Continued Republican success might well depend on extending Negro
suffrage to the North, and in many cases this meant opposing the popular will as recently expressed in a series of referendums. To some, at least, extending political rights was a question of morality as well as good politics. William D. Kelly, who strongly advocated Negro suffrage, wrote that “Party expediency and exact justice coincide for once. . . .”

Because the question was so touchy, the Fifteenth Amendment which emerged from Congress was a moderate document giving the suffrage to no one and dodging the important question of the right of states to establish qualifications for voters. The amendment merely guaranteed that the right of citizens should “not be denied or abridged . . . on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.” Even a guarantee framed in such negative terms met with stiff opposition in many northern states where ratification was a touch and go matter. Professor Gillette’s study probes the political considerations involved in each section and traces the changing viewpoints on the question at hand as ratification became imminent. A number of related issues, including West Coast apprehension over possible Chinese suffrage, and demands for woman suffrage, influenced local legislatures faced with accepting or rejecting the amendment. The final result was a victory for compromise, and neither the proponents of a stiffer amendment nor persons who wished voting to remain a strictly state-controlled activity were satisfied. Those who agreed with President Grant when he stated that the amendment “completes the greatest civil change and constitutes the most important event that has occurred since the nation came into life,” were also quickly disillusioned.

The amendment fixed Negro suffrage on the North but it did little else. The current revolution for civil rights underscores how limited was the Negro’s power to improve his status in a society where his opportunities were limited by prejudice and tradition, even when he had the ballot.

This is a useful and timely study. It contains much valuable information, though the author might have drawn upon items of human interest to enrich his book. There can be little quarrel with the emphasis on political factors in the making of the Fifteenth Amendment, yet this study probably gives too scant a recognition to the strain of genuine idealism that played a part in the deliberations of those responsible for the amendment and its adoption. The book is based largely upon newspaper sources with manuscript and other materials used where helpful.

Wilmington College

Larry Gara


Lockout exemplifies many of the vices and some of the virtues of what we call “popular history.” Author Leon Woolf, known best for his widely-read
In Flanders Field and his prize-winning Little Brown Brother, is a talented writer with an easy style, a sharp eye for dramatic detail, and a flair for exciting narrative history. He makes easy judgments and quick characterizations, and tells a good story. Few of the many spectacular nineteenth-century American industrial conflicts offer so rich an opportunity to a writer with these abilities as the 1892 Homestead "Strike." But Woolf's capacities as an historian hardly match his skills as a writer. The final product therefore is rich in detail and often exciting in story, but sadly inadequate in analysis and marked by the absence of hard historical thinking. Since few labor historians write as well as Woolf and since the Homestead "Strike" is of such paramount importance in American labor history, so critical a verdict is all the more unfortunate.

Woolf tells his story well, and, even though the particular events have been narrated before, his is the fullest account to date. Although it contains serious factual errors and lapses in the narrative, my disappointment with Woolf's book is not in the story it tells. Nor do I think the author's severe judgments of Frick and Carnegie unnecessarily harsh. And his explanation of the long-range significance of the event is probably sound, too. But it is the overall context he creates for the Homestead episode and his use of sources that I find most distressing and analytically self-defeating.

Good history relates particular local events to the "times" (or the broad historical context) in which they occur. This is a commonplace, but the historian equally talented in dealing with the particulars and the larger context is rare. The interplay between the two is crucial. Woolf lets the "times" (Gilded Age America) explain the "events" (the Homestead crisis). This is a fair strategy. But Woolf's understanding of Gilded Age America derives largely from textbooks and popular clichés: a time of "political shabbiness and vacuity unmatched before or since," "a wasteland," dominated by an ethic "morally . . . otiose and feebly sanctimonious." Workers were without effective "power," "public opinion" cheered ruthless capitalists, and employers, aided by a pliant political authority, ran riot over employees and easily made hard times even harder. Woolf lets this reading of the "times" explain what happened in the summer of 1892. But too many of the facts and events that dot Woolf's narrative contradict his general view of the society-at-large. The result is an inadequate and often baffling effort at explanation.

Let me illustrate. If Woolf's general view is accurate, the Homestead workers should have been easily defeated. But the dispute lasted about three months. Why? More than this, the strikers displayed enormous local (community) power. "By July 4," a few days after the conflict erupted, Woolf writes, "all executive functions of the boroughs of Homestead and Munhall were being administered by the [Strikers'] Advisory Committee and its lieutenants, who worked the water, gas, and electric stations, enunciated ad hoc laws, and kept the peace." What allowed the strikers and their
sympathizers to gain such power so quickly in the Gilded Age America of Mr. Woolf?

And there are other questions, too. If the Amalgamated was so conserva-
tive and exclusive a craft union, "an oversized puddler's clan," why did so
many nonunion Homestead workers—the unskilled and the semiskilled and
even some foremen—support it against Frick's effort to destroy the union?
What of the strikers and their leaders? Their main leader, Hugh O'Donnell,
was born in 1863 of Irish parents, worked as a heater, owned clear a home
filled with respectable "middle-class" furnishings (a Brussels carpet and a
good-sized piano) and a substantial library, and was a dyed-in-the-wool
Republican! What made a man of this background the leader of so well-
organized a challenge to industrial power? And was he typical of the strike's
leaders? What of the rank-and-file? Of them, we learn little. And some of
what is reported is little more than a distillation of crude contemporary
stereotypes. The Slavic and "Hungarian" steel workers, for example, are
described only as "impetuous and semi-hysterical" and as "the most blood-
thirsty of all. . ." If politicians and law officers usually bent before the
pressure of inscrutable industrialists, why did Sheriff William H. McCleary
refuse to deputize the Pinkerton "police"? Why did Governor Robert E.
Pattison hesitate so long in sending the state militia to Homestead? Why
did investigative committees of the U.S. Senate and House of Representa-
tives gently but significantly rebuke Frick's use of private police? Why did
the Pennsylvania Legislature (and the legislatures of other states, too)
respond to Homestead with a law limiting the use of private police? If
"public opinion" sanctioned capitalist ethics and authority and scorned the
wage earner, why did Sheriff McCleary find it almost impossible to raise a
posse to put down the strikers, and when he did got only men who "would
not bear arms, . . . would not interfere with the picketing, . . . would not
escort the scabs or detectives into the works, and so on"? Why was it im-
possible to find juries to convict indicted Homestead strikers and their
leaders of "crimes" ranging from "assault" to "riot" to "conspiracy" to
"murder" and finally to "treason" itself (under the never-before used
Crimes Act of 1860)? Woolf's simple view of Gilded Age America makes it
impossible for him to answer adequately these and other pertinent questions
that emerge from his narrative.

And, finally, there is the gross deficiency in research. Woolf has read the
secondary material and admits the limitations and prejudices of much of it.
In addition, he relies heavily on the able work of John Fitch and the recent
scholarship of Henry David and David Brody. But his use of primary
materials is lamentably weak. Contemporary Congressional investigations
are used well, and the New York Tribune is quoted more regularly than any
single contemporary source, but Pittsburgh newspapers are rarely cited. "I
have done what I could," Woolf assures the reader, "to emerge from this
labyrinth with an account that approaches the elusive goddess Truth." But
the goddess remains elusive because a most pertinent source has been neglected entirely. Although Woolf’s narrative deals mainly with workers, he does not use a single labor source. It is as if one wrote a biography of Abraham Lincoln without reading Lincoln’s letters, or a history of prohibition without consulting the dry journals. Basic labor sources, particularly the Pittsburgh National Labor Tribune, are not even mentioned. The workers’ view of the Homestead episode is drawn largely from nonlabor sources and secondary accounts. This weakness is without excuse. Woolfs book should prove something that needs no proof. Labor history requires the study of the labor sources. Even popular and well-intentioned labor history.

State University of New York at Buffalo

HERBERT G. GUTMAN

_Apostles of the Self Made Man, Changing Concepts of Success in America._


Success, the idea of it and the fact of it, has probably been more important in American history and American thought than almost any other single conditioning factor. America, alone among great present-day nations, can be in a position to think of itself in terms of a “success,” and conversely criticize itself in terms of “failure” (The Democratic Dream, etc. Do Europeans flagellate themselves over the failure of the Aristocratic Dream? As for the Socialist dream...). The general public obeisance to whatever is considered successful in terms of actors or astronauts continues unabated. The role of success, educationally, professionally, in personal life is all-pervasive. Yet a proper definition of the word remains elusive, and a proper history of the idea is only half written.

Mr. Cawelti’s contribution to history and definition is lively, provocative, persuasive. He goes through a rather random-seeming selection of literary sources, some important (Franklin, Emerson, Dewey), some ephemeral (Horatio Alger), to illustrate what he believes to be a history of change in the American idea and ideal of success. He would like us to believe that the idea, the ideal, has degenerated from a cohesive plan for a unified democratic society, which would set up conditions productive of leadership by a natural elite, to a present-day denial of purely individual success and of the “self-made man” as a valid human goal. Naturally, this oversimplifies his thesis; but by using illustrations first from Franklin and Jefferson, then from two opposing nineteenth-century sources, the sentimental novel, and the work of more critical serious writers such as Cooper and Emerson, and finally tracing the disillusionment with the idea of personal success in such writers as Mark Twain and Henry James, he produces a graphic outline, a vivid picture of the decline and fall of a concept. From the enlightenment of political theory in the eighteenth century we descend to increasingly money-oriented and religiose distortions in the nineteenth century, and finally end
up in the twentieth with a fantastic quasi-mystical yet business-mad mishmash in the writings of such people as Dale Carnegie and Norman Vincent Peale on the one hand, and an almost total rejection of the "self-made man" in the works of writers like Fitzgerald and Faulkner on the other hand.

The graph he draws, the picture he paints is vivid enough, and one that makes immediate good sense. As the languid Oxford don said at a scientific conference, it's the sort of thing that sounds as though it ought to be true. Mr. Cawelti, in his short book based on long reading, is persuasive. Is he convincing? His argument is good; but it is argument, not proof. Would it not be possible, by using another such spectrum of good examples, to come up with some other opposed but equally persuasive hypothesis? Is it really fair to mix and in a way equate Franklin and Fitzgerald with Horatio Alger and T. S. Arthur, Dale Carnegie with Faulkner? One would think them bound to be opposed at any time, in any place, purely on the basis of character and genius. True, they all reflect ideas about "success." But then, especially in America, who doesn't? What doesn't?

For instance, as one small, biased, personal kind of criticism, arising purely from my own particular small corner; it is perfectly obvious that from the Adamses to the Kennedys one of the dominant conceptions of success in America has been the establishment of a Family. Family success, rather than just purely personal self-seeking, certainly dominated the thinking of many a nineteenth-century merchant, many an Irish politician, many a Jewish department store magnate. Such families were successfully established too, beyond the three-generation shirt sleeve limit. The Rockefellers, now in their fourth, are a long way from shirt sleeves. Does this concept of "family" mean nothing? Is it nowhere reflected in American literature? If not, why not? Mr. Cawelti seems to propose that "success" and the "self-made man" are virtually equivalent. I'm sure many other even more cogent criticisms of this sort could be made of the book. Meanwhile, read it if you're interested in the subject at all, since it does present a pertinent theory; and is short, well written, and stimulating, which is saying a great deal. Anything that serves to illuminate this all-engrossing subject serves a purpose. Until America defines the word "success" properly, it will be threatened with "failure."

Princeton, N. J.

Nathaniel Burt


Volume five of Professor Link's "study of the life and times of Woodrow Wilson" covers the period from the Sussex crisis in the spring of 1916 to the declaration of war against Germany one year later. There are two main
themes: the presidential election and Wilson’s vain attempt to end the war by his personal mediation. Both were of prime significance in American history. The political campaign marked the first step in the transformation of the Democratic party from an aggregation of latter day Jeffersonians, still obsessed with the parochial doctrine of states rights, into the dynamic instrument for social and economic reform it was to become under Franklin Roosevelt and his successors. At the same time, the President’s diplomatic efforts marked the first American endeavor to play a decisive role in world affairs.

The election of 1916 was the closest in our history since the Jacksonian revolution, with the exception of 1876. The outcome remained in doubt for several days, and the shift of only 1,904 votes in California would have elected Hughes. (By comparison, it would have required a change of 11,874 votes, properly allocated among five states—Hawaii, Illinois, Missouri, Nevada, and New Mexico—to have elected Nixon in 1960.) Moreover, no election in our modern history has been marked by such vicious, lying attacks on the personal character of a presidential candidate as the Republicans launched in a desperate effort to defeat Wilson. This hatred rose to a crescendo after Wilson forced the railroad operators to accept the eight-hour day under the Adamson Act in the midst of the campaign. Immediately an aroused business community added its imprecations against the friend of union labor to the superpatriots who were already castigating him for his softness towards Germany. The outcome left an aftermath of bitterness on both sides which carried over into the fight to ratify the Versailles treaty three years later, and contributed largely to its defeat by the Senate.

Wilson’s victory is usually attributed to the popular appeal of the slogan, “He kept us out of war.” While there is no doubt of the vital importance of the peace issue, and of Hughes’s failure to reconcile the belligerent utterances of his most outspoken champion, Theodore Roosevelt, with his own efforts to placate the normally Republican German-American vote, probably an equally decisive factor was Wilson’s success in winning so many Progressives who had stood at Armageddon in 1912. Disgusted by the cynical manner in which the Bull Moose had used them in his attempt to garner the Republican nomination for himself, only to abandon them the moment they had served his purpose, some twenty per cent of the former Progressives supported Wilson. Moreover, a far greater percentage of these voters came from the states west of the Mississippi, where they combined with those (especially women) who demanded peace above all else, to provide the President with his margin of victory. Moreover, some 300,000 Socialists and left-wing independents, who had voted for Debs in 1912, supported Wilson four years later. Although Hughes was able to increase the vote of a reunited Republican party by 870,000 over Taft’s showing in 1908, Wilson won 2,700,000 more votes than Bryan had received in 1908 and 2,830,000 more than he had obtained in 1912.
So, in the last analysis, Wilson only won because his first term in the White House had brought a marked change in his attitude towards the role of the federal government in enacting progressive legislation. His timely conversion to woman suffrage, and to such federal measures as a law abolishing child labor, a model workmen’s compensation act for government employees, rural credits for farmers, and an eight-hour day for railroad workers, accompanied by his appointment of Brandeis to the Supreme Court, heralded his emergence as a full-fledged liberal. He even abandoned the traditional Democratic shibboleth of a tariff for revenue only by advocating a tariff commission to fix protective duties scientifically, and by favoring legislation to prevent dumping of foreign goods and permitting American exporters to combine under an exception to the anti-trust laws. Not only did Wilson appropriate practically the whole of Roosevelt’s New Nationalism: he even won over Herbert Croly, whose book had inspired the Bull Moose in the first place! The result was the metamorphosis of the old Jeffersonian Democratic party, dedicated to the principles of states rights and laissez faire, into an organization which, at least nationally, was to become the champion of a strong Hamiltonian federal government, devoted to promoting the general welfare through advanced social legislation. There is no question but that Woodrow Wilson planted the seeds of Franklin Roosevelt’s New Deal.

Perhaps even more significant was Wilson’s ill-fated attempt to act as mediator to end the First World War. Link provides a fascinating account of the appearance of Wilson on the world stage, and of the suspicion and hostility his call for a new international order aroused in European leaders. Most British and French statesmen were actually convinced that he was working, even though unwittingly, for a German triumph. On the other hand, the Kaiser scornfully rejected any idea of attending a conference, as called for by Wilson in his appeal for peace in December 1916. “Certainly not under his chairmanship!” he snorted. Instead, that foolish monarch chose to heed the counsels of his military and naval advisors, and endorsed the unrestricted submarine campaign that forced a most reluctant Wilson to bring about the American intervention that cost him his crown. Link argues persuasively against the notion that the President was influenced to enter the war by fear that Germany stood on the threshold of victory, and that her triumph would endanger the security of the United States. He points out that Wilson’s stubborn resistance to war was due to his belief that the best interests of both America and mankind would be served by a negotiated peace without a decisive victory for either side. In light of what has happened since, few would argue today that his view was altogether far-fetched. But he finally felt obliged to accept belligerent status for two main reasons, according to Link: “because he could see no other way to protect American national rights and shipping on the high seas in the face of repeated German assaults, and because he believed that the war was in its final stages and American participation would hasten its end.”
he been aware of how close the Allies stood to military and economic disaster, he would have been wise to force them to tear up their arrangements for carving up the post-war world among themselves, as the price of American support. But both their dire straits and their secret treaties were kept well hidden until the United States declared war; so a golden opportunity to pledge them to a new international order in advance was lost before a single American shot was fired.

Professor Link has written the most interesting volume in his series to date. Every student of American political history will await with understandable impatience his forthcoming treatment of Wilson as the nation's war leader, of his participation in the Paris Peace Conference, and of his tragic failure to persuade the Senate to ratify the Treaty of Versailles.

Princeton, N. J.

C. Pardee Foulke


J. Franklin Jameson was a man like unto none other whom I have ever known. For some reason, as far as I know unrevealed, he wished to construct his personality according to a pattern of his own contriving. He was a kindly, generous man, possessed of a real sense of humor who found it convenient to appear austere and unbending. He was a man of great talent, even genius for history, who chose to hide this talent and spent his life in making it possible for and urging others to use and develop theirs. He spoke of himself as heuristic.

For more than fifty of his seventy-eight years he spent his great energy and his superb intelligence in organizing and improving the field of historical scholarship. He was a charter member of the American Historical Association, managing editor of the American Historical Review, Director of Historical Research of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, and Chief of the Division of Manuscripts of the Library of Congress. For most of his life he was the symbol of American History, universally acknowledged.

Anyone who was perceptive could penetrate his formidable exterior defenses and could appreciate his real humanity and kindliness. So he had warm and appreciative friends among historians of all ages. As he indulged so little in self-revelation and in fact revealed so little in any permanent form which could be recognized as portraying him, it was very appropriate for a group of those who knew him well to essay his portrait in the form of the series of essays in this book. The chief designer and editor of this volume was Ruth Anna Fisher, who carried out one of Dr. Jameson's great projects as its European director discovering documents relating to American history and procuring copies for the collections of the Library of
Congress. She and thirteen associates prepared the chapters of this book which present a very real and complete portrait of this great scholar.

It was my privilege to be in a position to receive his friendly counsel and to return my gratitude for it over a period of fifteen years. Like Mr. Mearns I have the final recollection of visiting him at his home while he was hopefully nursing the expectation of returning to the Library of Congress. I also found him sitting straight up in bed, at work, with a kindly smile for his visitor. Historians, scholars, and those others who try to discover the depths of character, particularly of those who for obscure reasons try to hide them, owe much to Miss Fisher and her associates. There is only one thing to be regretted and that is that the excellent photograph printed on the jacket is not bound in the book.

University of Pennsylvania

Roy F. Nichols

Lights Along the Delaware. By Marion Willis Rivinus and Katharine Hansell Biddle. (Philadelphia: Dorrance & Company, 1965. x, 114 p. $3.00.)

This is a story of the great houses that lined the Pennsylvania side of the Delaware River from Torresdale to Bristol, and of their counterparts on Radcliffe Street in Bristol itself. The period emphasized is the Victorian, and the book includes an essay on how wealthy Victorians lived in their well-staffed mansions and on their carefully groomed country estates. Many interesting customs are recorded.

To each of the houses is given a brief section wherein each one is described, its various ownerships mentioned, and much valuable data of a biographical and genealogical sort is detailed. These sections are rich in anecdote and preserve in print many amusing episodes of the past. In a broader sense, the development of the Torresdale area is outlined so that, all in all, this book represents a worth-while contribution to local history.

The authors quite properly admire the old Delaware River homesteads and deplore the sad fate that has overcome many of them. As they say: “Beautiful Victorian mansions still standing along this river stand beside once beautiful mansions that have been allowed to deteriorate, or they stand by empty lots where landmarks have been destroyed because of lack of interest and a lack of civic responsibility.” Regretting that “the lights are going out one by one” in the Victorian mansions that remain, the authors have rendered a service in composing this book as a memorial to the flush times of a bygone era. Their book is truly a labor of love for its proceeds are to be donated to Historic Fallsington, the organization created to preserve the historic homes and buildings in the quaint colonial village of Fallsington.

Historical Society of Pennsylvania

Nicholas B. Wainwright
Historical Manuscript Depositories in Pennsylvania. Compiled by Irwin Richman. (Harrisburg: The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1965. iii, 73 p. Index. $1.00.)

Over the years the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission has produced many valuable aids to historical scholarship. Here is another and much needed addition. The Historical Manuscript Depositories in Pennsylvania lists, with brief descriptions of their collections, 105 Pennsylvania repositories which own historical manuscript materials on both Pennsylvania and American history.

The information provided for each institution is certainly adequate for an introductory survey. It includes the address, the name of the director or librarian, the extent of the collections as measured in cubic feet, and the availability of copying services, if any. The manner in which a depository's manuscripts are organized and arranged is also indicated. For obvious reasons no effort has been made to present an exhaustive enumeration of the materials housed in all of the various institutions, particularly where guides to the collections are available. But for some of the smaller depositories the major holdings are helpfully listed in considerable detail.

Mr. Richman's title and his foreword indicate that his work is primarily a guide to the manuscript depositories in Pennsylvania, not a detailed guide to the collections in them. But since holdings are listed for most institutions, one may, at the possible risk of caviling, raise a question about the omission of certain classes of research materials. Not included are state, county, or municipal records, a depository's own institutional holdings, or photographic reproductions of manuscripts. The omission of microfilms and photostats might be explained by the availability of catalogues and the problem of duplication, but the greatly increased use of filmed manuscripts might have justified their inclusion. There come to mind, for example, the huge collection of photostats on the Susquehanna Company at the Wyoming Historical and Geological Society, in Wilkes-Barre, and the Papers of the Continental Congress, a project of the National Archives Microfilm Publications, located at the Independence National Historical Park in Philadelphia.

There is no question as to the value and importance of Mr. Richman's work. He and the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission are to be commended for an accomplishment that will considerably ease the path of scholars in search of primary source materials in Pennsylvania.

Temple University


It is almost thirty years since the late Henry Charlton Beck first published his two books on the Forgotten Towns of Southern New Jersey.
Beck, a Camden, New Jersey, newspaperman, was on the staff of the *Camden Courier-Post*, in which the material comprised in the books first appeared. Beck's method of writing was to mix folk lore, tradition, and personal interviews with a little history so as to make a good story, and his books are still fascinating reading. Much of the current interest in the local history of Southern New Jersey stems from the work of Mr. Beck.

The present volume, *Historic South Jersey Towns*, has something in common with the works of Mr. Beck. The author, William McMahon, is also a newspaperman, but this time in Atlantic City, and the articles comprising the book were first published in the columns of the *Atlantic City Press*. The territory embraced in McMahon's book, the counties of Atlantic, Cape May, Cumberland, and Salem, is less than that included in Beck, but within their common area both men often write of the same town. And it is particularly in these stories concerning the same towns that the sober, factual writing of McMahon stands out in contrast to the vivid, often lurid, tales of Beck.

In *Historic South Jersey Towns*, Mr. McMahon tells of all of the important towns and many of the lesser ones within the area covered by the book. As might be expected of a book which originally appeared in an Atlantic City newspaper, the coverage of each county is not equal. Almost half the book is devoted to Atlantic County. Cape May County takes up about a third and only one sixth of the book concerns the important counties of Salem and Cumberland. The text is arranged alphabetically by counties, with a short history of each county preceding the discussion of the towns contained therein. The town histories are, in general, adequate. They are brief and have been written with due regard to facts and with a minimum use of folk lore and tradition.

*Historic South Jersey Towns*, which is issued by the Press Publishing Company of Atlantic City, is a volume bound in an attractive, but substantial paper cover. It is well illustrated with reproductions of old photographs and wood cuts. The illustrations are well chosen and reasonably well reproduced and add greatly to the value of the book. One omission that is to be regretted is that no map of the area is included. Such a map would be invaluable to one who, like this reviewer, is only a summer resident of one of the coastal resorts and whose knowledge of the location of many of the towns is limited.

This book is a good example of "popular history." In it Mr. McMahon blazes no new trails, makes no new discoveries, but he tells, in a simple style, the stories of some of the oldest and some of the newest towns of New Jersey. It is a book which will be valuable to residents of the area covered, and to those who spend their vacations in the various resorts of Atlantic and Cape May counties.

*Historical Society of Pennsylvania*  
J. Harcourt Givens
A Collection of Upwards of Thirty Thousand Names of Germans, Swiss, Dutch, French, and other Immigrants in Pennsylvania From 1727-1776.


The zeal exhibited by the Genealogical Publishing Company in making available once more out-of-print basic source material is commendable and to be encouraged. But the value of perpetuating this particular work is open to question. First published in 1856, and again in 1876, it stimulated the interest of Americans of German and Swiss descent in establishing the arrival of their immigrant ancestors. So popular was it that a third version, supplemented by post-Revolutionary lists (1786-1808), and a last name index (lacking in Rupp's editions), appeared in 1890 as Volume XVII of the Second Series of The Pennsylvania Archives. Uncritical and eager for information, searchers referring to these three versions accepted unquestioningly the form and context of Rupp's lists. Until 1934, when the Pennsylvania-German Society, in the three-volume Pennsylvania German Pioneers, published all the extant original lists, newly examined, analyzed, translated, and properly indexed by the Rev. William John Hinke, the Rupp lists stood as the definitive work on Pennsylvania-German immigration ship lists. Today they are chiefly curiosities to which no serious, knowledgeable researcher should refer.

This is not to belittle Rupp's pioneering work, but he labored in a period when few practiced critical analysis and interpretation of historical documents. In his eagerness to publicize the lists, Rupp failed completely to understand or appreciate the significance of all the original material he examined. His treatment of the three sets of lists—the captains' lists and the two signature lists—was entirely arbitrary. Failing to reproduce exactly even one set of original lists, he altered the headings, the arrangement and spelling of names, completely omitted ages and the names of all females. He misread the names of ships and their captains, merged lists and was unable to decipher correctly many passengers' names. The perpetuation of these errors and other deficiencies, all clearly demonstrated in the Introduction to Pennsylvania German Pioneers, will only entrap the unwary.

The present reprint, reproducing by photo-lithography Rupp's 1876 edition, is slightly enlarged from the original, presumably to facilitate reading, but retains original pagination. A last name index, published in Leipzig in 1931, follows the usual German form of running lines, rather than the standard columnar form. Sturdily bound, the book unfortunately will probably last as long as did Rupp's editions. Without detracting from the basically sound purpose of the publishers in presenting this particular work, one can only hope that in future they will exercise more discrimination in the selection of titles for reprinting.

Philadelphia

Hannah Benner Roach