BOOK REVIEWS


In the opening words of the first volume of The British Empire before the American Revolution, begun in 1924, first published in 1936, and since revised, Professor Gipson wrote: "The American Declaration of Independence of the year 1776 presents a terrible indictment of the British Crown and the system of government supporting the old Empire. . . ." The emotional climate of 1776 had made "a detached, unbiased view of the spirit and genius of the old British Empire" impossible, but the author was then setting out to provide such a view (p. vii). He has now nearly completed this life's work. Only a final volume which will include a survey of the parts of the Empire still loyal in 1776, as well as essays on historiography and bibliography, is yet to come. At the end of the twelfth volume he returns at last to the Declaration of Independence, and in a few measured paragraphs shows how well he has held through forty years' labor to a consistent point of view. Here one feels his compassion for the old Empire, especially for its "genius and spirit," being firmly controlled by an even stronger passion for balance, equity, and objectivity. This struggle between sympathy and integrity has been apparent from the beginning, and there are times when it seems to have drained the author, leaving him without the will for artistry. But the struggle has also driven him to carry out a plan of research that is staggering, and the result—like an enormous building whose design and construction are open to criticism at many points, but whose total effect defies criticism—must be accepted as a transcendent work of historical art.

These two volumes begin with the repeal of the Stamp Act, and contain almost a thousand pages on the decade that followed this seminal crisis. Throughout, the author directs our attention toward the problems faced by the British government, the formulation of policies to deal with the problems, and the reaction to the policies within the colonies. In considering the colonial reaction, Professor Gipson is especially concerned with the relations between colonies and between regions within colonies. He is fascinated by a society whose land and boundary quarrels, rent wars and Regulators, give it the appearance of anarchy, but which achieves a remarkable unity in only a few years, all without any noticeable weakening of anarchic tendencies. He does not explain the phenomenon, for that is not his style; instead, he
describes it with care for detail, giving only an occasional paragraph or two to his own considered thoughts.

There is little that is genuinely new in these volumes, for they cover a decade literally filled with two generations of monographic studies completed since he began his work. He has digested these studies, and has also found time to read most of the printed and manuscript documents on which they are based. No thirst for novelty keeps him from retelling the old stories, nor from once again dissecting documents so famous that some of us neglect to read them. Every page is, at least, a factual and bibliographical reference, though sparkling new insights are not to be expected. In fact, some of the weakest spots in these volumes occur when the author engages in the conventional form of small-scale interpretation (for example, XI, pp. 51 and 145; XII, pp. 74-75).

The true originality of the work lies in its scrupulous and thorough marshalling of evidence. Nothing is taken for granted or passed over quickly in professional shorthand. Everything is spelled out, and the cumulative effect is often compelling. As we plod, day by day, through the political talk and tactics of the winter and spring of 1767, we begin to appreciate the Parliamentary popularity of Charles Townshend in a way that even his biographers do not convey. Or, as we read, one after another, extracts and summaries from the Boston press of 1773, we begin to doubt our initial dislike of the author's choice of title for the chapter—"Tea and the Climate of Sedition." Written by any historian with less confidence in his aim and method, these books could be dull; as Professor Gipson has written them, they are no duller than the repetition, symmetry, and bulk of the British Museum. When concentration falters, the reader remembers that the subject is complex, and knows that he—not the author—is getting dull.

Within the tetralogy which Professor Gipson has written, these two volumes are part of the fourth and, architecturally speaking, most difficult book: "The Triumphant Empire." It is most difficult because the first three books, eight volumes in all, are a history of the coming and waging of the Great War for the Empire, a subject with natural coherence; but at a higher level it must be the later War of the Revolution that gives point to the whole enterprise. Only by treating the second war as the "aftermath" of the first can the focus of the entire work be justified. Yet, by doing this, the author raises a serious problem for himself, in that the climax of the story must somehow be made to turn on the paradox of triumph and collapse. Imperial collapse would seem to be the essence of the Revolution, but Professor Gipson, as the subtitle of this fourth Book suggests, is drawn toward the Empire Triumphant in order best to explicate its "spirit and genius." To say that he never completely solves his problem is less a judgment than a recognition of the unusual difficulty of his aesthetic and explanatory task.
His search for a solution has led him back, not to George Bancroft, but to Thomas Hutchinson, with whose outlook and historiography Professor Gipson is clearly sympathetic. He has finally rejected the label “American Revolution” in favor of “War for American Independence,” and he has also found the metaphor of parent and child illuminating. This metaphor is older than the event itself, and the two labels describe radically opposed ways of seeing that event. By exhuming the metaphor and choosing one label over the other, he has dealt with his paradox in one of the few ways available; that is, he has imposed on it a framework which is recognizably Tory.

Never before has a historian so persuasively presented the view that the Americans were mad; that their rage had no just relation to their grievances, nor their fears to their perils; that—like children—their demand for “independence” had a depth of motivation barely exposed by the long, loud wrangle with the mother country. Professor Gipson understands the parent as an attractively human mixture of faults and virtues, whose intrinsic worth is proved by its success and by the admiration which it excited everywhere. But he frankly does not understand the children. Their behavior can be described, and they may even be accepted for what they have become, but they cannot be explained by the means normally available to parents and historians. They are quite simply bent on achieving “independence,” whether they admit or even realize it themselves. At times, like any good parent who wonders where all went wrong, the author asks how and with what consequences Britain might have avoided this mistake or made that concession; but at heart he seems to know that it is enough to tell the story of a fairly decent parent plagued by offspring who are as ungrateful, willful, and wild as they are strong, handsome, and full of talent. Like the monstrous adolescent imbalance of psyche and physique, the American Revolution must be seen as a form of madness.

There may be those who will receive The British Empire before the American Revolution as the last monument of an “imperial school” of historians whose day has already passed. That, however, would be a mistake. Gordon Wood, in a brilliant article (William and Mary Quarterly, Volume XXIII) has argued, correctly I think, for the unique value of the Tory view in shaking us free from our habit of seeing the Revolution in rationalistic terms, whether the categories are those of principle or self-interest. Only as we learn to see, as Governor Hutchinson and Professor Gipson have seen, that much of what happened does not make sense will we be able to achieve a new depth of historical comprehension. Professor Gipson, by going further than the rest of us could in acquiring, sustaining, and controlling this single point of view, has placed himself and his work on the leading edge of historical inquiry.

Princeton University  
John Shy

This book is one of an eighteen-volume series on the American frontier from 1492 to 1960, edited by Ray Allan Billington. Naturally, most of the other volumes deal with specific phases of nineteenth-century frontier expansion. Mr. Leach has been given the unenviable task of compressing 150 years of early frontier development, from Maine to Pennsylvania, into 200 pages. As Billington notes in his Foreword, western historians normally begin their story with Daniel Boone. This volume on the pre-Boone Atlantic coastal frontier helps explain why. The early New England, New York, and Pennsylvania pioneers worked their way inland slowly and circumspectly, with none of the dash and daring of the first Spanish and French pioneers, or the post-1763 American pioneers. If Mr. Leach wished to stage a romantic epic (which he doesn’t), he would have had a hard time doing so. There were no Puritan Davy Crocketts or Quaker Kit Carsons. Colonial Americans faced east rather than west, and they were reluctant to cross the Appalachians until all available coastal land had been settled. The immense extent of the interior wilderness intimidated them more perhaps than did the Indians or the French. Mr. Leach concludes his survey of northern colonial frontier expansion by rejecting Frederick Jackson Turner’s contention that these early pioneers exhibited the democratic individualism and pugnacity of nineteenth-century frontiersmen. He observes: “a distinct frontier society with its significant characteristics was very slow to emerge out of the seedbed of a transplanted European culture. Not until well into the eighteenth century do we begin to find a fairly sharp differentiation between society in general and the peculiar society of the frontier.” He argues, correctly I believe, that the colonial frontier settlers were more influenced by their European heritage than by their American wilderness environment.

Mr. Leach’s book is useful as the first connected history of the northern colonial frontier. He is, of course, eminently qualified for this task. His Flintlock and Tomahawk (1958) is a first-class history of King Philip’s War. In this second book, he has digested and synthesized a great mass of monographic literature, and drawn repeatedly on his own archival research. Yet there are few surprises in Mr. Leach’s narrative. No doubt, because he has to cover so much ground, his book has much the character of a textbook. He does the best he can to tie together developments in New England, New York, and Pennsylvania, but the story of the eighteenth-century Pennsylvania frontier cannot be understood without reference to southern developments which are relegated to another volume in this series. Obviously, the migration movement along the Susquehanna needs to be discussed in conjunction with the southward thrust into the Great Valley of Virginia and the Carolina back country. The parallel Indian crises of 1675–
1676 in New England and the Chesapeake also call for co-ordinated treatment, as do the mid-eighteenth-century competitive schemes of Virginia and Pennsylvania land speculators for expansion into the Ohio Valley. Mr. Leach might have made fuller use of cultural anthropological techniques in trying to reconstruct the role of the Indians. His account of frontier religion (dismissing the Great Awakening in one paragraph) is certainly inadequate. On the other hand, his two chapters on the fur trade are excellent, and he summarizes the complexities of land appropriation and land speculation in the various northern colonies adroitly. The well-designed maps are most helpful, as are the extensive bibliographical notes.

University of Pennsylvania

Richard S. Dunn


In late years, the early legal history of Massachusetts has received special attention. In 1960, George Lee Haskins published Law and Authority in Early Massachusetts, in which the first two decades of the Massachusetts Bay Colony were studied; the following year saw the appearance of Joseph H. Smith's Colonial Justice in Western Massachusetts, 1639–1702; and in 1966 two books were issued, Kai T. Erikson's Wayward Puritans and the one here reviewed, dealing with both the Bay Colony and the Plymouth Colony from their beginnings until they were merged into one province by a Royal Order of 1691.

The book comes as a pleasant surprise to this reviewer. Having known the author for thirty-five years, as member of the New York bar, psychologist at the state prison of Norfolk, Massachusetts, in the early thirties, college teacher of psychology and criminology, director of the famous Cambridge-Somerville “experiment in the prevention of juvenile delinquency,” resulting in a book by that title that he co-authored, and, finally, as deputy director of the Massachusetts state department of corrections, I have nevertheless been unaware of his deep concern with the history of criminal law and punishments evidenced by this book, which Dr. Powers is so well qualified to pursue both by legal training, scholarly preparation, and administrative experience.

The title of the book does not completely describe its contents. In a prologue, the author indicates that he wishes to show not only how the two colonies were established and how they developed their own statutes of criminal law and procedure, but also how that legislation “has left its imprint on the present administration of criminal justice in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.” This aim leads him to illustrate, whenever practicable, this influence by pertinent references to developments in more
recent times, and to compare, in a lengthy appendix, the civil rights and liberties of the Bay Colony with those of the Commonwealth today.

The first four chapters relate the history of the founding of the two colonies and describe their administrative and judicial organization and their legislation concerning civil rights and liberties. A chapter on the relationship of church and state deals, among other matters, with the cases of Roger Williams, Anne Hutchinson, John Wheelwright and the Anabaptists, all of whom fell victims to the religious intolerance of the Puritan fathers. That attitude survived the colonies, because, the author notes parenthetically, a conviction for blasphemy was upheld by the state's supreme court as late as 1838, and Catholic inmates of the state prison could not receive the services of chaplains of their own faith until 1875.

Other chapters are devoted to corporal punishments: of which whipping was the most common; fines and humiliating penalties, such as the stocks and the pillory; the colonial jail and the penalty of death. The history of the prosecution of Quakers and the trials and punishment of witches are dealt with in two chapters. These chapters describe the manner in which drunkenness and alcoholism were treated, the most common crimes and penalties, and the workings of the system of criminal justice. Some idea of the character of crimes and penalties may be gained from the statistics of criminal cases in the court of assistants during 1630–1640. Of 277, drunkenness led the list with sixty-two, followed by thirty-three cases of "villifying authorities," twenty cases of "lewd, lascivious and wanton behavior," nineteen of stealing, sixteen of fornication, sixteen of liquor law violations, thirteen of "avoiding jury duty, etc.," and eleven of swearing. There were only five cases of assault and battery, and three murders. The most common punishment was a fine (131 cases), whipping (76), stocks or pillory (24), banishment (15), posting of peace bond (11), imprisonment (10), but admonition, restitution, disenfranchisement, public avowal, wearing a placard or letter, branding, and cropping ears occurred, and the three murderers were executed. The similarity of these punishments to those in use in western Europe, and particularly in England, is obvious, as is the absence of the most gruesome of the latter.

Altogether this is a scholarly and well-documented study.

University of Pennsylvania

THORSTEN SELLIN

Penn Family Recipes: Cooking Recipes of Wm. Penn's Wife Gulielma with an Account of the Life of Gulielma Maria Springett Penn, 1644–1694. By EVELYN ABRAHAM BENSON. (York, Pa.: George Shumway, Publisher, 1966. vi, 213 p. Illustrations. $7.95.)

Whatever motive Edward Blackfan had in transcribing the Penn Family Recipes, he deserves our gratitude for preserving them from oblivion. And Evelyn Benson is due more than a gesture of thanks for rendering Mr.
Blackfan’s copy into plain English. We can well believe that the transcriber wrote “in great hast.” But an added obstacle was the seventeenth-century spelling, the abbreviations, and the custom of making an “f” like an “s” and an “e” like an “o.” It takes patience for accuracy and enthusiasm for knowledge to complete such a task.

How right the author is in regarding the recipes as important historical material! For every detail in any department of the daily life of the past enriches our knowledge of the period in question.

We can imagine ourselves at the long dinner table where the family partook of the “rost leg of mutten” or the “frigasy of chicken,” and in the kitchen where a “Fansey of Apells” was being prepared for dessert. We can sit in spirit before the fire at tea time with Mrs. Penn. The direction for “a lofe cut in the midell” whets our appetite: “buter it with sweet buter and sugar, then lay the 2 halfes together and keep it warme by thee till you eat it.”

Unfortunately, there is far too little told about the lovely Guli herself, the owner of the recipes. We wish for much greater detail about this well-born, wealthy Englishwoman, outstanding because she was the first love and the first wife of the great William Penn, and also because she was one of the early members of the Society of Friends.

But the lack of information is not the fault of Evelyn Benson. Material in the way of letters, diaries, or references to Gulielma Springett Penn in the records of the Sussex Friends is missing. The author is to be congratulated upon her skill in bringing the few facts about Gulielma Penn’s life and spiritual influence that are known into juxtaposition with the recorded activities of her famous husband and other conspicuous Friends. Thus has she given this “excelling person, both as Child, Wife, Mother, Mistress, Friend and Neighbour” a place in the pages of history.

Philadelphia

Sophie H. Drinker

Religion and the American Mind: From the Great Awakening to the Revolution.


In all of Perry Miller’s writings about the intellectual life of early America, there is just one pregnant but all-too-brief article on the crucial period between the Great Awakening and the Revolution, “From the Covenant to the Revival” in the first volume of Religion in American Life (Princeton, 1961). A student of Miller’s, Alan Heimert, has now filled this gap. Professor Heimert has not only perpetuated Miller’s point of view and standards of scholarly excellence, but he has also offered the most stimulating discussion of the significance of the Great Awakening yet to appear and a revisionist interpretation of the nature of the American Revolution.
Professor Heimert argues that the American Revolution must be understood as a religious movement if the historian is to grasp the dynamic forces which toppled British government in America and altered the social structure of the individual colonies. The Revolutionary generation, he says, inherited an intellectual cleavage which was first clearly articulated during the Great Awakening. Indeed, the Revolution may have been only “an incidental episode” in the struggle between the two camps which appeared during the 1740’s. On one side were the “Calvinists,” the evangelists who emphasized the tradition of piety in seventeenth-century Puritanism and whose chief spokesman was Jonathan Edwards. Arrayed against them were the “Liberals,” such “Arminians” as Charles Chauncy and Jonathan Mayhew, who transformed Puritan rationalism into a sort of Lockean creed. These two groups were spokesmen for an intellectual division which ran through colonial society. The Liberals represented the “better sort” who had received a gentlemanly education and were inclined to the rationalism of the eighteenth century. The Calvinists articulated the deeply felt passions of the rest of American society. In examining the debate between these two parties, an exchange lasting from the Great Awakening through the Revolutionary period, Professor Heimert drastically revises the generally accepted view of the role of the liberal clergy in the Revolution. He sees the Liberals as profoundly elitist and conservative, more interested in holding the populace in check than in encouraging the break with England. It was not the Liberal but the Calvinist clergymen that were the ideological heralds and the leaders of Revolutionary agitation. The Calvinists gradually transformed their religious doctrines into political principles that not only justified independence from England but fostered the unity of the American colonies and encouraged the reordering of colonial society upon a more democratic footing. Equally important, the Calvinist clergy stirred the rank and file to action with the rhetorical techniques they had developed at the time of the Awakening. The Liberals were fundamentally Tory in their outlook, Heimert argues, while the allegedly conservative Calvinists developed a political philosophy “that stands as the American counterpart of the writings of Rousseau.”

Although Religion and the American Mind will remain the standard work on the role of religion in the American Revolution for many years to come, there are several areas where Professor Heimert’s thesis will have to be amplified, and perhaps revised. The scope of the book is not so all-encompassing as the title suggests, since only the Puritan mind is actually analyzed. Puritanism is certainly the most important single fiber of the American mind, but the contributions of such sectarian bodies as the Quakers, or such non-Calvinist churches as the Church of England, or even the Lutheran Churches should not be overlooked. Professor Heimert also has too strong a bias towards New England. He generally portrays the leaders of the Presbyterian and Baptist clergy in the Middle and Southern colonies as mere parrots of the Puritan tradition as it was expressed in New
England. It does not seem unreasonable to postulate that the ethnic and religious diversity south of New England forced the intellectual leaders there to reinterpret their Puritan and Calvinist heritage in highly significant ways, and that the differences which resulted were also of the utmost significance for the American mind.

Temple University

Martin E. Lodge


This index volume brings to a close a monumental publication of sources for American colonial history from 1738 to 1774, and supplies the one deficiency which reviewers have lamented almost unanimously as each successive volume made its appearance. For, despite the subtitle, General Index, which this volume bears, there was no index in any of the preceding volumes. Indeed, there was not even a table of contents listing the papers published until 1962, when Volume XIII concluded with a Chronological List of Documents. Historians and anthropologists have had to pore over page after page, making lists of their own, doubtless gleaning from context some illuminating information which no index could suggest, but working without any clues to specific data. At last, their task has been lightened; the lack of an index has been handsomely rectified in this substantial volume.

The Papers of Sir William Johnson might be regarded solely as basic sources for biographical study of a major colonial figure, but they are certainly much more than that. His varied activities as landowner and land speculator, as Indian trader and agent, as a general in the French and Indian War, and as British Superintendent of Indian Affairs make his papers a seemingly inexhaustible mine of data on the Indians and on colonial life and politics during his period. Probably no man before or since has known and understood the Iroquois better than Johnson. His papers have countless bits of information about them and other Indians, and enough tantalizing data on their life and customs to make modern students of the Indians wish that he had set down on paper more of his firsthand knowledge.

The State of New York acquired the basic collection of the Johnson Papers between 1800 and 1866, accumulating twenty-six volumes of manuscripts in the New York State Library. Some of the more important documents were published in 1849–1850 in the Documentary History of the State of New York, Volumes II and IV; and others were published after 1855 in several volumes of Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York. To avoid duplication, these documents already published were omitted from The Papers of Sir William Johnson, and so they are not
covered in detail by the General Index. However, they are included in the Chronological List in Volume XIII, and the earlier volumes have cross-reference notes and summaries of their contents which the index apparently does cover.

Work on the preparation of this great documentary publication began before 1907, and some of the Johnson Papers were actually in galley proof when the New York Capitol fire of 1911 destroyed or damaged many of the manuscripts. The first volume finally came off the press in 1921, and others appeared in regular succession to 1931, when Volume VIII was published. These eight volumes ranging from 1737/8 to 1775 covered Johnson's entire career. The losses from fire, however, had led to a search for Johnson documents in other libraries and depositories. By the time Volume VIII was issued so much new material had been found that four additional volumes were projected, covering the same date range as the first eight. Volumes IX-XII, which might be called a second series, were published from 1939 to 1957. Meanwhile, still more material came to light and brought the publication of Volume XIII in 1962, with its contents ranging from 1738 to 1788. The high editorial standards which had prevailed throughout the more than four decades of publication were maintained and even refined by Dr. Milton W. Hamilton, who edited the final four volumes and brought the work to an altogether successful conclusion.

In the preparation of the index, some limitations obviously had to be imposed to keep it within bounds, and even to make it possible at all. The present editor and the indexer had to depend largely on notes and identifications made by earlier editors; it would have required a full-scale research project to dispose completely of all the vague or inconsistent items. Cross-references had to be limited, and arbitrary choices had to be made among the numerous variant spellings of Indian names. This means that researchers may find it necessary to do some further searching in the index and in the Papers after checking the obvious index entries, but they still have good reason to feel grateful for this valuable aid. It staggers the imagination to think of the work involved in going through and compiling entries in the many thousand pages of sources with myriads of names of persons and places in a bewildering variety of spellings. No complaint about omissions or failures to make cross-reference could be justified under the circumstances. Within its limitations, the General Index is a remarkable achievement and reflects great credit on the indexer, Mrs. Roberta Blaché.

Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission

DONALD H. KENT


John Woolman (1720-1772) was born at Rancocas, in Burlington County, West Jersey, the fourth child and eldest son of a Quaker couple, three years
before his well-known contemporary Benjamin Franklin arrived in the Delaware Valley from Boston. Woolman worked at several occupations, but is best remembered as a tailor at Mt. Holly. Recorded as a Friends minister in 1743, he traveled among Friends from New England to the Carolinas, but especially in the Middle Colonies, preaching in meeting and visiting Quaker families. He lived a quiet, largely uneventful life cut short by smallpox in 1772 when he died in York, England, while on his only overseas journey.

Thus it is indeed strange, at least on the surface, to find John Woolman listed in the “Great American Thinkers” series along with Jonathan Edwards, Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, John C. Calhoun, William James, Thorstein Veblen and others. Woolman made no pretensions to intellectual prowess, and was perhaps slightly suspicious of “thinking” as opposed to “feeling.” Unlike the other men discussed in this new series, John Woolman did not write many books, and when he had finished his first serious writing, Some Considerations on the Keeping of Negroes..., he laid it aside for several years before submitting it for possible publication by Friends.

The author, in his subtitle, refers to Woolman as a “Quaker Saint,” and then, feeling defensive about this label, quotes Rufus M. Jones to strengthen his case. In an “Introit,” Cady makes it clear that in calling Woolman a saint he means that he was a prophet, a visionary, one seeking to be completely faithful to his spiritual insights, and adds, “Woolman speaks intimately, profoundly to our condition... He is a genuine American saint.”

John Woolman is rightly remembered for his Journal, first published in Philadelphia in 1774, and kept in print to the present. His most famous editor was John Greenleaf Whittier who published an edition in 1871, and his most dedicated editor was Amelia Mott Gummere who brought out a well-annotated edition in 1922. Today, Professor Phillips Moulton of Adrian College is preparing a new edition. The author of this biographical study has excerpted large sections from the Journal in his text, and classes the Journal with Franklin’s Autobiography, Henry David Thoreau’s Walden, Walt Whitman’s Democratic Vistas, and The Education of Henry Adams.

Cady compares Edwards, Franklin, and Woolman, and suggests that in his way, in his area of importance, Woolman ranks with the others. Furthermore, he discusses the impact of Woolman upon nineteenth-century literary figures such as Whittier, Whitman, and Thoreau. In his final two chapters he suggests that contemporary writers James Baldwin and Martin Luther King have much in common with the eighteenth-century Woolman.

This stimulating study of the impact of John Woolman on his own time, and on our own time, is well worth reading. As a historian, the reviewer cannot refrain from referring to the dangers of taking a man out of one context and placing him in another, but he must admit that in this case it produces a stimulating essay. The historian must add that although this slender volume adds little to historical scholarship, it will make Woolman
better known to contemporary readers, and it provides interesting insight into today's problems.

Haverford College

EDWIN B. BRONNER

The Arts in America: The Colonial Period. By LOUIS B. WRIGHT, GEORGE B. TATUM, JOHN W. MCCOUBREY, and ROBERT C. SMITH. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1966. xvi, 368 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. $15.00.)

All ye who upon art-and-antiques picture books have come to cast a weary and a wary eye, take heart. This new survey is not a random muster of illustrations fleshed out with perfunctory verbiage. It is purposeful, authoritative, and coherent. Four noted scholars have united to produce an intelligent definition of the foundations of American architecture, painting, and decorative arts, each area consistently related to the others and to the background of American life and thought. The three divisions of the book are preceded by an essay, "From Wilderness to Republic, 1607 to 1787," in which Louis B. Wright, always aware and felicitous, provides as foundation for them a brief and charming review of the regional patterns of social history in these years, and, most important of all, the emergence of taste, American in character.

Following this prelude from the Director of the Folger Shakespeare Library, Drs. Tatum, McCoubrey, and Smith, all colleagues at the University of Pennsylvania (and, I suspect, taking advantage of that common ground to effect a more concerted effort), have written, respectively, their summaries of our architecture, painting, and decorative arts. Each of the three is assigned about equal space, and an about equal share of the 274 illustrations. It is difficult to evaluate them one against another, but that on architecture will probably be adjudged the most satisfactory. Certainly, the subject lends itself more readily to concise treatment than in the others, where a greater selectivity is necessary. The architecture of the Floridas and Southwest is first discussed, followed by the succession of styles and influences on the Atlantic seaboard. Architectural terminology is both used and explained, and the whole is an excellent introduction for the lay reader. The section on painting touches, very properly, also on sculpture and engraving. Here and in decorative arts, material has been selected both to identify individual artists and craftsmen of importance and to characterize the regional developments.

This handsome volume is intended for the general reader, who will find it an enjoyable and informed introduction to connoisseurship. It is not intended as a handbook or guide, though the excellent illustrations alone give it much value of that sort. The bibliography is brief and carefully selected. A well-organized index unites the whole. For the specialist, it is a model of this type of presentation. The stated objective of its publishers has been to
establish beyond cavil the fundamental worth of traditional American art, and in this it will surely be successful. American culture has been characterized by a wider diffusion than in Europe, and a lack of points of concentrated wealth and taste. Our art reflects a democratic and utilitarian view. Sophistication followed usefulness rather than luxury, yet always with a restraint, balance, and sincerity which should be recognized today, and cherished in future.

Dickinson College

Charles Coleman Sellers


The Colonial Experience is an impressive achievement. Based on wide reading in both primary and secondary sources, and sustained by a powerful narrative form that carries the reader along with remarkable ease, it stands on balance as a brilliant synthesis of the colonial era. Professor Hawke relies frequently, when offering conclusions, presenting summary statements and judging interpretations, on the views of eminent authorities in the field. Even more often, however, he draws on the writings of contemporaries. Commenting on who came to America and why, Hawke states that emigration “was not a mass movement, but one in which each individual made his own private and personal choice”; he goes on to document this by quoting such seventeenth-century figures as Roger Williams, Richard Mather, Thomas Shepherd, William Byrd, and George Alsop. For the reader, this directness imparts a sense of immediacy and involvement. The result is history at its best—alive, exciting, and meaningful.

After an imaginative examination of European culture on the eve of expansion, in which he tries to suggest what of the Old World was brought over and became a part of the New, Hawke proceeds to a discussion of the founding of the English colonies in North America. The Chesapeake colonies and the New England colonies are introduced as distinct regions, while the proprietary provinces, excluding Maryland, are handled in a single chapter. Having established the colonies, Hawke then summarizes the state of colonial society at the close of the seventeenth century. A chapter is devoted to the unsettled conditions, the stresses and the strains, that prevailed throughout much of English America between 1675 and 1690. A second chapter contains a superb description of “America at the End of the Seventeenth Century.” Imperial affairs, 1689–1763, are discussed in the two succeeding chapters. Before passing on to the post Seven Years’ War period, Hawke writes first of “The American Mind in the Eighteenth Century” and then of “Life in Eighteenth-Century America.” The last four chapters (there are sixteen in all) cover the years from 1763 to 1789, with the final section treating the events surrounding the adoption of the Constitution of 1787.
The strength of this volume rests not merely in its comprehensiveness. While basically traditional in its approach, it surpasses all other one-volume surveys of colonial America in the richness of its detail and in its depth of understanding. One senses that the guide on this journey through the first two centuries of American history has steeped himself in the literature and is able to speak with authority on major problems.

In an undertaking as ambitious as this, there is bound to be room for disagreement. Readers may wish to quarrel with Professor Hawke on questions of interpretation or perhaps over errors both of commission and omission. Thus, the close attention to the international environment and the rival empires in the New World makes all the more glaring the failure to include the English West Indian colonies in this history. And Hawke might have developed more extensively than he does the observation that at the beginning of the seventeenth century "English culture was by no means fixed." Too little is made of the fact that English practices and institutions were highly fluid at that moment when overseas expansion got underway.

In many respects, the least satisfying section of The Colonial Experience is that dealing with the American Revolution, precisely where one would expect Professor Hawke to be at his best. He is, for example, uncertain just how to assess the internal aspects of the Revolution. On the whole, he leans toward the view that "no internal upheaval occurred in the new nation, either during or after the war." But he also believes that "no event that led to the migration from America of some one hundred thousand of the 'better sort' of people . . . can be called a 'conservative' movement." He writes (p. 608) that by the beginning of 1777 "the low point of the Revolution had been passed." Later on, however, he remarks that "the mutinies of 1781 were the low-water mark of the Revolution" (p. 630).

With its handsome binding and the obvious care that went into its printing, it seems unfortunate that a number of the volume's forty-three maps (one of which is The Vinland Map, reproduced on pp. 10-11) should be of limited value. The small scale and excessive detail will impede use of those maps appearing on pp. 22, 32, 172-173, 318, and 366-367. The military maps (see, for example, "The New York-Philadelphia Campaign, 1776-1778," p. 604) are generally superior and add a great deal to the text. The lengthy bibliography, totaling more than fifty-five pages and thoughtfully annotated, will be welcomed by students at all levels. Readers may miss the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of 1787 which are not printed in the appendix. The single appendix, and it is sure to get much use, lists "The Chief Magistrates of the Thirteen Colonies and States" through the 1780's.

Professor Hawke has scored a hit. For a long time to come, beginning students, interested laymen, and specialists in early American history will be consulting this husky and rewarding volume.

Oregon State University

Darold D. Wax

Mr. Gerson has written a lively and interesting account of the life and military career of General Henry Lee. He has written for the general reading public, and he has omitted the documentation which would have been required had he been addressing himself to the professional historian. The absence of documentation makes it difficult for the reviewer to determine from what sources the author has obtained his information. It seems clear, however, that he has relied heavily upon Lee's own writings and upon those of his son, Henry Lee, Jr.

The author is correct in claiming that Lee was a brilliant leader of cavalry. Lee proved his skill and daring repeatedly in numerous battles and skirmishes fought in New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and the Carolinas. He fought as part of a military team, however, and not as a white knight who slew dragons single-handedly. The author has overlooked what the rest of the team achieved and has given Lee credit for more than his share of dragons. Lee played an important part in the campaigns in the Carolinas, for example, but it was General Nathanael Greene who decided when and where Lee was to be employed.

Lee won a number of successes at the expense of the light troops commanded by Lieutenant Colonel Banastre Tarleton. He could hardly have bested Tarleton, however, if General Daniel Morgan's army had not inflicted heavy casualties upon Tarleton's troops at the battle of Cowpens. But for some reason Mr. Gerson has failed to make any mention of Cowpens. Lee was not present at Cowpens, but Lieutenant Colonel William Washington was there at the head of a squadron of Virginia dragoons. Washington's troopers made a charge as spectacular as any of those made by Lee's dragoons during the war, drove Tarleton's cavalry from the field, and inflicted heavy casualties upon them.

Mr. Gerson's preoccupation with Lee's achievements has evidently caused him to overlook the achievements of Greene, Morgan, William Washington, and others. Washington and the dashing South Carolinian, Wade Hampton, distinguished themselves in a number of cavalry encounters with the British on occasions when Lee was not present. Lee won his share of victories but he could not be everywhere at once: Washington, Hampton, Francis Marion, and others demonstrated that they could perform creditably in his absence.

It should be added that the author has fallen into the error of overestimating the strength of the British Army. He has asserted that Cornwallis commanded an army of 10,000 to 15,000 men at the beginning of 1781 (p. 96), but British army returns in the Clinton Papers in the Clements Library reveal that the Earl had 8,500 men in his army, including garrison troops and Tory militia. Cornwallis had fewer than 2,000 officers and men.
under his command at the battle of Guilford Court House, but Mr. Gerson has stated that he had 3,000 (p. 107).

Errors such as those cited make the reviewer reluctant to recommend Mr. Gerson’s book. The book is well written, but it exaggerates Lee’s role in a number of battles and campaigns. Lee was a dashing and successful cavalry officer, but he was only one of many fine officers who served in the Continental Army.

George W. Kyte


This is an altogether delightful book, and one which reminds us that good historical writing not only pays scrupulous respect to verified fact but also employs wit, wisdom, sympathy, taste, and style. All these qualities are here.

Mrs. Lopez is assistant editor in charge of the French materials for The Papers of Benjamin Franklin, now being edited at Yale under the direction of Professor Leonard W. Labaree. She has of course drawn from the works of biographers and scholars who have previously described Franklin’s personal relationships during his years in Paris—notably Carl Van Doren’s Benjamin Franklin (the best biography), Alfred Owen Aldridge’s more recent Franklin and His French Contemporaries, and the numerous articles by Gilbert Chinard—as well as the many excellent bibliographical studies, such as Amacher’s Franklin’s Wit and Folly. But in addition to these sources, Mrs. Lopez has had at her disposal what none of her predecessors had, the Yale University Franklin Collection containing in the originals or in photocopies all the material relevant to her subject gathered from private and public collections in thirty-two states and fifteen foreign countries. By making available this enormous quantity of documents (it is estimated that the new edition will contain about 20,000 items, compared to the 1,806 in Smyth’s Writings, hitherto the most complete), and by generously sponsoring and assisting this undertaking ten years before the material could appear in the Yale Papers, Professor Labaree and his fellow editors have given Mrs. Lopez an opportunity that every Franklin and eighteenth-century scholar must envy. Their confidence has been well justified.

Mrs. Lopez has worked from the original documents, many of which are unpublished or published only in part, and without access to these originals it is not possible to make definite judgments; but every indication is that she has culled her material judiciously, has reported it faithfully, and, being both a scholar and a Frenchwoman, has translated it accurately and sensitively. She has given us a picture of Franklin’s daily life and personal relationships in a breadth, variety, and profusion of detail which we have never
had before, and it is not too much to say that her portrait of Franklin has a precision and vitality that even Van Doren and Chinard did not achieve.

Perhaps these qualities are the results of Mrs. Lopez’ peculiar qualifications for her special task. She states her method in the Preface: “Women, they say, have no special gift for synthesis but patience enough to ferret out countless details; well, let us try an intimate close-up of a man’s leisure hours.” The result is a book of female gossip, but gossip controlled by a scholar’s conscience, enlivened by wit, graced by sympathy, and well written. This may not be a method suitable for all historical writing, but it works well in this book.

One might take exception only to the title, which seems to imply both frivolity of subject and a perpetuation of the myth of the septuagenarian Franklin as a mere aging lecher. It is difficult to think of any other historical figure who in a comparable space of time or at so advanced an age accomplished so much of significance by the simple and apparently effortless power of his personality. This ailing old man, handicapped by quarrelsome and carping colleagues, by a weak government at home, and by a thieving maître d’hôtel, a secretary who was a spy, and a playboy grandson, not only inveigled the French ministry into providing first financial and then military support of the American Revolution, but at the same time virtually single-handedly established the new American republic as a partner in the culture of Western Europe and created a unique amity between two nations that has survived the vicissitudes—even the latest—of nearly two centuries. This was a miracle of personality, and one which can be explained only by an understanding of how Franklin worked with people.

Mrs. Lopez has excluded from the scope of her book “the political, economic, and philosophical aspects of Franklin’s story in France,” and has concentrated on his relations with people, especially with women. There was the pampered, talented, neurotic Madame Brillon, his neighbor at Passy, with whom he spent two evenings a week playing chess and drinking tea, who sat on his lap and called him mon cher papa, but who regretfully refused to consent to her daughter’s marriage to Temple, Franklin’s grandson. There was the ardent Comtesse d’Houdetot, whom Rousseau had loved and who was for fifty-two years the mistress of the poet Saint Lambert, and whom her protégé Crévecoeur rewarded for her enthusiastic Americanism by having her made an honorary citizen of New Haven. There was the aged Duchesse de La Rochefoucauld, whose son, at Franklin’s prompting, translated the American constitutions; there was the Comtesse de Forbach, whose two sons distinguished themselves at Yorktown; there was the Comtesse Golowkin, amie of Chastellux, general in Rochambeau’s army, academician, and author of one of the best contemporary books on the United States; and there were many others. But most important of all was Madame Helvétius, widow of the Philosophe, affectionately christened by Franklin “Notre Dame d’Auteuil,” to whom he proposed marriage. She was in her late fifties and he in his seventies, but it took Turgot’s best efforts to talk
her out of what he called her ill-advised "vagaries," and she had to flee to Tours for the summer to regain her emotional equilibrium.

But Mrs. Lopez offers us more than this sort of thing, charming as it may be. Fellow members in Madame Helvétius' "Académie d'Auteuil" were the Abbés Morellet and De La Roche, Turgot, and Cabanis, and from this group was to develop the school of Ideologues, with which Jefferson was to be so closely linked. Franklin's landlord in Passy was Jacques Donatien Leray de Chaumont, who played a large part in financing and sending supplies to the American troops. His next door neighbor was Louis Guillaume Le Veillard, who, besides introducing him to Madame Brillon, persuaded him to continue the Autobiography and was entrusted with one of the two final copies. Other close friends were Lavoisier and his wife, and Jean Baptiste Leroy, also an important scientist, whose diminutive and difficult wife Franklin called his petite femme de poche. We are told the details of Franklin's observations of the ascensions of the first balloons constructed by the Montgolfier brothers and by Jacques Charles, of his participation in the investigation by the Académie des Sciences of Mesmerism, of his weekly attendances at the Court of Versailles, and of much more. This book, far from being merely an account of Franklin's autumnal dalliances, offers a broad and characteristic picture of his friendships with aristocrats and bourgeoisie, with scientists, philosophers, artists, and everyday people, and it provides essential psychological, social, and biographical background for an understanding of the astounding accomplishments of Franklin's years in France.

Brown University

Durand Echeverria


Miss Bowen's purpose in this book is not to engage in academic controversy, nor to present fresh documentation, but rather she seeks to recreate the drama of the invention of the Constitution. Although her predilections are admittedly "Old Whig" and "Bancroftian," the author's view is her own.

Miss Bowen argues that the colonies, which had no pretensions to independent sovereignty before the Declaration of Independence and were not mentioned in that document by name, flaunted their state sovereignty after the 1783 peace was signed. This unwarranted behavior, contends the author, precipitated a crisis for the congenitally feeble Confederation that resulted in the calling of the Philadelphia Convention. In Miss Bowen's view the Framers of the Constitution rejected alike the principle and the practice of the Articles, and, displaying a willingness to reach honorable
compromise and a happy capacity for sound experimentation, these men of hope and vision produced the innovation of a federal republic to govern a vast territory democratically. State jealousies, she finds, invaded the meeting hall in conflicts concerning the apportionment of representatives, slavery, and commercial legislation. According to Miss Bowen, the crucial issue was the large and small state dispute concerning membership in Congress that threatened dissolution of the convention until the compromise of an equality in the upper house and proportionality in the lower house was reached. Although Miss Bowen maintains the Constitution was philosophically and legally a revolutionary change in government, she rejects the notion the Constitution was a conservative counterrevolution merely because the Founding Fathers sought to preserve order and protect property, and she suggests the revolution was unique in that neither a central power nor a strong man swept into power. The result of the Convention was a twofold balance of the executive and legislative powers and the states and the federal government, with the judicial branch, she feels, the umpire between them. According to the author, the Antifederalists lacked faith in this Federalist government of limited powers, but these men of restricted view or understanding could not prevent ratification of the Constitution.

Miss Bowen has produced a lively study of the creation of the Constitution that is both literate and scholarly, but her sense of drama, exemplified in her treatment of the daily dialogue of the Convention, tends to distort the importance of differences concerning the means of achieving consensual principles. While she correctly diagnoses the significance of the conflict between the large and small states, she underestimates the role of sectionalism in the convention. Her contention that independent state sovereignty was not at issue before 1776 can hardly be reconciled with the Revolutionary argument that individual colonial legislatures were coequal with the British Parliament; moreover, she fails to indicate that while the states were not mentioned in the Declaration of Independence, their representatives in the Second Continental Congress passed upon that document. The author's view of the proper role of the states in the 1780's seems to owe more to the Federalists and to events after 1789 than to objective scholarship, and her suggestion that the Constitution created no central power ignores both political reality and the variety of Federalist thought. Contrary to Miss Bowen's argument, the "conservatism" of the Constitution rests not upon its function to preserve order and the rights of property but rather with its alleged rejection of the precepts of weak central government, legislative supremacy, a single-house legislature, frequent elections, rotation in office, strong checks on governmental officials, and direct popular voting, associated in the eighteenth century with democracy. The author fails, too, in explaining why a government that reflected an overwhelmingly middle-class society would feature, through refinement of elections and a strong executive, so little popular participation or power. Miss Bowen seems to think that the highmindedness of purpose exhibited by the Founding
Fathers is inconsistent with an economic interpretation, but social, economic, or class bias directly relates to an individual's view of history, objectives for the future, and principles of moral and political action.

Despite these differences, however, Miss Bowen has produced a popular history of the highest achievement. Not just another book on the Constitution, *Miracle at Philadelphia* is superb historical writing by an author well versed in the primary sources. Especially outstanding, though slightly misplaced, are the three chapters comprising a tour of the United States in the late 1780's. Miss Bowen has once again proved history does not need to be dull to be scholarly.

*University of Kansas*  
JAMES B. SCHICK

*The Quasi-War: The Politics and Diplomacy of the Undeclared War with France, 1797-1801.* By ALEXANDER DECONDE. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1966. xiv, 498 p. Illustrations, comment on sources, index. $10.00.)

In the last two years or so I have reviewed Bradford Perkins' *Castlereagh and Adams* and Richard B. Morris' *The Peacemakers* for this journal. I am now to review Alexander DeConde's *The Quasi-War;* and, frankly, I am afraid of becoming a pollyannish reviewer. I delight in being heartless and scathing, but have had little opportunity and Dr. DeConde leaves me even less opportunity than the two authors above.

*The Quasi-War* is the product of deep research in the libraries and archives of three nations: Great Britain, France, and the United States. The footnotes (marshalled at the end of the text, presumably by publisher's fiat) run on for ninety-two pages, and are all that the most pedantic professional could demand. DeConde's work is built on the scholarly equivalent of bedrock.

Most professional historians have every skill, every tool essential to accomplish their tasks, except the decisively important ability to write well. Most of us are brilliant musicians who have spent so much time studying music than we have never learned to play it. Dr. DeConde, in contrast, plays his history very well indeed. The admirable organization of this book arises largely from the natural unity of the Quasi-War—wars, even the fuzzy, quasi-ones, begin, reel onward and... end. But a mix that includes Fries Rebellion and a tsar's desire for Malta is not one that every author could persuade to jell. As for style, Dr. DeConde is no Parkman, but if lucidity is what one demands from a historian first and foremost, then he has an excellent style.

The first question which should be asked of any book is the discourteous "So what?" (One wishes university presses would practice asking it more often.) Is there a need for a book on the Quasi-War? Have not a dozen top historians carefully sifted the years of the administration of John Adams?
Yes, but DeConde’s emphasis is different. He covers domestic affairs in some detail but does not concentrate on them, which is a virtue: the Alien and Sedition Acts have been overemphasized for so many years that people who remember them can claim never to have heard of the war that spawned them. The naval side of the war needs redoing, but it was done by Gardner W. Allen a half century ago. Dr. DeConde’s emphasis is on diplomacy, even when discussing American politics, which is so completely justifiable that one wonders why this tack has not been taken by most who have examined the Quasi-War. It was a war with a foreign power, and not primarily a domestic matter. The commodores and sailors who fought it did not dictate its unique quality, its quasi-ness. The statesmen and diplomats did the world that favor. They kept it damped down and finally extinguished it. Dr. DeConde has written a book about the making of a peace, not a war, and so has had to concentrate on diplomacy.

Before closing, let me make a few comments not on the text but on matters of secondary importance. A nine-page chronology follows the text which is very helpful to the reader, who is sometimes obliged to follow the actions of John Adams, Toussaint L’Ouverture, Tallyrand, Nelson, and Paul I of Russia simultaneously. This chronology is an unexpected gift, but why no formal bibliography? Each author whose work is referred to can be found in the index, along with the reference to the page on which the work is first noted, and there one can find the full bibliographical notation. But one cannot obtain a bird’s-eye view of the whole body of material on which the book is based without wading through the ninety-two pages of footnotes.

One last complaint, aimed at the publisher. Must all history books of any size cost at least ten dollars? The Quasi-War should sell well for a scholarly work, but not at ten dollars. Why can’t we imitate the British and cut down on margins, paper quality . . . and price?

Washington State University

Alfred W. Crosby, Jr.


Only in recent years has James Madison attracted the scholarly supporters he deserves. Most notable among these have been Irving Brant and Adrienne Koch who between them have restored Madison to a position where he must no longer be ignored by students of American political, constitutional, and intellectual history. This activity has been a pleasure to watch. Miss Koch’s new book was originally delivered as the Whig-Clio Bicentennial Lectures at Princeton University, and is another milestone in this regeneration.

Although Madison has found a full-scale and able biographer, there still remain several questions to be answered. One of these has been a treatment
of his intellectual development. Using Madison's own brief statement made at the age of eighty-three, Miss Koch postulates that the core of ideas here expressed, liberty, justice, and union, may be taken as a means to analyze his philosophy. In each case the historical development of his ideas has been traced from the intellectual stimulation of Witherspoon at Princeton, through the spectacular events of the Constitutional Convention, the lasting years of the "great collaboration" with Jefferson, Madison's own experience as chief executive, and, finally, the productive years of retirement.

Each of these three themes is present throughout Madison's entire life, although each of them looms larger at one time or another in his thought. In discussing the theme of liberty, the main attention is focused on the successful struggle for religious equality, although arguments for one freedom clearly cannot be separated from another. The second lecture deals with justice, which for Madison was the one great goal of government. Here the emphasis is on federalism as the technique by which justice may be achieved. Here, as elsewhere throughout the book, the relevancy of Madison's thought to twentieth-century problems is made explicit. The final chapter deals with the preservation of the union. In the years of retirement, the ex-president was faced with the imposition of threats to the Union. Now he is motivated by the desire to protect what had been created and to reject nullification and secession.

With Madison, as in the case of Jefferson, the intellectual historian is handicapped by the fact that there is no statement in the corpus of either man's work which sets forth his political philosophy in an orderly, convenient way. In each case this must be extracted from the large body of their official and personal writings. It is a difficult and a challenging task. Miss Koch has risen to it admirably. In this all too brief work we have the first approach to an organization of Madisonian philosophy. It is long overdue. On the surface it seems a simple task, but that is the result of Miss Koch's logical and very admirable style. This is an important book and one which deserves as wide an audience as possible. It should be of considerable value to all who have an interest in Madison and his period. It should probably be considered for the reading lists of all courses in the history of the early nation.

A special word of praise should be added for the excellent substantive and critical notes which are included in this book.

PMC Colleges

Carlos R. Allen, Jr.


Charles Montgomery's American Furniture: The Federal Period is a "must" for every library, museum, historical society, and collector. It is
a monument in furniture history. Unlike most of its predecessors, it is a teaching book rather than just a record. It is a model for clarity of presentation.

To review briefly the publishing landmarks in antique American furniture history, we will remember that books on seventeenth-, eighteenth-, and early nineteenth-century American furniture have been written since 1891 through the early decades of the twentieth century. Some were by pioneers like Irving W. Lyons, Luke V. Lockwood, Wallace Nutting, and some were monographs such as Nancy McClelland’s *Duncan Phyfe and The English Regency* and Vernon Stoneman’s *John and Thomas Seymour*. All of these are general pictorial collations with text, sometimes more romance and tradition than fact.

In 1935 William MacP. Hornor, Jr., published the *Blue Book of Philadelphia Furniture* which gave a definite regional character to his text and photographs. He collected these from both family documents and furniture actually in the possession of descendants of colonial Philadelphians. The paucity of footnotes is an indication of the lack of documentation and, perhaps, of scholarship that was typical of most of the earlier works.

In 1941 Edwin J. Hipkiss produced his scholarly catalogue of the M. & M. Karolik Collection in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, with notes on secondary woods. Though much of the Karolik furniture was from the northern colonies, this book made further sound regional attributions.

1952 saw the widely known *American Furniture, Queen Anne and Chippendale Periods*, a partial catalogue of the Winterthur Museum furniture collections, by Joseph Downs. These collections, vast in their scope, include furniture from most urban centers on the eastern seaboard. Regional characteristics were segregated on a broad scale, and there were numerous references to primary and secondary woods to aid identification of American furniture made before the Revolution.

*American Furniture: The Federal Period (1788–1825)* continues the cataloguing of the collection at the Winterthur Museum. It illustrates 491 pieces from more than a thousand examples that were studied. This first large-scale survey of American Federal furniture is fresh. The method of approach is new for a furniture book. One is aware of the author’s effort to tell others what he found difficult through the years to find out for himself. He also strives to tell us methods used in procuring this information and why, in most cases, he reached the conclusions he put into print. He firmly and modestly predicts probable advances in future regional attributions.

The Foreword by Henry F. du Pont, the patriarch of American furniture, calls Mr. Montgomery’s book a furniture encyclopedia of the early years of the United States. It is this, and more, when one considers the five introductory chapters, the twenty essays on the various furniture forms, plus the copiously illustrated catalogue, text, and bibliography.

In this section titled “Background” are five headings. “The Business of Cabinetmaking,” under which the apprentice system is described, traces
the tendency toward specialization and the trend to large furniture-making
and upholstery shops as the order of the Federal day.

"Price Books" tells of lists of prices for the making of furniture in all its
multiple forms and detail. A Philadelphia list, written in 1786, bears the
name of Benjamin Lehman. Two years later, a very extensive London list in
infinite detail was published, and a further list entitled *The Philadelphia
Cabinet and Chair Makers Book of Prices* was published in 1794. Employee
relations, unions, and strikes are all mentioned; the beginning of a system
that changed social relations throughout the Western World.

"Woods Used in American Furniture 1790-1825" is unique. It not only
discusses the woods used, but it provides us with a table listing both pri-
mary and secondary woods for each region, and often special ones for special
uses. Techniques of embellishment, inlaying, crossbanding, veneering, and
carving are discussed in detail. Important and informative are the half-
dozen superb colorplates of stringing, banding, and veneering arranged by
region. It would be difficult to overestimate the importance of these tables
and regional details to the true student of American furniture.

"Upholstery and Furnishing Fabrics" nails down firmly the types of
fabrics and bed furnishings used in America at this period, and tells us in
general that, as suggested in the English design books of the period, English
materials were used and English practices followed.

Mr. Montgomery begins "Connoisseurship and Attribution": "Con-
noisseurship involves not only evaluation of an object but also its identifi-
cation. Evaluation raises such questions as how good the piece is, how it
compares with others made about the same time in terms of workmanship,
materials, and condition, and whether it is all original. Identification re-
quires that we decide where and when it was made and who made it. Since
connoisseurship is a matter of judgment, and attributions are at best
tentative, the connoisseur is like a judge in a courtroom—he must gather
all available evidence and then weigh it as objectively as possible." There-
after he explores the secondary wood, furniture forms, carving, workman-
ship, and dating as aids to establishing the "how, when, where, why, who,
and what" for any particular piece of furniture.

The catalogue of the Winterthur Museum Federal furniture follows.
It is arranged according to furniture forms from "Beds" to "Work Tables," and includes such categories as "Unusual and Specialized Furniture" and
"Fancy Furniture." They are numbered, dated, and arranged in groups
according to the region of their origin. Dimensions, primary and secondary
woods are included, plus a thorough discussion of detail in a spirit of true
connoisseurship. It can scarcely fail to fulfill the most avid desires of the
student, the curator, the collector, or the connoisseur himself.

At the back of the book several pages are devoted to enlarged photo-
graphs of carved details and cabinetmakers' labels and stamps, as well as
cabinetmakers' biographies. There is a splendid bibliography for those who
would delve into the source material, and a most adequate index.

This is a useful monograph relating to a subject of considerable contemporary interest and built around the career of a man who should be better known. The tone of the work is sympathetic, both to the man and to the cause for which he labored. The author is well qualified for his task, having devoted some years to the study of abolitionism and having previously published a biography of Elijah P. Lovejoy.

Relatively little is known about Lundy's personal life. He was born on a New Jersey farm in 1789 and reared as a Quaker. During his lifetime he lived in many different communities and led a more or less peripatetic existence. In his childhood and later he suffered from ill health. The author insists, however, that he was not neurotic. Leaving home at the age of twenty, he learned the saddler's trade in Wheeling, West Virginia, and continued to practice it at Mount Pleasant and at St. Clairsville, Ohio. In 1815, he married Esther Lewis, by whom he had five children. She died in 1826, and the children were parceled out among Lundy's friends.

In 1816, he began his antislavery career by organizing the Union Humane Society, with a view to supporting antislavery candidates for office and to improving the condition of Ohio's free Negroes. In 1817, he became associated with an antislavery newspaper, the Philanthropist, published at Mount Pleasant by Charles Osborn. He also supported the American Colonization Society, which was formed in 1816-1817. In 1819, he moved to Missouri, where he fought adoption of the proslavery constitution. Two years later he returned to Ohio and began publication of the Genius of Universal Emancipation, the work for which he is best remembered. In 1822 he moved this paper to east Tennessee.

Lundy's program specified the duty of the national government to abolish slavery in federal territories, to admit no more slave states, and to prohibit the interstate slave trade. In addition, he asked that the southern states provide for the gradual abolition of slavery and that all states give equal rights to free Negroes. He also demanded repeal of the three-fifths compromise. Dillon emphasizes Lundy's early and consistent advocacy of political action as the best means for abolishing slavery. Several chapters of the book deal with Lundy's interest in Negro emigration projects centered around Haiti, Canada, and Mexico. He did not promote the Liberian settlement.
In 1825, the *Genius* was moved to Baltimore, where William Lloyd Garrison worked with Lundy for a while and got himself jailed for libeling a slave trader. Dillon argues that Lundy's antislavery program was a good deal more practical and less doctrinaire than Garrison's.

The last part of the study centers around Lundy's efforts to prevent the annexation of Texas. In this connection he worked closely with John Quincy Adams. The Texas issue received the bulk of Lundy's attention in the *National Enquirer*, which he published in Philadelphia from 1836 to 1838. In 1837, he helped to organize the Pennsylvania State Anti-Slavery Society, which adopted his paper as its organ, with a new name, the *Pennsylvania Freeman*. Most of his possessions were destroyed in the burning of Pennsylvania Hall on May 17, 1838. Shortly thereafter he moved to Illinois to be with his children. There he died the following year, at the age of fifty.

The author was handicapped in his research by the absence of any large collection of Lundy's correspondence. However, Dillon did find Lundy letters in a dozen other collections scattered around the country, including some at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. He also relied extensively on an early biography of Lundy written by Thomas Earle, as well as the various newspapers which Lundy edited. While the material seems a little skimpy at times, the book is a valuable contribution to historical literature on the antislavery movement. It is well written and nicely printed, with useful footnotes at the bottom of each page.

*Pennsylvania State University*  
*IRA V. BROWN*

*Medicine in America: Historical Essays*. By RICHARD HARRISON SHRYOCK.  
(Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1966. xviii, 346 p. Index. $7.50.)

Richard Shryock, Emeritus Professor of the History of Medicine at The Johns Hopkins University, now at The American Philosophical Society, has in his teaching and writing over the past thirty-five years skillfully integrated medical history with social and cultural developments. Like several other medical historians in this century—Arturo Castiglioni, Paul Diepgen, Victor Robinson and Henry E. Sigerist—he has made significant scholarly strides by extracting general social history from medical sources.

This collection of fifteen essays, originally published between 1930 and 1962, is now reprinted from a large body of scattered sources in a single, accessible volume. The essays are preceded by a masterful forty-five-page article, "The Medical History of the American People." They appear under five headings that identify their content: Period Pieces, Personal and Public Hygiene, The Medical Profession, Medical Thought and Research, and Historiography. An index concludes the work.

A testament of an eminent medical historian, this volume of essays is dedicated to a Baltimore colleague and friend of the author, Dr. Owsei
Temkin, now Director of the Institute for the History of Medicine at The Johns Hopkins University. A foreword is provided by Professor Merle Curti of the University of Wisconsin, who aptly describes this book as “a rich intellectual experience.” Setting the tone in his own preface, Professor Shryock notes that “medical history involves social and economic as well as biologic content and presents one of the central themes in human experience.” He asks, “After all, what is more basic in the life of any people than life itself?”

Written with an urbane and occasional witty touch, these essays are broad in scope and perceptive in content. Their topics provide rich fare for the reader—medical practice in the Old South, the origins of medical specialization, the early American public health movement, women in American medicine, a medical perspective on the Civil War, American indifference to basic sciences in the nineteenth century, the evolution of the American physician from 1846 to 1946, the interplay of social and internal factors in modern medicine.

Of particular interest to Pennsylvanians is the essay “Benjamin Rush from the Perspective of the Twentieth Century.” Other eminent figures depicted in this collection are Boston’s Rev. Cotton Mather, a pioneer immunologist through his advocacy of variolation; Sylvester Graham, health faddist of Graham Cracker fame; and Dr. William Charles Wells, a native of Charleston, S. C., and pre-Darwinian proponent of the theory of natural selection.

*Medicine in America* is a welcome addition to our bookshelf of volumes by Richard Harrison Shryock. It will be widely useful for college and medical students, professional historians, and practicing physicians.

Temple University

Fred B. Rogers


This is something of a pioneer volume in the field. Accounts of the concern of any state for the history of its activity in preserving its documentary heritage, such as there have been in the past, have not been noted for complete coverage or for serving as a really informative record. Here we have a carefully researched study of the fortunes of North Carolina’s records, their keepers, and their publishers all the way back to 1663. Would that Pennsylvania had such a book.

If such a volume were written about Pennsylvania, it very probably would follow a somewhat similar historical outline. Though we sometimes forget the fact today, a concern for preserving records and writing history
of the American states is not new. It began with certain colonial concerns and leadership. Dr. Jones places proper emphasis upon the problems of record keeping in the colonial era and wartime danger in the Revolution. The vicissitudes of record keeping from 1794 down to 1903 are sketched in broad strokes which include the Civil War problems. North Carolina, in general, is now and has been ahead of Pennsylvania in its concern for records of counties and municipalities. This is covered adequately and has many lessons for Pennsylvania.

Part Two of the book takes up the work of the North Carolina historians of the years between 1780 and 1907. North Carolina appears to have been the first state to recognize the importance of colonial records in British depositories. This was a result of a need for sources to aid in determining the boundary dispute with neighboring South Carolina. North Carolina was early in publishing something in the way of state history based on original sources. Efforts to write later state history were of varying quality, but at least something was written. Collection and publication of records is generally well covered by Dr. Jones.

Part Three is titled “Caretakers for Cleo” and covers the formation of historical societies and the establishment of a state archival and historical agency. Organization of historical societies dates back to 1833 in North Carolina. Creation of the state facility followed a tortuous course. As in Pennsylvania, the pioneer state historical society failed to continue as a state-wide agency. The State Historical Commission was not created until 1905, but ten years ahead of Pennsylvania. As in Pennsylvania, it actually was an outgrowth of effort by private associations to establish a state agency.

A postscript deals with very recent developments but one cannot help but wish the fuller story had been brought down to a more contemporary terminal. A genuine historical renaissance has been characteristic of the last forty years in North Carolina. The state has continued a tradition of leadership as one of the more historically minded states and with great regard to preservation of its records and scholarly publication of the same. The book is well written and makes what could be rather dull material rather readable.

Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission

S. K. Stevens

Science and Society in the United States. Edited by David D. Van Tassel and Michael G. Hall. (Homewood, Ill.: The Dorsey Press, 1966. vii, 360 p. Bibliography, chronology, glossary, index. $7.95.)

This book offers a survey that is much needed at this stage of historical thinking; it presents a collection of essays by different authors on aspects of the relationship between science and society in the United States. Put another way, it attempts to suggest elements of the history of science in
this country which can be incorporated into our general historical framework.

The success with which the contributors fulfill this objective varies and this variation is as much a function of the quality of historical studies available in each field examined as it is of the penetration of the individual author. Most directly pertinent, most comprehensive, and most likely to be used are the first three essays: on industry by Kendall A. Birr, on agriculture by Reynold A. Wik, and on medicine by John Duffy. Each of these rests, in part, upon important related work for which we are indebted to their authors. They are not uniformly satisfactory upon all phases of the national period of American history, but they serve very well as interim reports.

The remaining essays introduce important insights in several fields and disclose a surprising amount of historical work completed or underway. They comprise: Charles E. Rosenberg on social thought, Charles Weiner on higher education, Howard S. Miller on private support, Carroll W. Pursell, Jr., on government support, and Clarence G. Lasby on the military. More than half of all the essays included in this volume demonstrate an inordinate concentration upon the later nineteenth and the twentieth centuries. This only in part reflects the interests of the authors. More fundamentally, it reflects the broadening and deepening of the impact of science upon society during the later period, especially in this century. It was strikingly in the same era that American science rose to make continuing, major contributions to the mainstream of science—and this ought somewhere to be remarked.

The editors deserve much credit for planning and carrying through this volume. They disclaim identification as historians of science, and this may have been to their advantage in seeking to draw what is known into the current of general American history. They have provided a helpful tool which ought to be widely used toward this end.

In the present state of knowledge, the editors cannot be criticized for failing to supply a general synthetic guide to science in American society or a summary of the field. In fact, gestures in this direction are represented in a chronology and a guide to bibliographical guides appended to the volume; both offer some help in following the separate essays but little more. The introduction, which more specifically seeks to survey the field and its background, is even more disturbing. It consists of two parts. In the first, the editors survey the mainstream of scientific development during the American period; this, despite its brevity, is coherent and well done—but only slightly related to the rest of the book. In the second part, the editors offer a view of science in American Society which lacks direction and authority. It does not help us along the way. As a whole, the book will help, especially if it is not asked to do more than is possible at this time.

New York University

Brooke Hindle
As a City Upon a Hill. The Town in American History. By PAGE SMITH.

Professor Smith contends in this "collective biography" that, with the exception of family and church, the small town represented the dominant form of social organization experienced by most Americans up to the early twentieth century. He justifiably criticizes historians for their comparative neglect of its role in American life. Smith maintains particularly that the full significance of the "covenanted" or "colonized" community has not been appreciated. Its archetype was the New England Puritan town, based upon the church covenant; and wherever New Englanders or their descendants had migrated through the mid-nineteenth century one was likely to find towns created by groups who affirmed some version of the original covenant. Smith devotes little attention to other forms of the colonized-covenanted community, such as those rooted in religious or secular utopianism, antislavery, and temperance sentiment.

He contrasts the covenanted communities with the "cumulative" kind which lacked plan, ethnic and religious homogeneity, group ideals and identity. Their origins were "fortuitous" or speculative. In successive chapters dealing with religion, economic development, politics, law, temperance, social life and structure, ideology, mobility and literature, Smith concentrates almost exclusively upon the covenant towns which, presumably, had the greatest impact upon American life. They exerted, according to Smith, a conservative influence which perpetuated older religious or social values; they produced a unique character-type, aggressive and ambitious but tempered by ideals of service through the professions; and they provided the model in American society (contrasting both with the cumulative town and city) of shared communal experience. These were "true communities," "organic communities," which provided a buffer against "alienation." Ultimately (and regrettably in Smith's estimation), the town was absorbed into the mainstream of urban values and institutions, thus undermining its distinctive ethic and organic qualities.

City Upon a Hill must be evaluated as an eclectic, interpretive essay rather than a research monograph. As such it is imaginative and heuristic, but also impressionistic and diffuse. For all practical purposes it might be subtitled: "Some Selected Features of New England Town Colonization." Southern and western towns are explicitly excluded, but so is virtually everything except the New England-inspired covenanted community. The topical organization leads to a telescoping of time to a degree that one is not always sure what century is being discussed. Although the covenanted community's significance lies in its contrast with the cumulative and urban forms, the latter two merely hover in the background so there is no concrete basis for comparison; in other words, Smith is so impressed with the distinction between the organicism of the covenanted community and the
alleged alienation of the city that he ignores functional and institutional sources of stability which compensate in the urban setting for the absence of organic cohesion. It is hardly enlightening, in this connection, to refer to the surrender of the town “ethic” to the “package deal promoted by the urban hucksters” (p. 502). Nor is the cause of comparative community analysis advanced by an occasional lapse into mysticism, such as reference to the town having “lost its soul to the city” (p. 212), or by a seeming preference for Martin Buber’s Platonic idealization of community as opposed to less exalted, but more empirical, social science investigation.

If Smith largely concentrates upon some features of the New England-Midwestern town experience, and upon the covenanted as opposed to other forms of community organization, he is also selective in his choice of themes. He deals with the town in terms of social values, but not at all as an artifact. The town-building process is taken for granted. One learns nothing about planning and physical layout, architecture, building and housing, communications or transportation. Yet the spatial-temporal distribution of population, as affected by the physical habitat or environment, surely played an important role in patterning human relationships. For example, the early New England towns, or the nineteenth-century communitarian settlements, deviated sharply from American norms in their co-ordination of physical and social planning. Instinctively or deliberately, their founders attempted to reinforce social and religious goals through certain land use and physical design practices. The very choice of the town rather than the dispersed homestead pattern of settlement is the most obvious illustration of the importance of ecological and planning factors.

A City Upon a Hill will, hopefully, alert historians to the need for further investigation of the role of the town (better still, towns) in American life. Even its limitations—partial perspective and bold, unverified generalizations ranging from the nature of community cohesion to the emasculation of the American male after the promise of the covenant faded—should prove valuable in this respect.

University of Pittsburgh

Roy Lubove
that it should be directed in perpetuity by a sole trustee, a Lowell descended
from John Lowell, "the Old Judge" whose three fruitful marriages provided
New England with all the Lowells who count. The sole trustee was to act as
a committee of one in all matters, from investing the funds to selecting the
lecturers. He was to carry out, in each generation, specific provisions set
down by the sole begetter: one course of lectures each year on "the historical
and internal endurance of Christianity"; other courses on philosophy,
natural history, and the arts and sciences; high fees for the lectures in order
to secure the best men (not until 1952 did a woman deliver a Lowell lecture);
not a penny for brick and mortar.

When John Lowell, Jr., romantic, wealthy, learned, died in Bombay in
1836, still on the track of Marco Polo, Bostonians preferred the lecture to
all other forms of entertainment. It might seem that he had founded an in-
stitute which was so limited by the specifications in his will that it could
serve its purpose only as long as Bostonians thronged the Odeon to hear
Silliman or Agassiz or Charles Francis Adams. But things did not work out
as one might have predicted. How the Institute survived the age of the
public lecture and continued to be a force in Boston's intellectual life is the
theme of Mr. Weeks's delightful little book.

Because each trustee was sole, Mr. Weeks has made his study a series of
interrelated biographies. The Institute was the man. What John Amory
Lowell, Augustus Lowell, A. Lawrence Lowell, and Ralph Lowell wanted
done was done. Attention to their prescribed duties was, of course, not
enough. Imagination was needed to keep the Institute alive to the intellec-
tual needs of the community it served. The four trustees were conservative
men but they were also farsighted, and each has put his impress on the
Institute.

The first trustee, John Amory, was a consolidator. He at once established
the precedent that the lecturers must be men of great distinction, even if
this meant that some of them had to be imported. Lecturers could be paid
as much as $2,000 for a course—this at a time when the salary of a full pro-
fessor at Harvard was $1,200. John Amory kept his attention on the spirit of
the rules under which he operated. Signs of fruitful (yet lawful) change were
evident in the support he gave personally and through the Institute to the
infant Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The Lowell Institute had
begun reaching out.

Augustus, the second trustee, was the most conservative of the four. Yet
he put aside his prejudices when he chose his lecturers. Some of his choices
show how willing he was to move with the times and admit speculation to
the platform: George Kennan, in 1884, on Russia; Dr. Henry P. Walcott on
State Medicine; Professor Felix Adler on The Ethics of Marriage.

When A. Lawrence Lowell became trustee in 1901, the Institute had
branched out in many directions. There were courses of instruction for
teachers and classes in drawing, arranged by John Amory. Augustus had
established the Lowell School of Practical Design, underwritten evening
courses for advanced students, and lectures for workingmen at the Wells Memorial Association. President Lowell introduced further innovations along these lines, the most notable being the University Extension Courses taught at colleges in and around Boston.

Ralph Lowell, the present trustee, though a financier who must, one imagines, attend more directors’ meetings than anyone in Boston, resembles the founder in the breadth of his intellectual interests and in venturesomeness. One of his acts as trustee is the most imaginative in the history of the Institute. At a time when attendance at the Public Lectures was declining alarmingly, he acted on a suggestion made by President Conant and began broadcasting the Lowell Lectures. From this operation grew the cooperative ventures WGBH—FM and WGBH—TV, the best organized and most influential of all experiments in education by radio and TV.

Founder John Jr. would be pleased with the Institute in its present incarnation. There is another Lowell (John, Ralph’s son) prepared to take over as the fifth trustee. The founding bequest of $250,000 has kept well ahead of the depreciation of the dollar. (The capital fund is now $8,000,000.) John Jr.’s lecturers are still educating New Englanders, though in forms and in places he could not have dreamed of.

Princeton University

Willard Thorp


For more than one hundred and fifty years, the Morgan family has been engaged in private banking in the United States, and since 1854, when Junius S. Morgan left Boston to become a partner of George Peabody, the wealthy American banker in London, he and his descendants, as Edwin Hoyt states, have “played an important part in the development of America, a role comparable only to that of the Rothschilds or Barings in England’s growth of Empire.” The period of their greatest influence began in 1871 when Junius’ son, J. Pierpont Morgan, and Anthony Drexel became equal partners in Drexel, Morgan and Company of New York and in Drexel and Company of Philadelphia, and began using J. S. Morgan and Company, of London, and Drexel, Harjes and Company, of Paris, as their European correspondents.

This powerful combination of directly related partnerships, in what were the leading financial centers on the two continents, became a major instrumentality for international trade and for the supplying of credit to the rapidly expanding economy within the United States; but how this was accomplished and what the banking houses did is largely an untold story, for reasons that are not attributable to the author. He is not, and makes no pretense of being, an economic historian. His interests are social, pri-
marily concerned with the conduct and attitudes of men of great wealth in a democratic society, and for the economic story he has had to rely on others.

Unfortunately, only a few economic historians, in the United States, Great Britain, or Europe, have concerned themselves with this subject; the banking houses themselves, partly from a tradition of confidential secrecy about their customers’ affairs, have been reluctant to explain what they do. The result is a general ignorance except about matters that become notorious through leading to court cases, governmental investigations (almost always hostile in intent), or some other form of unwanted and undesirable publicity, and these exceptional incidents, infrequent though they are, have been further distorted by ideologically oriented writers, many of them Marxists, who use the individual acts of misconduct, fraud, or incompetence, that are revealed, for the purpose of discrediting what they call the capitalist system.

Mr. Hoyt’s account of the work that the Morgans have done, and of the function they have performed in national and international trade, thus almost necessarily is inadequate and misleading; but, in all other ways, he has written a pleasing, informative book about one of the few American families that, in spite of all the vicissitudes affecting the economy during the past two centuries, has survived with wealth in the same line of work.

New York University

THOMAS P. GOVAN


This project, which may run to forty volumes, is an outgrowth of the Wilson Centennial Year of 1956. The idea was conceived by the directors of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation who had the good judgment to enlist as editor Arthur Link, whose monumental biography of the twenty-eighth President has now progressed through five volumes to the United States declaration of war against Germany in 1917. The necessary financial aid was contributed by various foundations, corporations, and individuals, while Princeton has provided a base for the enterprise and a professorship for Link to supplement his editorial activities.

The plan is most ambitious and marks the first attempt to do for a modern American statesman what has already been undertaken in behalf of such Founding Fathers as Jefferson, Hamilton, and Franklin, as well as for the Adams family. The edition will not only contain all the significant writings, speeches, and interviews of Wilson that can be gathered together (except for all but two of his published books), but also incoming or relevant letters.
that throw further light on his missing correspondence or otherwise un-
known or incompletely documented events of his life. The present volume,
for example, contains no less than 170 letters written by others (mostly his
father and mother) as well as the minutes of the Eumenean Society at
Davidson College (1873-4), the American Whig Society and the Liberal
Debating Club at Princeton (1875-9), and the Jefferson Society at the
University of Virginia (1879-80). They present facts about his youth of
vital importance to a knowledge of his family background and a study of
his development.

Undoubtedly, the most significant factor in his development emphasized
again in these pages is the remarkable relationship between Dr. Wilson and
his distinguished son. This relationship was at the same time so close, and
yet so intelligently critical on the part of the older man, that it becomes
obvious why the son always regarded his father as the greatest teacher,
guide, and friend he ever had. Dr. Wilson was a strict, albeit a loving task
master. The story is already well known of how he would send his adored
Tommy to the dictionary to find the exact word the occasion demanded
when teaching him to use correct English in his everyday conversation. But
the Doctor was not simply a vain and heartless martinet. When the youth
was bitterly disappointed by his failure to qualify for the junior oratorical
contest at Princeton, his father recognized his grief in terms of the warmest
sympathy. Yet he went on to point out that the defeat would reveal his true
worth by causing him to redouble his efforts. "Dismiss ambition," Dr.
Wilson advised, "and replace it with hard industry, which shall have little
or no regard to present triumphs, but which will be all the time laying foun-
dations for future work and wage. I know you. You are capable of much
hard mental work, and of much endurance under disappointment. You are
manly. You are true. You are aspiring. You are most lovable every way and
deserving of confidence. But as yet you despise somewhat the beaten track
which all scholars and orators (almost) have had to travel—the track of
patient study in mathematics, in languages, in science, in philosophy. Dearest boy, can you hope to jump into eminency all at once?"

Wilson's early concentration on oratory as a prime source of political
power has long been well known, but here for the first time is revealed the
pains he took to develop shorthand as an integral part of his education. He
taught himself the Graham method and made ample use of it in taking
classroom notes, and also in the commonplace book he kept, and the spas-
modic diary which now brings to light a charming picture of his student
days at Princeton. But while the old College of New Jersey was a delightful
spot in the seventies under Dr. McCosh, the elderly professors and the old-
fashioned curriculum offered very meagre fare to the undergraduates, and
Wilson owed most of what he obtained there to the careful reading he pre-
scribed for himself outside his regular courses. As the Graham method fell
into disuse years ago, the editors are to be congratulated on obtaining the
services of Clifford P. Gehman of Denver who, at the age of ninety-one,
continues to labor on documents that might otherwise have defied attempts to decipher them. The result is to furnish striking new evidence of the youth’s development between the ages of seventeen and twenty-four, when this volume ends. One is struck by how much greater admiration he showed for British institutions and culture than for those of his native land. As a boy he filled notebooks with detailed accounts of imaginary naval squadrons, yacht clubs, and military organizations, in which Lord Thomas W. Wilson, Duke of Eagleton, Duke of Arlington, Duke of Carlton, or Marquis of Huntington, was in charge of operations as vice-admiral, commodore, commander-in-chief, or lieutenant general. Moreover, whenever he discussed American political practices, as in “Cabinet Government in the United States,” which was published in the International Review immediately following his graduation from Princeton in 1879, he drew decidedly unfavorable comparisons with the British system, a modified form of which he hoped would be adopted in America. Furthermore, the man who would later try to make the world safe for democracy, in his youth considered universal suffrage to be the root of all evil in the United States.

Finally, one must express surprise at the extent of young Wilson’s involvement in religion. The picture of him as the sober, pious, deeply serious son of a Presbyterian minister has become traditional. Nevertheless, it is somewhat startling to learn that at the age of nineteen he actually wrote quite a number of sanctimonious articles for his father’s North Carolina Presbyterian on such subjects as “Work-Day Religion,” “A Christian Statesman,” “One Duty of a Son to his Parents,” and “The Positive in Religion.” He also participated more actively in the religious organizations at college than either Ray Stannard Baker or Arthur Walworth emphasized in their biographies, the only published sources to give adequate treatment to Wilson’s youth and family background. (Link devoted only seven pages in his first volume to the whole twenty-four years covered here.)

This volume ends in December, 1880, when Wilson was forced by ill health to withdraw from the Law School of the University of Virginia. The editors are to be warmly congratulated on the scrupulous care they have taken to obtain accuracy in every detail, and to provide the reader with additional information concerning persons and events wherever necessary. One looks forward eagerly to the whole series, which gives every indication of proving an enduring monument to American historical scholarship. It should provide everything needed to understand the personality and career of one of our greatest presidents, as well as further insight into many of the problems that faced America and the world in his day as seen through the eyes of a perceptive observer.

Princeton, N. J.

C. Pardee Foulke

Daniel J. Boorstin draws a distinction between Historian's History, "the patient, endless effort to resurrect the dead past," and Citizen's History, "the living tradition" that has evolved from the past and will adapt to future environmental changes. Noting that "Citizen's History rules the world," Boorstin is convinced that "in a nation which aims at self-government, Historian's History must be brought to enlighten Citizen's History." His conviction and efforts and those of eighty-three distinguished colleagues have produced a unique "primer."

The unique quality of the work does not stem from the selections—for many, like the Declaration of Independence, are inescapable choices—but from the way the documents are edited. Boorstin has assembled a battery of experts. Beginning with Samuel Eliot Morison on the Mayflower Compact and ending with Oscar Handlin on Lyndon B. Johnson's 1965 Address on Voting Rights, the work includes Dumas Malone on Jefferson's First Inaugural Address, Dexter Perkins on the Monroe Doctrine, Allan Nevins on the Gettysburg Address, John D. Hicks on the Populist Platform of 1892, Richard Hofstadter on Bryan's Cross of Gold Speech, Sidney Hook on William James' pragmatism, Arthur S. Link on Wilson's Fourteen Points, Frank Freidel and William E. Leuchtenburg on Franklin Roosevelt's First Inaugural and Quarantine Addresses respectively, Hans J. Morgenthau on the Marshall Plan, and James MacGregor Burns on Kennedy's Inaugural Address. Feeling somewhat like a circus barker, I can only add that there are many more "stars" inside. Each editor not only introduces a document but also appends to it an appraisal of its "Afterlife." These evaluations of each document's changing meaning and current relevance are unique, interesting, and valuable. It is in these appendixes that the editors attempt to serve the needs of Citizen's History. It is here that many of these historians have distilled the quintessence of their lifetimes of scholarship.

Boorstin and his editors have carefully executed their grand design to guide citizens, but some selections are more instructive than others. Usually a document is alive and rewarding in proportion both to its relevance for today's society and to the commitment of the editor to its ideas. Although many of the selections embrace divergent viewpoints, and it is clear that the editors do not fully agree with each other, certain positions are more dominant than others. Six documents attack slavery and segregation, but no statement of the proslavery or segregationist position is given. And some editors seem bent on inspiring today's Americans with a mission to spread liberty throughout the world. Although Washington's Farewell Address is included, Richard B. Morris carefully explains why he thinks Washington's "Great Rule" of isolation is no longer valid. Benjamin Franklin's Way to Wealth, extolling industry and frugality, seems to have been included because these attitudes "for better or for worse" have influenced the development of our society. There is a similar lack of enthusiasm for William Allen White's diagnosis of Kansas' ills and Calvin Coolidge's faith in Massachusetts. Though Herbert Hoover's individualism is appreciated, Franklin Roosevelt's First Inaugural Address is admired as an "exhilarating portent"
of a redirection of America 'toward . . . a democracy based on full eco-
nomic, as well as political, equality.'" Obviously, some documents merely
reflect widely held beliefs that the editors do not agree with, while others
are used to instruct citizens on the correct path of action.

In short, the chief virtue of the work is also its chief vice. The authorita-
tive voice of the expert guide in the "Afterlife" appendix competes with and
sometimes muffles the voice of the document, deterring the reader from
making his own interpretation. Despite this drawback, the "Afterlife"
appendix does make these readings more meaningful. The eighty-seven page
section on the Constitution, edited by nine scholars whose comments are
most instructive, especially realizes Boorstin's objective. He has succeeded
in bringing Historian's History to the aid of Citizen's History. These in-
comparably edited volumes will enable the reader to deal more intelligently
with the issues faced by our society.

\[The Pennsylvania State University\]  \[Ari Hoogenboom\]

The Reinterpretation of Early American History: Essays in honor of John
Edwin Pomfret. Edited by Ray Allen Billington. (San Marino,
Calif.: The Huntington Library, 1966. viii, 264 p. $7.50.)

Those who come bearing gifts deserve, for the sake of courtesy, thanks
for their offerings, but no false gratitude need be expressed for this fest-
schrift to John Edwin Pomfret, who retired last year as Director of the
Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery, after a long and distin-
guished double career in the academic world. The contributing scholars,
who knew Dr. Pomfret either at the Institute of Early American History
and Culture or as Fellows at the Huntington Library, have honored them-
selves as much as the man they chose to honor. Their essays are, as the
dust jacket blurb says, "useful" surveys of the work done the past twenty-
or-so years and that yet needs to be done in colonial American history;
and in several instances they are as "stimulating" and as "brilliantly"
executed as the enthusiastic headnotes that preface them suggest. The
book's usefulness is marred only by the lack of an index; otherwise it
deserves high praise.

For those, like this reviewer, who know of Dr. Pomfret only through his
solid two-volume study of colonial New Jersey or his articles in this maga-
zine (he contributed seven all told), the volume's opening essay, a graceful
reminiscence by Allan Nevins, will prove especially enlightening. Dr.
Pomfret had a good beginning in life, having been lucky enough to be born
and reared in Philadelphia. He was educated first at Central High School,
then at the University of Pennsylvania, where he took his doctorate. His
graduate work centered on Irish history, but he soon had the wisdom to
shift to America's colonial past. He added a second career—fortunately,
for colonial historians, without abandoning the first—when Princeton made him an assistant dean in 1933. Through the years that carried him from Princeton to the presidency of the College of William and Mary in 1942, then, nine years later, to the directorship of the Huntington Library, his fascination with the early American past remained unabated. Pomfret’s was the guiding hand behind the founding of the Institute of Early American History and Culture, “one of his principal monuments,” says Nevins, and also behind the revamping of the *William and Mary Quarterly* from a provincial compendium of F.F.V. genealogies to one of the most distinguished academic journals in the country.

The opening section of this unique *festschrift*—unique in the sense that colleagues and friends rather than former students contributed to it—on Pomfret and his work is followed by five essays gathered under the heading “Recent Interpretations of Early American History.” Three regional surveys—New England by Edmund S. Morgan, the Middle Colonies by Frederick B. Tolles, and the South by Clarence L. Ver Steeg—give as much space to work that needs to be done as to what has already been completed. Morgan, with his usual balanced judgment, manages at once to elucidate Perry Miller’s importance and to give a sound estimate of Ola Elizabeth Winslow’s contrasting work. Ver Steeg’s excellent piece benefits from findings garnered from unpublished dissertations that might otherwise have lain unnoticed in local libraries. Merrill Jensen’s essay on historians and the American Revolution reveals to a striking degree the agreement among past writers on the nature of the Revolution and also a swinging back in recent years to interpretations advanced early in the twentieth century by the so-called “progressive historians.” Douglass G. Adair holds, in his contribution, that the Constitution “adapted to the concrete circumstances of the United States of 1787, the experience of mankind through all the ages as revealed by history.”

Jack P. Greene opens the book’s final section—“Approaches to Early American History”—with a knowledgeable account of the work done on the political history of the thirteen colonies. These studies show that factionalism pervaded American politics throughout the colonial period. Greene seeks, in the last page and a half of his essay, to bring order out of chaos by establishing “at least a rough typology of political forms into which, after the elimination of certain individual variants, most pre-colonial political activity can be found.” His four types—chaotic factionalism, stable factionalism, domination by a single, unified group, and faction free with a maximum dispersal of political opportunity within the dominant group—are only outlined here. Greene obviously plans to develop his typology more fully and convincingly at another time.

The remaining essays are closely tied to the authors’ special interests. Lawrence Henry Gipson writes on the imperial approach to the colonial past; Lester J. Cappon on archives and history; and Walter Muir Whitehill on archaeology’s relevance to the American past. Max Savelle’s discus-
sion of international relations in the colonial period, a chapter from his forthcoming International History of Anglo-America, presents "a double history"—one part tied to European diplomacy, the other "a history of the direct contacts between the Angloamerican colonies and the French, Dutch, Swedish, Portuguese, Spanish, and Danish colonies in the hemisphere and the correspondence, the agreements and disagreements, and the intercolonial treaties that were produced by them."
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Membership. There are various classes of membership: general, $10.00;
associate, $25.00; patron, $100.00; life, $250.00; benefactor, $1,000. Members
receive certain privileges in the use of books, are invited to the Society’s
historical addresses and receptions, and receive The Pennsylvania Magazine of
History and Biography. Those interested in joining the Society are invited to
submit their names.

Hours. The Society is open to the public Monday, 1 P.M. to 9 P.M.; Tuesday
through Friday, 9 A.M. to 5 P.M. The Society will be closed from August 5
to September 6, 1967.