

## BOOK REVIEWS

*Guide to the Microfilm of the Papers of Tench Coxe in the Coxe Family Papers at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.* LUCY FISHER WEST, ed. (Philadelphia: Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1977. 104 p. \$4.50.)

The historical significance of Tench Coxe is singular. His posthumous repute rests more on the papers he preserved than on his career, though the latter was historically consequential.

By the time of his death in 1824, Coxe had amassed tens of thousands of valuable historical manuscripts. Packed into large tin boxes—unsystematically arranged and uncataloged—the bulky collection was bequeathed, along with the extensive acreage Coxe had acquired during a lifetime of land speculation, to his children. In their hands and in those of their descendants, the collection remained for almost a century and a half, during which time the papers of his more prominent correspondents were gradually turned over to libraries and historical societies. The Coxe papers thus constituted one of the few, and indisputably the most important, untapped manuscript sources for the Revolutionary and early national periods of American history. Finally, in 1964, one of Coxe's descendants, Daniel Michaux Coxe, was instrumental in arranging that this invaluable collection be permanently housed at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. American historians owe much to Daniel Coxe's own esteem for scholarship and his historical consciousness.

Historians and other researchers are also indebted to the Historical Society of Pennsylvania for the scholarly commitment and the expenditure of time and resources that have now made possible a microfilm edition of the Papers of Tench Coxe. This formidable task has been successfully and expertly accomplished by members of the staff of the Society. Lucy Fisher West and her assistants spent some three years sorting, labeling, repairing, cataloging, and filming this previously tangled mass of manuscripts. Ms. West's *Guide to the Microfilm of the Papers of Tench Coxe in the Coxe Family Papers* leads the researcher through the maze of this large collection, now available on 122 reels of film.

For American historians this microfilm publication should be a matchless boon. Although Coxe (who was seemingly incapable of throwing away a scrap of paper) saved thousands of items that are of scant significance to even the narrowest scholarly specialist, he also preserved documents of incalculable historical importance. Among the latter were copies of his business correspondence with other Tory merchants during the American

Revolution, the voluminous letter books of the Philadelphia mercantile firm of which he was senior partner during the Confederation era, official documents and correspondence accumulated during his long and varied career as a public servant and, above all, the thousands of letters sent to him by prominent statesmen, national and state political allies, fellow land speculators, and literary associates.

To mine this rich collection is to discover a man far more historically significant than has previously been recognized. Indeed, Coxe's career personifies a large number of the major historical themes of his time. The thousands upon thousands of pages in the Coxe Papers contain unique and rich materials that should serve as the source of scores of articles and many monographs that will enrich the literature of American history.

For making this bonanza of original material more easily available, students of the Revolution and our early national history owe Ms. West and her associates at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania an especial vote of thanks.

*Lafayette College*

JACOB E. COOKE

*Princetonians, 1748-1768, a Biographical Dictionary.* By JAMES McLACHLAN. (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1976. xxviii, 706 p. Illustrations, index. \$30.00.)

The publication of *Princetonians 1748-1768* makes Princeton the fourth of the twenty-three existing pre-1800 institutions of higher learning in the United States to memorialize early alumni in a work of collective biography rather than in the usual annotated catalogue. Now the former College of New Jersey stands with Williams, Yale and, above all, Harvard, and the author of *Princetonians* joins the company of Durfee, Dexter and, especially, of the great Harvard alumni biographers, Sibley and Shipton, as recorders in depth of the lives of the sons of the colonial colleges.

Dr. McLachlan's book presents biographical sketches of 338 men who can be identified as having studied at that offspring of the Great Awakening, the College of New Jersey, in the classes of 1748 through 1768. Of the total number, 222 sketches were written by McLachlan, the balance by five other contributors. The biographies appear in a well-printed, sturdy, clothbound volume, arranged by class and then alphabetically. Each account is followed by a list of sources consulted and, where applicable, by a list of the writings of the biographee. This last subsection appears often for of the 338 Princeton alumni considered, 97 were Presbyterian clerics and 61 ministers of other denominations; thus, over a third of the total were men of the cloth who were, of course, the chief scribblers

of eighteenth-century America. Portraits of fifty-four of the subjects are included; one or two others seem to have escaped presentation here, but not many.

The early Princetonians of whom McLachlan writes came from or went to "every one of the thirteen states as well as . . . Tennessee, Kentucky, the West Indies, and Ireland," movements which are not surprising given the evangelical activism of the clergy, particularly the frontier-concerned Presbyterians, and their families. Whether this pattern of mobility is "in sharp contrast" to the graduates of *all* other colleges at that time is less certain. The boys enrolled at Nassau Hall stemmed, chiefly, from Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania. Occupationally, the clergy were followed in numbers by lawyers (49) and physicians (44) and these professionals and their businessmen colleagues furnished substantial representation to the Continental Congress and, later, to the federal Congress, to the Constitutional Convention, the Supreme Court, the U.S. Senate and House, and so on.

Chief Justice Oliver Ellsworth, Senator (and Governor of New Jersey) William Paterson, Postmaster General Ebenezer Hazard, Signer of the Declaration of Independence Richard Stockton, university presidents James Manning (Brown) and Jonathan Edwards, Jr. (Union) and a host of legal Livingstons and Ogdens are all here. So, too, are other eminent figures of the Revolutionary era whose subsequent institutional loyalties are proudly claimed by Princeton's rival, Pennsylvania: Signer Benjamin Rush and his fellow physician, William Shippen, Jr., the scholar-scientist the Reverend John Ewing, and state Attorney General Jonathan Dickinson Sergeant. Such people, amply covered in other works of reference, are here described in disciplined sketches which neither omit significant achievements nor diminish stature while framing them within the standard length required by the group democracy of this class reunion in print.

To this reviewer, James McLachlan and his collaborators make an even more important contribution; they bring to life the Old Boys previously known only to the specialist, or not at all. Many of them were perfectly marvelous colonial Americans. Who cannot enjoy reading about James Lyon, Class of 1759, who in his senior year wrote an ode, "Louisberg [*sic*] Taken," two years later composed and published one of the first collections of American hymns, then explored the Bay of Fundy with Anthony Wayne and, as a parson in far-away Machias, Maine, and still drawn to his college topic and ground of exploration, Nova Scotia, urged the Continental Congress to capture that province for the new nation?

The author claims our attention for the Reverend Samuel Kirkland, missionary to the Oneidas whose interracial academy became Hamilton College, and to an actual Indian Princetonian, Jacob Woolley of the Delawares, whose psychological and social assimilation at both Princeton and Dartmouth was a failure; the poor lad swore violently and threw

bedclothes out the window. We read of William Burnet Browne who owned Gobelin tapestries (there could not have been many such collectors) and left Salem, Massachusetts, to "sink" into the life of the Virginia country gentry while his classmate of '60, the Reverend Enos Kelsey, paid to clothe New Jersey state troops during the Revolution, provided vests and breeches "too small for the most minute Person" and "greatly worn out."

The production of *Princetonians 1748-1768* occupied the author and eight parttime research assistants five years. Their point of departure for research was the Princeton University Archives but the resources at Princeton for comprehensive eighteenth-century alumni biography—even for such an expected record as a *complete* roster of matriculants—are, like those at most American universities, save only Harvard, incomplete. It was sheer labor to reconstruct the lives of so many eligibles and, often, to even establish their names. There are no surviving matriculation records at Princeton and but one pertinent manuscript account book of 1753-1757, so the augmentation of the lists of degree recipients, always in print and hence known, with the names of nongraduates was very difficult. A second, inherent problem was the positive matching of known students bearing common names like John Harris and James Paterson with individuals of those names found of record elsewhere. By exhaustive, oblique research the identity of twenty-five nongraduates (there were certainly more) has been established. In a few cases the John Harris among the graduates are entered with their classmates in sketch formats but await future certain identification before they can be detailed.

Such problems are offset by one's interest in the lives of the majority of the subjects about whom so much information is offered, and by one's enjoyment of the author's personal attributes: a knowledge of the historical background, an ability to write easily and to interpret broadly, and a sense of humor. Nineteen other American colleges and universities, to include only those with fingers in the eighteenth-century pie, need a *Princetonians* and a McLachlan.

*University of Pennsylvania Archives*

FRANCIS JAMES DALLETT

*Braddock at the Monongahela.* By PAUL E. KOPPERMAN. (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1977. xxvi, 322 p. Appendixes, illustrations, maps, bibliography, index. \$9.95.)

What happened so suddenly and surprisingly at the Monongahela River on July 9, 1755, has become a tenacious part of American legend. It has proved useful in ridiculing British military arrogance, in elevating the dedicated citizen-soldier above the trained professional, and in glorifying

George Washington. There can be no doubt that it had a strong influence upon American military calculations at the approach of the War for Independence. Many early narrative historians, among them Bancroft and Parkman, described in colorful language that fateful encounter, but not until the middle third of the twentieth century did Braddock's defeat come under the intense critical scrutiny it so greatly deserved. Early in 1936, in an article published in the *American Historical Review*, Stanley Pargellis attacked the traditional interpretation by arguing that Braddock suffered disaster not because he persisted in employing inappropriate European formations and tactics but rather because he did not employ them well enough. This was a most helpful shaft of light, and Pargellis' argument has been widely influential ever since. Also not to be ignored was the general exoneration of Braddock advanced by Franklin T. Nichols in his 1946 Harvard dissertation. Here the blame was removed from Braddock's shoulders altogether and placed upon his subordinate officers and second-rate troops. "Braddock would have won," asserted Nichols, "had he led disciplined regulars." (See also Nichols' article in the April 1947 *William and Mary Quarterly*.) It is safe to say that ever since Pargellis and Nichols, for serious scholars at least, the story of Braddock's defeat has not been able to be passed off simply as "Braddock's folly."

Is there a need for any further study of a battle that lasted less than four hours? Can anything really new and enlightening be offered at this late date? Kopperman's *Braddock at the Monongahela* is a strong demonstration in the affirmative. In fact, it is certain to be used from now on as an indispensable tool by any scholar working close to the subject. Pargellis made use of seven eyewitness reports together with "an eighth account which was pieced together soon after the battle from the reports of survivors." Kopperman has managed to assemble and publish in his appendixes twenty-two Anglo-American eyewitness reports plus at least one such French report, not counting second- and third-hand reports which have proved useful to some degree. William Dunbar's account is here published for the first time, and that by Robert Stewart has hitherto been available only in the contemporary *South Carolina Gazette*. Studying all these reports with a fine critical eye, Kopperman is able to provide us with an account of Braddock's defeat that will be exceedingly difficult to challenge without new evidence. So far as possible he has determined the personal biases of the various eyewitnesses, and has attempted to discover or at least estimate their location during the action, which is of great help in his evaluation and comparison of their reports. Without question, critical evaluation and comparison of diverse sources is the outstanding feature of Kopperman's brief but very solid book. For this reason it will also prove useful in graduate seminars as a practical, easy-to-comprehend demonstration of how a scholar copes with a problem involving multiple conflicting sources.

As the author says in his preface, he aimed at no "‘root-and-branch’ revision of the traditional account of the affair, but at a more precise portrayal," which is exactly what he has achieved. To some extent he modifies or refines Pargellis' interpretation, particularly in restressing British panic as the principal factor in the disaster. He does not go as far as Nichols in exonerating Braddock, but at the same time refrains from immoderate condemnation of Gage. The crucial factors making for disaster still seem to include inadequate scouting, unsatisfactory deployment, faulty countermeasures at the outset of the battle, poor communication, and almost pathological fear of hostile Indians. As in most such battles, luck too played a role. Unfortunately, the important Mackellar and Orme maps are not here reproduced with sufficient clarity. Also surprising, as a minor point, is the author's slighting of the best biography of George Croghan. These are small faults. By making excellent use of the full run of sources now known, Kopperman has reconstructed the battle of July 9 in detail and with convincing evidence, thereby making a significant contribution to a subject that many had considered already pretty well exhausted. We are reminded again that in History there is no such thing.

*Vanderbilt University*

DOUGLAS EDWARD LEACH

*The Papers of Henry Bouquet*, Volume III, January 1, 1759–August 31, 1759. Edited by DONALD H. KENT, *et al.* (Harrisburg: The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1976. xxvii, 659 p. Illustrations, index. \$20.00.)

The documents in this third volume of the papers of Henry Bouquet cover the operations of the British Army in Pennsylvania during the first eight months of the year 1759. The French had evacuated the forks of the Ohio and retired to Venango, LeBoeuf, and Presqu'isle while the major axis of the British military effort had shifted north to New York and Canada. General Amherst did not plan to mount any offensive from Pittsburgh, but hoped to use the post to check any enemy advance. Provincial troops stiffened with detachments of Royal Americans and Highlanders at Fort Pitt and Ligonier were expected to secure the frontier. Although some tribesmen of the Six Nations, Shawnee, and Delaware at Fort Pitt professed their friendship, rumors filtered in that the French were massing large numbers of men to descend the Allegheny. Fearing a "Coup de Main," Amherst hesitated to pull back the troops to better winter quarters.

The British-colonial hold on the Pennsylvania frontier was tenuous. The fort under construction at Pittsburgh was too small for the garrison and indefensible against artillery. Sickness—scurvy brought on by the lack of fruit, vegetables, or vinegar and cider, and measles contracted in Virginia—further weakened the exhausted and depleted garrisons. Colonel Hugh

Mercer, the Scottish-born physician who commanded the detachment of the Pennsylvania regiment, complained of officers who resigned their commissions to follow the army as sutlers and peddlers. Some way should be found to "prevent such Vermin from coming up . . ." (p. 214). Both Mercer and Lieutenant Colonel Thomas Lloyd who commanded the Pennsylvanians at Ligonier complained of the quality of the provincial forces. Bouquet, the Swiss-born professional, charged that many of the staff officers and unit commanders "Fill[ed] their companies with riffraff, old men, or children . . ." (p. 53). For some months both the Pennsylvania and Maryland contingents went unpaid as the colonial governors squabbled with their legislatures over appropriations; at one point the high rate of desertion threatened to leave Fort Cumberland without a garrison. Lloyd suggested that the troops might find some relief back along the line of communication in the inhabited regions, but Mercer preferred to keep his men in Pittsburgh, never having known "any other Advantage accruing to Soldiers . . . from being in Towns on the frontier, than black eyes, Claps, and eternal flogging; and unless Carlisle & Shippensb[ur]g are of late miraculously altered in point of Morals, the old game at either of those seats of Virtue and good manners would undoubtedly be play'd over" (p. 308).

Provisioning the garrison along the exposed line of communications was a vexing problem, particularly since no agreement could be reached with the local assembly over settling the army bills for the previous campaign. Despite repeated advertising in Lancaster, York, Cumberland, and Frederick counties and in the district of Winchester for flour, grain, forage, horses, and wagons, the "Country people" appeared "Backward to Enter into the Service of the Crown . . ." (p. 107). Unable to borrow £100,000 from the assembly, Brigadier General John Stanwix was forced to send to London for a chest of gold and silver. The army commanders and Governor William Denny authorized civil officials to employ the military to impress wagons and horses. The results were not encouraging. Quakers claimed to be adverse to the hire of their wagons on religious principles. The farmers in Lancaster County proved to be the most backward, while those of Bucks and Chester, where the Friends were in the majority, gave only nominal assistance, sending wagons and animals unfit for carriage. The problem of supplying Pittsburgh and the other advanced posts was relieved somewhat by contracting with Virginia agents for flour, forage, and cattle under a credit granted by a London merchant house. Virginia troops also arrived to fill out the garrison at Fort Pitt and to provide escorts for convoys. Protecting the wagon and pack trains was still a hazardous task, however, as, with the coming of spring, the Indians outfitted at Venango and Presqu'isle began raiding, scalping, and killing around Pittsburgh, Bedford, and Ligonier and along the line of communications.

Amherst's basic strategy proved sound, however, for, when a British-

Indian force under Sir William Johnson operating from New York late in July defeated a French force drawn from the posts about the Great Lakes and took Niagara, the French burned and abandoned Venango, LeBoeuf, and Presqu'isle. Raids by Indians unhappy over the British advance continued along the Pennsylvania frontier. A forecast of future problems arising from this situation is to be found in the correspondence of Bouquet and Thomas Penn. From London the Proprietor urged that every method ought to be made to convince the tribesmen that the British did not intend to settle on their lands. If not, it would be impossible to preserve peace. Settlers, especially Germans with whom Bouquet was in touch, were returning to their deserted farms. They ought to be cautioned, Penn advised, "to beware of designing Men, who under the disguise of Friends to Liberty would introduce Licentiousness, which must undermine the very foundations of Liberty" (p. 243).

*University of Nebraska, Lincoln*

JACK M. SOSIN

*American Literature, 1764-1789: The Revolutionary Years.* EVERETT EMERSON, Editor. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1977. xvi, 301 p. Index. \$15.00.)

It was back in 1873-1897 that Moses Coit Tyler published his massive histories of the Colonial and Revolutionary periods in American literature. His distinction was that he was almost the first—perhaps the first—literary historian to recognize the distinctive qualities of American literature as the varied expression of unique and stirring historical events, and then to read and report on all the many kinds of writing that those events produced. For him literature was record rather than art and he found plenty of good writing but no real literature of the highest order. V. L. Parrington was the next, in 1917-1930, to read all these same writings and find no first-rate literature, in spite of the fact that he had a theory about the relationship of literature to the political and economic forces to which it gave expression. By now it seemed agreed that, before about 1820, early American literature was a vigorous expression of stirring events rather than an exercise of the imagination and that our national literary life really began with Cooper, Irving, and Poe.

Why then the sudden revival of interest in these early periods, with specialist groups going back over the same ground, founding their own "learned" journal, rereading the same writings and offering papers on them and their authors, but still failing to find a Shakespeare, or even a Dickens or Longfellow? We have known for a long time that the literature of our Revolutionary period consisted mainly of reports, tracts, sermons and imitative "belles lettres"; that the excitement of the War gave these writings increased power and effect, but that the real literary enterprise



began only toward the end of the century. Do Everett Emerson and his colleagues have anything original, more thorough, or more perceptive to contribute to the work of their predecessors?

The answer is—No—and Yes. Except for the chapters on the Loyalists, the travelers, and the blacks, there is little novelty in the material. We have the pamphleteers, the preachers, Franklin, Freneau, Jefferson, Crèvecoeur, the Connecticut Wits, the early drama and the *Federalist*; the choice is spotty and there are many writings not included. But the book has nevertheless a refreshing quality which lies in the sense of discovery and excitement in the authors of the essays. Here is a new generation coming once more to these writings and suddenly sharing anew the excitement of the stirring ideas and conflicts of those old writers. Tyler, Parrington, Commager, Murdock, Miller, and Jones are almost forgotten and never deferred to. These young men and women—many of them Assistant and Associate Professors—are telling us about what they have personally discovered. They are not bound to a historical frame and therefore are more free to read critically and enjoy. Crèvecoeur's whole experience—of which his American farm was but a small part—Dwight's *Conquest of Canaan* as an American epic, Mercy Warren's polemical plays, Madison's important share in the *Federalist*, Jefferson's denunciation of slavery, the contrast between Hopkinson and Freneau, Franklin's slow advocacy of independence, and many other flashes of fresh insight make this retreading of old paths almost a new experience.

The strength of the book lies therefore less in its scholarly authority than in its perceptive critical intelligence. Its weakness, of course, is that it does not give us old pioneers that credit we think we deserve. But each generation must write its own literary history, and if this isn't quite finished literary history, it is a good start.

*University of Pennsylvania*

ROBERT E. SPILLER

*Portents of Rebellion: Rhetoric and Revolution in Philadelphia, 1765-1776.*

By STEPHEN E. LUCAS. (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1976. xxi, 333 p. Index. \$17.50.)

Dr. Lucas' *Portents of Rebellion* does not traverse new ground. Professors Hawke, Hutson, Newcomb, Oaks and Ryerson—to name but a few recent contributors—have delineated many of the contours. But no one has examined the public rhetoric in Philadelphia between 1765 and 1776 as relentlessly or as well as Lucas. And no one had shown so methodically how rhetoric helped to propel the Revolutionary movement in that city from stage to stage. Nor has anyone previously explored as carefully Whig discourse in relation to local conditions and audiences. In the end Lucas

confirms Gordon Wood's suspicion that by 1776 the public dialogue was shaping events even as Revolutionary exigencies were changing the character of public rhetoric. The drift toward a more "proletarian" rhetoric was thus both cause and effect of the "democratization of the mind" in Revolutionary America.

Lucas concludes that in the decade before independence Whig publicists chose not to address the immediate economic consequences of British legislation. By concentrating on the moral inequity or long-range political ramifications they were able to appeal to a wider audience. Also, by focusing on constitutional issues and by arguing from principle—Lucas discovers no "ideological chameleons" among Whig leaders—Whig spokesmen hastened the bipolarization of public opinion and severely limited the possibility of meaningful compromise on either side. Events obviously helped to shape the public dialogue but Whig rhetoricians did more to "improve upon events" than did their Tory counterparts. Their ability to couch arguments in terms of specific audiences and their greater sensitivity to varying local conditions enabled them ultimately to erode confidence in the Pennsylvania Assembly among the city's numerous moderates after May 1, 1776. That proved to be the turning point in swinging the city toward independence, according to Lucas. Just as Richard Buel discovered substantial rhetorical differences between later Federalists and Republicans traceable to divergent social consciousnesses, Lucas finds that dissimilarities in "political and cultural universes" separated Whig from Tory spokesmen. The "gentlemanly ethos" of Tory addresses increasingly failed to compete successfully with the "popular mode" employed (often calculatingly) by Whigs.

Although thoughtful and well written, this is not an altogether successful book. That despite his efforts we still do not know to what different segments of Philadelphia society—by social station, ethnic origins, religious affiliation, occupation, and the like—responded or failed to respond, is not entirely his fault, of course. A more definitive answer must await studies similar to what Charles Olton has given us on the city's artisans. But the book is repetitious. Moreover, Lucas' evidence does not always support his contentions. We are told, for instance (and I believe correctly), that George Clymer and Thomas McKean were among "the most notable of the men" who "governed the public mind," but his work offers little to substantiate that conclusion. From the evidence he presents one would think that the less publicized Richard Wells and William Hicks were a good deal more influential.

Still, this is a useful book; it points up the need for similar studies of other colonies. Future works on propaganda and public opinion, however, would do well to go beyond a primary concern with public letters, editorials, speeches and broadsides to include (as Kenneth Silverman has done) music, art, the theatre, political cartoons, and literature—all public

statements of a sort. Future studies would also profit from Rhys Isaac's recent suggestion that historians employ "dramaturgical analyses" in their efforts to explicate the essentially oral culture of eighteenth-century America.

*University of Northern Colorado*

G. S. ROWE

*Sectionalism in American Politics, 1774-1789.* By JOSEPH L. DAVIS. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1977. x, 239 p. Index. \$17.50.)

This volume is primarily a history of political alignments in the Continental and Confederation Congresses. As such, it naturally invites comparison to H. James Henderson's *Party Politics in the Continental Congress* (New York, 1974). Davis' work follows so closely the path Henderson cut that, at times, the reviewer finds himself asking what justified its publication. If there is one thing which Henderson established, it was the preponderance of sectionalism in the politics of the Continental Congress. Davis reiterates the theme of sectional conflict, finding the same regional alliances, and the shifts in them taking place at the same time, as Henderson does.

Davis' work is saved from complete redundancy by broader research in the literary sources, which permits him to supplement the story which Henderson tells. Davis breaks new ground in analyzing the sectional dimensions of the struggle over the location of the national capital; he adds to our information about the Annapolis Convention and has good chapters on the sectional conflict over the regulation of commerce and over the navigation of the Mississippi. In attempting, moreover, to assess the impact of sectionalism on the antifederalists, he at times deepens our perspective on the period.

*Sectionalism in American Politics, 1774-1789* is a respectable work, well researched, clearly written, and short. The scholar wanting to inform himself about the workings of the Continental Congress will be advised, however, to go first to Henderson's book.

*The Library of Congress*

JAMES H. HUTSON

*The John Dunlap Broadside: The First Printing of the Declaration of Independence.* By FREDERICK R. GOFF. (Washington: The Library of Congress, 1976. 61 p. \$15.00 hard covers; \$7.00 paper.)

One of the more appropriate and satisfying academic enterprises marking the Bicentennial celebration was the assembling in one place for study the surviving copies of John Dunlap's first broadside printing of the

Declaration of Independence. Dr. Julian P. Boyd, editor of *The Jefferson Papers*, conceived of the project, the Ford Foundation granted the Library of Congress funds to carry out the program, and Frederick R. Goff directed the study. His findings, together with photographic reproductions of the twenty-one extant copies or fragments of copies, are brought together in the slim, tall handsome volume here under review.

The actions of the Continental Congress regarding the Declaration in June and early July, 1776, are well established. Richard Henry Lee of Virginia introduced the formal resolution calling for independence on June 7. Four days later Congress chose a committee to draw up the key document. Jefferson, given the assignment, completed the draft, according to John Adams, within a day or two after undertaking the composition. Franklin and Adams offered only minor revisions. The Congress, working as a committee of the whole, started debate on the draft July 2, revising and emending as it proceeded, approved the document during the morning of July 4, and directed the committee to see the Declaration in its final form through the press and send copies to the governing bodies of the United States and to the commanders of the Continental troops.

The committee carried the manuscript bearing the signature of Hancock and Secretary Thomson to 48 High (or Market) Street, on the south side three doors below Second, where John Dunlap, one of several Philadelphia printers employed by the Congress in those tumultuous early years, saw the text composed and worked off the press in time for Hancock to dispatch copies with covering letters dated July 5. Mr. Goff points to traces of offset from having been folded before the ink was entirely dry on eleven copies as evidence of the haste with which the broadside was printed and sent on its way. He could find no records on the number of copies run off but believes the total printing was not very large.

Of the twenty-one copies preserved Mr. Goff was able to assemble seventeen at one time in Washington and examine them in relation to each other with all the technological aids now available to the knowing bookman: the Scherr-Tumico paper micrometer, the kodolith film for contact reproduction, the Hinman collator, and Beta radiography for recording watermarks. His findings are interesting indeed.

The Historical Society of Pennsylvania's half-page fragment is unique in that its text alone carries a series of puzzling "diacritical" quotation marks and an article *a* which are absent from that of all other copies examined. The broadside printing of the Declaration exists in two states caused by the repositioning of the imprint partway through the run.

The two largest copies are those of the American Philosophical Society and the New-York Historical Society, two of the very small group printed on unmarked paper, while twelve others were done on fine Dutch paper, the watermarks of which Mr. Goff reproduces in exquisite detail. He measures the paper thickness, sheet size, and the margins of all the copies with meticulous care, but omits the measurement of the type-page and

does not point out that the text type used by Dunlap is Caslon English, or about 13 point in today's measurement.

Mr. Goff believes the unwatermarked sheets on which a few copies were printed was "probably imported paper." To this reviewer, who was surprised to find Dunlap with a goodly supply of imported paper eighteen months after the Congress imposed its nonimportation restrictions against Britain, the paper of the American Philosophical Society copy looks much like printing paper laid here in Pennsylvania in the seventies.

All in all, Mr. Goff, who served for years as Chief of Rare Books at the Library of Congress, carries off his labor of love with careful exactitude. He chose to open his volume with a full color reproduction of Rembrandt Peale's portrait of Dunlap owned by the First Troop Philadelphia City Cavalry, and would probably have wished, had the Engelhard Fund been able to afford it, to include a fold-out of the Declaration broadside in life-size, for who better than he, after this study, would recognize the imposing appearance of Dunlap's original printing?

*Temple University*

C. WILLIAM MILLER

*Broadsides & Bayonets: The Propaganda War of the American Revolution.*  
Revised edition. By CARL BERGER. (San Rafael, Calif.: Presidio Press, 1976. 226 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. \$12.95.)

This book is a revised edition of a work that appeared in 1961. The author continued to find new details and not only has incorporated them into an expanded text, but states that he has also reorganized his material. Illustrations have been added. The result is a full consideration of the efforts of both sides in the War for Independence to gain allies, promote disturbance behind the lines, deceive the enemy, and generally win world approval. Yet the impression remains that neither side was very effective on the propaganda front. Mr. Berger admits that the best propaganda was not carefully worded argument but military victory. Nothing succeeded like success, to fall back on an old saw.

His account of the failure to persuade the Canadians to join in rebellion is adequate. He believes that American propaganda was successful in keeping the Canadian government on the defensive (p. 39), yet this was a very limited success. Perhaps not enough emphasis is given to the absence of newspapers in Canada which might have focused discontent and aroused greater resentment. As for the Indians, the British had the advantage because they controlled most of the trade. The chiefs knew they must be on the winning side, but miscalculated. The best the United States could hope for was to promote Indian neutrality; even George Rogers Clark was satisfied with that. In the matter of inciting Negro slave uprisings, it is surprising that the British did not do better. After all, the

Americans showed a glaring inconsistency in extolling liberty and maintaining slavery, and the British promise of freedom should have been persuasive, yet by and large the blacks seemed to view the conflict as a white man's war. The Americans were more successful in subverting the German mercenaries, by offers of land and freedom, than the British were with the slaves. Hundreds of Germans deserted, and thousands never went home after the war. American propaganda seemed to arouse the Irish, but Great Britain countered disaffection there in 1779 by making concessions.

Mr. Berger does not limit himself to speeches, newspapers, and pamphlets; he examines rumors, letters, attempts at bribery and assassination, marksmanship, and weapons. His study invites speculation, chiefly on the question of why neither side was not more effective. Less mysterious is the appeal of specific incidents over a philosophical argument, such as the scalping of Jane McCrea in comparison to the Declaration of Independence. With considerable insight the author recognizes the tremendous impact on public consciousness of the character of George Washington. The British had no commander who could match him. Men who were not sure of their own political views could have faith in this upright and confident leader. His constant deference to Congress insured the Revolution against the excess of terror. His was a persuasive spirit, the highest form of propaganda.

The author reveals a certain unsteadiness in his use of sources. Sometimes he is meticulous in his citations; again he mentions a general date for a letter quoted but not the source of it; and occasionally the reader is left in the dark as to where a quotation might be found. In the last chapter here is a misnumbering in the notes. He also misspells Joseph Priestley's name and surely misspoke in saying that "peace negotiations were under-way" in the summer of 1781 (p. 69).

The book is a good resumé of propaganda practices during the Revolution. There is a bibliography, index, and sixteen pages of illustrations. Footnotes are at the back of the volume.

*William L. Clements Library*  
*University of Michigan*

HOWARD H. PECKHAM

*Massachusetts: A Pictorial History.* By WALTER MUIR WHITEHILL and NORMAN KOTKER. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1976. xii, 379 p. Illustrations, index. \$25.00.)

This handsome volume would be an ornament to any coffee table. But it is much more than that. The hundreds of pictures that it contains are a veritable gold mine of material on all phases of Massachusetts history. Walter Whitehill has written a short introduction with his usual felicity

and incisiveness; the rest of the book is filled with illustrations—from the Mayflower Compact to the busing crisis in Boston in the 1970s. What makes the book especially valuable to scholars is the comprehensive index that accompanies the volume. This index does not merely list the pictures by title; it lists everything *in* the pictures as well. For example, if someone is interested in Boston sidewalks, he will find four references in the index. In no case is a sidewalk the main subject of the pictures referred to, but in all of them sidewalks appear as incidental to a more general scene. In similar fashion there is more than a page of references to various costumes worn by Massachusetts people over the years. This editorial procedure gives the volume a new dimension when compared with most picture books and makes the illustrations a rich depository of historical information. In most illustrated volumes the pictures support the text; in this one the text supports the pictures. It is good to know that eventually volumes similar to this one will be published for each state in the Union.

Too many Massachusetts history books are written as if Boston were the only settled area in the state and as if Yankees were the only inhabitants. This volume, fortunately, avoids both of these pitfalls and gives ample attention to all parts of the Commonwealth and to the many ethnic groups living in the Bay State. For example, the Connecticut River Valley, often ignored in other texts, is given the treatment that this most beautiful part of the state deserves. But more important is the space accorded to various ethnic groups. There are many references to the blacks, the Irish, the Italians and the Jews, as well as to the Roman Catholics. The political history of Massachusetts in the twentieth century is in large measure the story of the struggle between the Yankees and the "Newcomers" for control of the state governmental machinery. One has only to record the names of such recent Massachusetts governors as Dever, Furcolo, Volpe, and Dukakis to be made aware of the inroads made by non-Yankee groups. This book treats the "Newcomers" and their political activities generously, in a way that gives a proper balance to Bay State political history in this century.

Walter Whitehill's introduction to this volume is a fitting complement to the picture-story that follows. He knows that he cannot tell the whole story of Massachusetts in seventeen pages and has selected his material wisely. He devotes about half his space to an account of the founding and growth of Massachusetts through the Revolution, including the charming interview with Captain Levi Preston as to why he fought in the war. In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries the treatment is topical and stresses social and economic developments rather than political ones. There is, for example, no account of the role of the Bay State in the Civil War or in the two World Wars, no attempt to deal with national politics. Instead the emphasis is on maritime activity, the development of the textile industry, the rise of educational institutions—and not just Harvard either—and the increasing diversity of churches. Mr. Whitehill concludes that today the

church population of the state is only about one-fourth Protestant—a far cry from earlier days. As in the picture-story part of the volume, ethnic groups are emphasized, with accounts of the Catholic hierarchy, Irish success stories like that of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and black achievements like that of Edward Brooke. Thus the introduction prepares the reader for what is to come and supports the positions taken in the picture-story part of the book.

This reviewer has done his homework trying to catch the authors in some errors, but aside from a few nit-picking quibbles came away empty handed. The only criticism that any reader could have would relate to what was left out, and here it is hard to fault the authors. There was, however, one serious omission. No mention is made of the oldest incorporated boarding school in the United States, an institution that has been an ornament to the Bay State for 200 years—namely, Phillips Academy, Andover.

*Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass.*

FREDERICK S. ALLIS, JR.

*The Antislavery Appeal: American Abolitionism After 1830.* By RONALD G. WALTERS. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976. xvii, 196 p. Note on sources, index. \$11.00.)

This is not a history of abolitionism in the United States after 1830, nor is it a summary of abolitionist propaganda for that period. It is a history of ideas, and might well be titled the Social Ideas of American Abolitionists after 1830. Running through this work is the assumption of a consensus among abolitionists and their contemporaries. Professor Walters argues that abolitionists shared many ideas with other intellectuals of the period, including their opponents, and that frequently they all had more in common than the abolitionists had with twentieth-century radicals. This is hardly a surprising conclusion, though it does conflict with the views of some contemporary historians. That the differences among the abolitionists themselves have tended to obscure their common objective is a point well worth emphasizing, though once again it is not wholly original.

The approach is topical rather than chronological, with discussion of such issues as ends and means, religion and its relationship to abolitionism, morality and the bases for it, sexual attitudes and their place in anti-slavery thought, the role of the family and slavery's effect on it, the virtues of a "progressive" industrial economy and the place of the idea of nationalism and disunion in abolitionist thought. Each of these is discussed at length with appropriate quotations and generalizations which sometimes suggest more agreement among the reformers than may have been the case.

In a bibliographical note, Professor Walters comments that in assessing



attitudes he found it necessary to check what the abolitionists said in public with what they said in more private letters and diaries. Although he did examine some of the manuscripts in the Boston Public Library, he failed to study other notable antislavery collections. A further dimension could have been added by comparing the statements public and private with the deeds of the reformers. A very little of this would quickly reveal the serious divisions which were a part of the crusade environment. While it is true that all kinds of abolitionists shared an interest in their eventual goal, to them the differences in style, leadership, and means were very real. That such divisions can obscure common objectives is easily demonstrated by the divisions among contemporary radicals who think of themselves as socialists, divisions sufficiently real as to lead to serious oppression of one faction by another that has attained power.

If the book indeed explains why nineteenth-century society and culture produced a particular kind of attack on slavery, as its jacket promises, the answer has eluded this reviewer. It does provide much information on the relationship of the abolitionists to their society and culture which was not previously studied, and that makes it a valuable work.

Some of the interpretations are provocative, while others are puzzling. For example, one finds that John Brown "was the most consistent of the abolitionists" (p. 32), an interpretation which challenges the role of Garrison and his lengthy career in the cause. Does an act of terrorism or violence imply consistency? And when he defines an abolitionist, the author includes a "commitment to the creation of a society in which blacks would have civil equality with whites." Such a definition, if applied to the period under consideration, would sharply reduce the number of those who thought of themselves as active abolitionists. Other readers will find additional material for controversy, but this in no way lessens the value of the monograph. It is a significant contribution to nineteenth-century intellectual history and to the history of reform ideas.

*Wilmington College*

LARRY GARA

*Pittsburgh Glass 1797-1891: A History and Guide for Collectors.* By LOWELL INNES. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1976. xix, 522 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. \$30.00.)

More glass was manufactured in Pittsburgh and its environs than in any other area of the country in the last century, yet until the publication of *Pittsburgh Glass* no study of this important industry had been undertaken. Lowell Innes has toiled for many years seeking information about this "midwestern" glass and the craftsmen who made it. It has been no easy task, because the story of nineteenth-century glass is one of complex

interaction, imitation, and technological change. The styles of European imported glass were copied by glassmakers in every part of America, many of whom had trained abroad. As glassblowers migrated from factory to factory in this country, they carried new ideas and skills—and often their tools and molds—with them. The advanced marketing techniques of the period further obscure the identification of the glass of one area: no glass manufacturer was content with local sales but sought and found customers in all parts of the United States. Finally, the mechanization of the industry that began in the second quarter of the nineteenth century increased standardization while diminishing regional differences.

With all of these considerations well in mind, the author has set out to define and defend what is “Pittsburgh” about Pittsburgh glass. He has ferreted out an enviable group of glass objects that can be firmly attributed to Pittsburgh glasshouses on the basis of such things as family histories, travelers’ accounts, inscriptions or marks, and manufacturers’ catalogs. In each of his chapters on the different types of glass made in the city, Innes presents these well-documented glasses as control groups by which other attributions can be made. But glass connoisseurship is not an exact science and with some of the mold-blown, cut, and engraved glasswares it is difficult to understand how or why Innes has come to a “made in Pittsburgh” conclusion. Sometimes he has been so careful to present all the arguments for and against a Pittsburgh attribution that his own opinion has gotten lost in the discussion. Much of the commentary about individual objects would have best been placed in footnotes, but regrettably there are no footnotes at all. This is a serious flaw, not only because of the burdens placed upon the text as a result, but also because of the problems students will have in finding supplemental information.

Glass historians should welcome the author’s fresh approach to lamps and chimneys, pictorial flasks, and glass at the Centennial. Innes has directed attention to the intriguing and generally ignored objects that combine the techniques of free-blowing and pressing. The chapters on pressed glass, laden with detailed descriptions of patterns and their variations, will certainly appeal to the collector. Throughout these sections Innes has been careful to remind collectors of the pitfalls in making attributions. All of the chapters on the glasswares are replete with interesting quotes and illustrations from neglected primary sources such as *The Crockery and Glass Journal*, although the historian may find fault with the author’s interpretation of written records. The book is profusely illustrated and the comprehensive captions will be appreciated. Many of the objects shown are from private collections or institutions whose collections are not widely known.

The consideration of the many varieties of Pittsburgh glass occupies nearly four-fifths of the volume. Innes sets the stage for his discussion with a brief history of the city and its resources that glassmakers found so inviting. His story of the development of the pioneer glasshouses is drawn

from primary documents that shed new light on the operations and aspirations of the early factories. The historian will be frustrated, however, because it is obvious that the author has been able to present only a tantalizing fraction of the material he uncovered. It is unfortunate that Innes chose not to present, even in an appendix, the detailed ownership histories of each factory and the auxiliary independent firms that decorated glass or made molds for the glassworks. This is the sort of information the business historian expects to be able to find in a regional study such as this. Many readers will not be familiar with Pittsburgh and for them a map of the city showing the locations of the glassworks would have been helpful.

Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum

ARLENE PALMER

*Impeachment of a President: Andrew Johnson, the Blacks, and Reconstruction.*

By HANS L. TREFOUSSE. (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1975. xii, 252 p. Bibliography, index. \$10.95.)

Andrew Johnson's historical reputation has declined greatly since the near-adulatory treatment he enjoyed during the first fifty years of this century. His descent is an almost perfect inversion to the rise of American Negroes toward more equal and decent legal conditions and aspirations.

Taken together with his earlier studies of leading Republicans Butler and Wade, Professor Trefousse's *Impeachment of a President* reaffirms impressively the judgment that Johnson's race views, translated into public policies (or, better, into covert opposition to enforcement of such policies as the Freedman's Bureau and Civil Rights Acts), brought on his impeachment. This essential insight gives solidity to Trefousse's *Impeachment*. It need hardly be said that Trefousse is aware of, and describes, selfishnesses and frailties on all partisan sides. His point remains firm and convincing, however, that no other combinations of concerns and purposes than those centering on race could have brought Johnson to the Senate bar. Transcending insight, Trefousse achieved remarkable clarity in expressing this very tangled tale, so that the fatiguing DeWitt study (1903) need no longer obstruct bibliographies.

Trefousse's *Impeachment* missed becoming part of the legal and constitutional history literature that played prominent roles in the Nixon near-impeachment. The Trefousse book would have instructed and comforted the Representatives of 1974 on basic points.

First, it would have indicated how reluctant Congresses were, 1865-7, to resort to the constitutional but virtually unused and politically hazardous impeachment process. Second, the Trefousse book would have underscored the Capitol Hill confusions shared by too many constitutional

lawyers and historians in 1868 as in 1974 and 1977 about indictability as a minimum for impeachability.

Trefousse has made clearer how this indictability factor fuddled the Johnson impeachers. Their problem was less that their case against Johnson was inadequate than that, short of Nixon-level self-recorded evidence of conspiracy to obstruct justice, indictability was incredibly difficult to prove, *if* law-court standards about testimony, witnesses, etc., were observed in the Senate. Ours is simply not England's government. There, Parliament wraps up all impeachment processes, including punishments, within itself. Parliament can (and has) impeached, convicted, and punished high officers not only for criminal offenses but for a wide range of misconduct equalling malfunctioning or maladministration. There is no use yearning for that elastic standard, as some scholars, including earlier reviewers of Trefousse's *Impeachment*, have done.

Our Constitution's impeachment clauses were intended as ultimate weapons; our set elections provide policy and personnel alternatives frequent enough to make impeachment seem too drastic. Of all Presidents, only Andrew Johnson and Richard Nixon became so dangerous as to make waiting for the next election unbearable. And, by riveting criminal indictability to impeachability, Johnson and Nixon may have killed impeachment. Surely no future President will keep tapes of the sort Nixon saved; hopefully, no President will behave in ways that brought Johnson and Nixon to impeachment.

The Senate's failure to convict Johnson (by one vote) was, I agree with Trefousse, Johnson's victory in a war not a battle; a war that bore bitter fruits for a century. Race attitudes, that for a few bright years appear to have been heading toward more decent levels of co-existence because of federal interventions, hardened again in white supremacy, anti-intervention patterns. Johnson never deserved his footnoted eminence. Trefousse's *Impeachment* helps the descent.

Trefousse's is the clearest, most judicious, and race-relevant account we have of the Johnson impeachment story. He deserves, and I offer, gratitude for his accomplishment. (Editorial note: The review copy of this work was not received until early this year so that the lateness of this review is not the fault of the reviewer.)

Rice University

HAROLD M. HYMAN

*Union County, Pennsylvania: A Bicentennial History.* By CHARLES M. SNYDER. (Lewisburg, Pa.: The Colonial Printing House, Inc., 1976. x, 324 p. Illustrations, appendix, index. \$10.00.)

Daniel Webster's well-known love for Dartmouth College, small as it was, obviously is equalled by Charles M. Snyder's affection for Pennsyl-

vania's Union County, small as it is. This excellent history of a local community is the product of his industry and local pride and the Bicentennial-inspired interest in a people's roots. It hardly matters that Union County has little to distinguish it from its neighbors. The author concedes that it is one of the Commonwealth's smallest both in area and population; that few of its residents ever held high political office; and few of them have had their names listed in *Who's Who in America*. Nevertheless, its location "athwart the frontier during the bloody struggles [of] the French and Indian and Revolutionary wars," its settlement by "intrepid Scots-Irish and German frontiersmen," and its later role as "a microcosm of the political and social currents which swept the nation" justify, to his mind, setting down the record of its past.

Sponsored by the Union County Bicentennial Commission, the author drew upon official state records, local histories and annals, historical society proceedings, and newspaper files for his sources. These he leavened with innumerable stories, many of them gossipy in character, born of local tradition. They remind us that generations may come and go but human nature does not appear to change very much.

A professional historian, the author devotes his first five chapters to the County's history, beginning with the eighteenth-century frontier to the recent past. Originally a part of Northumberland County, it became a separate political entity in 1813, and in turn Snyder County was carved from it in 1855. Meantime, as Northumbrians the residents withstood Indian raids, fought the French, took an active part in America's war for independence, and, shortly after the Federal Constitution was adopted, turned to Jeffersonian Republicanism.

The area's most prominent political personage in the early nineteenth century, crusty Senator William Maclay, was the only inhabitant to achieve national fame. Andrew Jackson captured the support of most voters and the Democracy prevailed, despite Anti-Masonic and Whig inroads, until it foundered on the free soil controversy. Loyalty to the Union during the Civil War (misnamed "War Between the States" by Professor Snyder) solidified the hold of the Republican Party and this has been the political coloring, with infrequent exceptions, of Union County since then.

Seven chapters are devoted to chronicles of individual townships and principal towns. These narrate the social and economic changes which took place as Union Countians tried to adjust to the increasing industrialization of their state and nation. The chief industries appear to have been farming and lumbering, although small individual manufacturing enterprises sprang up from time to time. Isolated as it was in the back country, transportation always was a problem, but the Pennsylvania Canal helped open the region in the 1830s and within two decades the railroad arrived to be followed a half century later by the automobile.

The story of the community's economic, religious, educational, and cultural developments during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century comprises the final seven chapters, one of which deals with "Women Through the Passing Generations." By 1976, the author notes, "changes were occurring at an unprecedented rate," manifested by population growth and urbanization. Agriculture continued the basis for the economy but "pressures of a growing population were raising questions regarding land and water conservation." As it had in its beginnings, Union County shares the same problems which beset the rest of us.

Gettysburg College

ROBERT L. BLOOM

*Biographical Dictionary of the Confederacy.* By JON L. WAKELYN. FRANK E. VANDIVER, advisory editor. (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1977. xii, 603 p. Bibliography, index. \$29.95.)

Jon L. Wakelyn has published two separate but related studies. The first is a sixty-page essay on "the collective leadership of the South from 1850 to 1877"; the second, a collection of 651 biographical sketches of individual Confederates. In addition, Wakelyn has attached a chronology of events and five appendixes listing information about the subjects of his sketches. Included in this lot are 252 generals, 264 members of the Confederate Congress, assorted other males (cabinet members, businessmen, governors, bureaucrats), and six women. These are the people who, in Wakelyn's opinion, made "important contributions to the total war effort" (p. 10).

The propriety of publishing yet another biographical dictionary of Confederates is questionable. Of Wakelyn's 651 subjects, 516 are treated in Ezra Warner's *Generals in Gray* and/or Warner's and Buck Years's *Biographical Register of the Confederate Congress*. Wakelyn's justification is that many earlier sources contain erroneous information and he sought to avoid such mistakes by "digging into old files and county studies" (p. 12). With accurate data and computers it would then be possible to answer questions about the South's leaders. Two things then are necessary for the successful use of quantitative history in a study such as Wakelyn undertook—accurate data and accurate classification and counting of those data. These are the criteria by which *Biographical Dictionary of the Confederacy* must be judged.

Wakelyn appears to have failed to collect accurate data. This reviewer checked carefully the sketches of the generals and found that they often contained erroneous information. (How could Frank Vandiver, the advisory editor and author of a biography of Stonewall Jackson, permit Wakelyn to declare that Jackson's marriages were "childless" (p. 249)? Most of the errors are, in themselves, minor and often the obvious result

of carelessness or haste, but they are so numerous as to call into question both the value of the book as a reference source and the use of the data in Wakelyn's essay on leadership.

The major weakness of the essay on leadership is Wakelyn's failure to inform the reader who is being classified as what for counting purposes. For example, he writes (p. 40) that there were thirty-two generals of cavalry in the southern army but his biographical data indicate that forty-five generals led Confederate cavalry and that another six may have (neither group includes Nathan Bedford Forest, John Hunt Morgan who is listed as a congressman on p. 517, L. S. Ross, Jo Shelby, or P. M. B. Young, since it is impossible to tell from Wakelyn's sketches that they were cavalry generals). Forty-one generals with Mexican War experience are said to have served with the Army of Tennessee (p. 44). The biographical sketches indicate that forty-six did and another seven may have. Wakelyn states (p. 42) that only four lieutenant generals served with "the Tennessee command" (presumably the Army of Tennessee). Five lieutenant generals were with that army in the summer of 1864. Nor does Wakelyn define terms carefully. He considers a general's "prime fighting years" to be 30-40 (p. 43), but his "prime years" as 35-40 (p. 39). If it is important to determine the average age of generals (pp. 39-40), it is then important to define precisely the categories into which they are divided on the basis of age. It might be noted in passing that Wakelyn has twelve-year-old Wade Hampton giving his daughter in marriage to John S. Preston (pp. 214, 253).

Were Wakelyn's data accurate, or had he produced a detailed study of collective leadership that would have defined his categories and listed the individuals in each, his work would be useful. By trying to do both, he has not done either well and has produced what appears to be a hastily done, seriously flawed work that will be of only limited value.

*Valdosta State College*

RICHARD M. McMURRY

*Concise Dictionary of American Biography*, Second Edition. JOSEPH G. E. HOPKINS, Editor. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1977. xii, 1229 p. \$50.00.)

In 1936 Dr. Roy F. Nichols paid tribute in the pages of this *Magazine* to the virtual completion of a magnificent project—the publication of the *Dictionary of American Biography*. Its first volume had appeared in 1928 and, at the time that Dr. Nichols wrote his comments, its twentieth and final volume of sketches was in press, to be followed in 1937 by an index volume. Thus was created one of the most valuable reference works in the field of American history, one that truly represented, in Dr. Nichols' words, "a notable contribution to American scholarship."

The story of the *Dictionary* has not been static since 1937. It has been continued by two reprintings and its coverage, restricted to sketches of prominent men and women who had been dead for at least ten years, has been brought forward in time to individuals who died before 1951 through the publication of four supplement volumes.

In addition, in the early sixties, Scribner's brought out their first *Concise Dictionary of American Biography*, in which the biographical sketches were condensed in a scale of reduction of approximately one to fourteen. The single volume of 1,273 pages thus contained 14,870 biographies of Americans who had died prior to 1941. It was reviewed in the October 1964 issue of this *Magazine* by Dr. Harry M. Tinkcom.

The new edition of the *Concise Dictionary* extends the coverage time span ten years further, to people who died prior to 1951. In slightly fewer but considerably larger pages, it contains 1,100 new entries for a total of about 16,000 biographies. Edited under the sponsorship of the American Council of Learned Societies, it is a credit to all concerned and will be immensely useful.

This reviewer has no quarrel with the publisher's claim that this volume is "an indispensable reference guide for the college student, the research worker, the journalist, the interested reader who wishes to check an unfamiliar name, or the casual seeker of facts"—a "Who Was Who" in American history. Those who want to learn more about anyone described in it may consult the original twenty volumes of sketches and the four supplements.

*Historical Society of Pennsylvania*

NICHOLAS B. WAINWRIGHT