

## BOOK REVIEWS

*Conestoga Crossroads: Lancaster, Pennsylvania, 1730-1790.* By JEROME H. WOOD, JR. (Harrisburg: The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1979. xi, 305 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. \$8.50.)

This is an excellent study of how a tiny Pennsylvania village became a well-organized urban community in the half century before the thirteen colonies met at a crossroads in Philadelphia with their own problems. Lancaster, Pennsylvania, was the crossroads which became the meeting place for a unique combination of diverse social classes, religious sects, ethnic groups and economic interests which managed to join in the formation of a small but very typical American urban community early in our history.

Dr. Wood suggests several factors which made Lancaster distinctive. Its location, between urban Philadelphia and the Indian country west of the Susquehanna, made it a significant connecting link between the wilderness and the city in the years before American independence. The mixed interests of its population seemed to promise more fragmentation than cooperation, but by 1780 the mixture had formed an urban community second only to Philadelphia in every aspect normally associated with city life. Its political development gradually changed from policy making by a democratic town meeting to the delegation of authority to elected representatives.

Using a topical rather than a narrative organization, he describes in his first section the major administrative problems and changes during the pre-Revolutionary years—joint management by English Quakers and German settlers, decisions about roads, bridges, markets and trade, accommodations for troops and supplies during the French and Indian wars, and for prisoners and military supplies during the Revolution. Although “participation by the greatest part of the inhabitants” in policies and actions was legal, the process proved too cumbersome for a large population with varied interests, and an upper class of leading citizens, mainly merchants, assumed the responsibility.

A second section, appropriately entitled “A Back Country Emporium,” contains an interesting and detailed description of how Lancaster’s commercial importance developed. In rapid succession, it became a trader’s depot, a warehouse for the Indian trade to Philadelphia, a wholesaler’s center for the distribution of household necessities to small merchants in villages all through the area, a production outlet for leather goods, furniture, clocks, silverware, rifles and clothing, manufactured in craftsmen’s homes and sold throughout the eastern colonies, and finally a profitable location

for the emerging upper class of merchants, often chosen as political leaders, and respected for their interest in community and cultural progress.

A final section concerns the widely varied elements of the population which formed the community. Society became more stratified, major religions became more tolerant of each other, the language barrier remained between English and German, but they were often brought together at markets, taverns, fairs, elections and holidays, and a new mixed language emerged as "Pennsylvania-Dutch." Newspapers, almanacs, and pamphlets were published in English and German, and a college, founded in 1787 to educate both German and English students, was supported by the whole community.

All these developments are enlivened by hundreds of quotations, comments, and descriptions from contemporary letters, diaries, and many hitherto unpublished manuscript sources, making it a valuable and significant reference on early American life.

In conclusion, Dr. Wood points out that although the primitive cross-roads had become an urban community by 1790, it was not yet a perfect society. Commerce brought significant economic development but also more social stratification. German and English groups were not really cohesive till another century. Like the rest of the nation, the community gradually surrendered policy making to the administration. He seems unduly concerned that the inevitable inequality of wealth delayed the achievement of a genuine sense of community, but admits that the search was to continue in every town and village, as indeed it has through the later years. American society has always been the result of the interaction of diverse people, and this, he states, was "typically American," but Lancaster was one of the first places where the search for community began.

The book includes thorough documentation in reference notes, and a valuable bibliographical essay. It is a scholarly and readable exploration of a significant phase of Pennsylvania history.

*The National Historical Society*

FREDERIC SHRIVER KLEIN

*The Southern Colonial Frontier, 1607-1763.* By W. STITT ROBINSON. (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1979. xviii, 293 p. Illustrations, maps, bibliography, index. \$12.50.)

The value of this book lies primarily in its role in the series entitled *Histories of the American Frontier* under the editorship of Ray Allen Billington and Howard R. Lamar. The projected fifteen volumes promise to describe the advance of the frontier across North America and "explore aspects of the pioneering experience that make the story of expansion meaningful to today's society." Professor Robinson's skill in bringing together from various specialized studies a carefully written narrative of the colonies

from Maryland south is to be commended. Although many of the books he cites are quite old, he makes good use of fuller histories of the states as well as articles in scholarly journals, and occasionally supplements these with new information from primary sources. He discusses the expansion from the Chesapeake of population throughout the region. Taken as a whole there is little here that is new, but to have the pertinent information organized and presented in this way as a part of the larger story is another matter. Those accustomed to reading only of the events within a single colony will now be able to see and appreciate the larger scene.

While each of the colonies of Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina is covered, there are chapters dealing with such topics as Indian policy, conflict between the colonies, Scots-Irish and German settlers in the backcountry, the French Huguenots in South Carolina, the role of Spain and France in the region, and religion and education on the frontier. In connection with the French and Indian War, relations with still other colonies are mentioned.

The role of land speculators in the expansion of settlement is examined and the effect of the creation of townships in what the author defines as "the middle country" to which some colonies lured foreign Protestants is discussed as it related to the plan of frontier protection. The "lure of land for the European immigrant" was understood by colonial governments and employed to advantage. The important effect of indentured servants, colonial land policies, and the ease with which a person might rise in the social scale all influenced the movement of the southern frontier.

Although Professor Robinson appears to have accomplished his goal in a very commendable manner, the resulting book is not entirely satisfactory. The tightly set type, the narrow margins, the quality of paper, and the unattractive appearance of the illustrations detract from the book. The footnotes, grouped at the end of the book, arranged only by chapter without reference to the page from which the citation comes, require constant checking to see *which* chapter is being read. The index, again something for which the author may not be responsible, is selective in the extreme. Countless interesting people, sometimes mentioned several times in the text, as well as places and events do not appear in the index or else are so well concealed in broad headings as to be effectively lost.

*University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*

WILLIAM S. POWELL

*Colonial Massachusetts: A History.* By BENJAMIN W. LABAREE. (Millwood, N. Y.: KTO Press, 1979. xvii, 349 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. \$17.00.)

Comparisons, as the old saying goes, may be odious, but of the nine volumes published thus far in the distinguished *History of the American*

*Colonies* series, this is far and away the most satisfying. Labaree's scholarship is of the highest order, as is the case in the other volumes of the series, but what sets this work apart is its excellence of literary style, something often found lacking in contemporary monographic studies. Here, well-turned sentence follows well-turned sentence, vivid descriptions are intermingled with moving paragraphs of narrative, and diction is always precise. Here the colonial Massachusetts story is told in strict chronological fashion, with most chapters providing, for a decade or two, a happy combination of political, social, economic, and ecclesiastical history.

The obviously most original feature of Mr. Labaree's work is his centering each chapter around a particular individual, with a thumbnail biographical sketch providing an introduction and a "reflection" providing a chapter conclusion. Such a literary technique could be a dangerous one, but here it is "pulled off without a hitch," and the reader meets such well-known figures as Massasoit, John Winthrop, William Bradford, Richard Mather, John and William Pynchon, Samuel Sewall, James Otis, Thomas Hancock, Jonathan Edwards, Thomas Hutchinson, Ebenezer Mackintosh, and John and Samuel Adams. Less familiar are Edmund Rice, one of the founders of both Sudbury and Marlborough, and Captain John Parker, commander of the militia who on Lexington Green fired the shot heard 'round the world.

Also remarkable are the balance and restraint exercised throughout the book. Newburyport and Salem, the subjects of several of Labaree's earlier studies, receive no special emphasis, and the Boston Tea Party, on which he published the standard work (1964), is treated in a mere six pages. Nor does Mr. Labaree ever allow his love of maritime history to intrude.

This reviewer would quarrel with the author on only one point. Labaree states (p. 73) that "Massachusetts Bay had no established church in the sense of a centralized institution enforcing an orthodox religious or social creed through a hierarchical structure." The latter part of this quotation is unquestionably true, but although there was no established Church, there were established churches. True, the ministers did not interfere with the state, but the fact remains that the magistrates *did* interfere with the churches, and this is precisely what is meant by "establishment."

*Trinity College, Hartford*

GLENN WEAVER

*My dearest Julia: The Love Letters of Dr. Benjamin Rush to Julia Stockton.* (New York: Neale Watson Academic Publications, Inc. in association with The Philip H. and A. S. W. Rosenbach Foundation, 1979. xvii, 62 p. Illustrations. \$14.95.)

How the Rush Papers were fragmented, and who got what when we probably shall never know. Most of Dr. Benjamin Rush's voluminous correspondence (letters received and drafts of letters sent), financial and medical records, commonplace books, manuscripts of published articles and

unpublished lectures, and library became the portion of his physician son James. To this inheritance James Rush added his own massive accumulation of letters and manuscripts, including not only his own extensive writings, but much intra-family correspondence: James to father Benjamin, brother Richard to James, Richard to mother Julia, brother Samuel to James, James to mother Julia, and such like. All these Rush Papers were bequeathed to the Library Company of Philadelphia in whose possession they remain.

In the rooms of the Parke-Bernet Galleries of New York on May 24-25, 1943, were sold an important, if far less bulky, segment of the Rush Papers. These came down through Benjamin's son Samuel's daughter Julia who married Alexander Biddle and in whose family they remained until offered to the highest bidder. The letters included a fascinating series from John Adams and no less than 58 letters from Dr. Rush to his wife Julia after their marriage. Most of the latter were bought by Dr. Josiah C. Trent and are now part of the medical collection he gave to Duke University. Some of them were printed in 1892 by Alexander Biddle and some in 1951 in the selective edition of Benjamin Rush's letters edited by Lyman H. Butterfield.

Now another offshoot of an offshoot has surfaced. Julia Rush Biddle Henry (Mrs. T. Charlton Henry) before her recent death gave the Rosenbach Foundation an archive of Rush-Biddle Papers, some originally part of the lot which Alexander Biddle got through his wife, the granddaughter of Julia Stockton Rush. Somehow separated from the later letters which Dr. Benjamin Rush wrote to his wife after they were married were seventeen here printed. These were written by Rush to his spouse-to-be, Julia Stockton, from October 25, 1775, to January 5, 1776; on January 11 they were wed.

The letters in this slim volume are the expressions of an ardent and impatient swain which in today's illiterate world would have been interminable telephone conversations. They do not tell us much we did not know about Dr. Rush. His fiancée, Sarah Eve, had died suddenly late in 1774. He was vulnerable to the charm and sturdy virtues of sixteen-year-old Julia Stockton, half his age, whom he met at her family's home, Morven, in Princeton. After a number of visits, they became engaged. In the interval before the wedding he sent off to her pages filled with protestations of love, praise of his beloved, expressions of strong religious feeling and certainty of a companionate and happy marriage. There is virtually nothing of the revolutionary storm that was brewing. Of more than passing interest is the list of "books as are commonly read by your sex," which he shelved in Julia's bedroom in anticipation of her coming.

An introduction by Whitfield J. Bell, Jr. and Lyman H. Butterfield ably sketches Benjamin Rush's career and sets the stage for the full texts of the letters. These they perceptively sum up "as an appealing testament of mutual respect and endearing love."

*History of Delaware.* By JOHN A. MUNROE. (Newark, Del.: University of Delaware Press, 1979. 302 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. \$17.50.)

John Munroe has provided a concise, one-volume history of Delaware that has been sorely needed for a long time, as the last single volume work to attempt a comprehensive history was written in 1928. The only exception is a less complete work by Carol Hoffecker in 1976.

The *History of Delaware* is unabashedly based upon secondary materials, despite some "unfilled gaps" that he closed, and there are no footnotes. This presents some problems, for there are many topics in this rich book that one might like to know more about. However, further study is aided by an extensive bibliographical essay which describes the pertinent books and a few articles that one might peruse. There is also an index and nine appendixes that provide a handy reference to political and demographic information.

This survey is a clear, straightforward account of the long transition of Delaware from a Swedish colony to a suburban enclave within the northeast megalopolis. The author notes social, economic, population and cultural changes as the decades roll in an orderly chronology, but he shines when he describes Delaware's political history, particularly during the colonial and federalist periods that he portrayed in previous books. We follow the successful colonial fight for independence, especially against Pennsylvania; the important place of Delaware in the early years of the new Republic, as Federalists and the Whigs fought off the Jeffersonians and Jacksonians for control; the ascendancy of Democrats, then Republicans, and then Democrats again. Loyal Delawareans can wax proud over such heroes as the three U. S. Secretaries of State: Louis McLane, John Clayton, and Thomas Bayard, or chortle over the bitter infighting among Republicans that stalemated local politics so completely that the state had no U. S. Senators at all from 1901 to 1903.

He captures the "feistiness" of native Delawareans quite well, who have never trusted outsiders and have often asserted their distinctiveness, represented by their eagerness to approve the new federal Constitution before everyone else because it gave them representation in the upper house equal to the giants such as Virginia and Pennsylvania. But as the author notes, Delawareans have often refused to agree with the majority of their countrymen when they believed their own interests were not being served. They refused to support Munroe in 1816, and approved McClellan in 1864. They destroyed Lincoln's compensated emancipation plan, even though they had not allowed slave importation since 1776.

The author portrays Delaware as unique, moderate, and practical, represented by the "stay at home" attitude of many Delawareans during the Civil War. However, perhaps it wasn't gradualism or the apparent uniqueness and feistiness of Delawareans, but overpowering conservatism

that allowed the Federalist Party to live on until the 1830s, longer than in any other state, only to be surpassed by the Whigs and then conservative Democrats. Was it not also conservatism that scotched the aborted 1853 state constitution and produced the 1897 constitution that demanded the schools be racially segregated? Was it gradualism that made the legislature reject the thirteenth, fourteenth, fifteenth, and nineteenth amendments?

On the other hand, Dr. Munroe makes clear that Delaware was neither quick to adopt reform nor notably pure in its political operation. He dissects political chicanery with relish. He also successfully describes the extremely rapid changes of post World War II Delaware, which went from a decentralized city-urban dichotomy to a centralized suburban state to which both city and rural areas have become reluctant adjuncts. One wishes that he had spent more time on nonpolitical history, however. Despite material on demography, religion, racial relations, philanthropy, agriculture, industry, culture and education, his primary interest is politics. Sometimes, the nonpolitical material seems to jar the political chronology so that the book's organization suffers.

There is probably no way that any one-volume history of a state can please everyone. The author has done a remarkable job of piecing together 340 years of a small, but diverse state proud of its heritage. The *History of Delaware* successfully provides a solid compendium suitable for anyone who wants a digestible and intriguing account of the history of the first state.

*University of Delaware*

ROBERT J. TAGGART

*The Relation of the Quakers to the American Revolution.* By ARTHUR J. MEKEEL. (Washington, D. C.: University Press of America, 1979. vii, 368 p. Bibliography, index. \$12.00.)

The title of this book accurately reflects the unique situation of Quakers during the period of the American Revolution. The Yearly Meetings and most of the members attempted to maintain neutrality and noninvolvement during this critical period, but with only limited success. Both the British and the Patriots found it difficult and often impossible to understand and respect the neutrality which Friends sought to maintain. Arthur Mekeel has covered this story thoroughly and has written a very useful volume on the subject.

The first third of the book traces Quaker efforts to find a satisfactory solution to the tensions and controversies between the British government and the American Colonies. As the author examined the efforts of both British and American Quakers to find a solution to the problems, he provided an excellent example of the way in which trans-Atlantic cooperation has worked in the Quaker world for three centuries. Dr. John Fothergill, David Barclay, Daniel Mildred and others on the London side worked

closely with the Pembertons and their allies in Pennsylvania. Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, which was as large as all the other Yearly Meetings put together, clearly took the lead in this effort and it served as the bellwether throughout the war years which followed.

The central third of the volume traces the activities and the sufferings of the Quakers in Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, including New Jersey and Delaware. In one chapter he has examined the suspicion of Friends at the time of the British occupation of Philadelphia, and the imprisonment of Quaker leaders in Virginia during the winter of 1777-1778. Mekeel has not uncovered new and startling information to any large degree, but he has drawn together material from original sources and recent monographs to present a clearer picture than we have had before. The following chapters are used to survey the situation of Friends in New England, New York, and in the Southern Colonies. In addition he has endeavored to draw up actual figures on the sufferings of Friends during these years; sufferings which included imprisonment, fines, and the seizure of property.

A small minority of Quakers were unable to maintain the neutrality of the majority; one group actively supported the Patriot's cause and the other actively or passively threw in its lot with Britain. Mekeel has briefly summarized the organization of the Free Quaker Movement by the Patriots and has made some effort to draw together all the known material about those Quakers who supported Britain. It is easier to learn about what happened to the winners than the losers, but the author has traced various Loyalist groups to Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Ontario in Canada, as well as others who returned to Britain. Both the Loyalists and the Free Quakers had been disowned by their Yearly Meetings.

In his chapter on Quaker relief efforts, Mekeel begins with the story of how Friends raised money to help the suffering civilians in Boston during the British blockade and traces various other less dramatic relief efforts during the war. While Friends had turned their backs on the men who had joined the Loyalist cause, they were willing to provide food and supplies to their families when they faced hardship and privation in Canada. British Friends joined Americans in this effort.

Mekeel has concluded his book with a brief examination of the way in which Friends sought to find their place in the new government of the United States, especially after the writing of the Constitution and the creation of the federal government in 1789. Dr. Fothergill had warned them many years earlier of the dangers which lay ahead as they followed a policy of neutrality. Such a position might be interpreted as adherence to the existing power, and he had suggested instead, "submission to the prevailing power" (p. 99).

This is a valuable and competent study which had long been quoted by scholars in its manuscript form and it is a pleasure to welcome it in print.

*Diary of the American War: A Hessian Journal, Captain Johann Ewald, Field Jäger Corps.* Translated and edited by JOSEPH P. TUSTIN. (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1979. xxxi, 467 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. \$27.50.)

This extensive and detailed diary is divided into four volumes and a supplement. The four volumes describe six campaigns, from 1776 to the British surrender at Yorktown in October 1781. In fifteen pages a supplement continues the thread, from January 1, 1782, to the time Ewald arrived back in Hesse in 1784.

Diaries vary markedly in their value as source material. Some are minute in parts and extremely sketchy in other parts. Often they reflect a bias. Upon careful examination some betray the tendency of the diarist to revise entries years later and thus inject facts that he did not have, and a different point of view than he had when the entry supposedly was written.

In producing this running account of British military operations in America Captain Ewald wrote well. He had authored an eighty-six-page pamphlet, *Thoughts of a Hessian officer about what he has to do when leading a detachment in the field.* It was published in Cassel two years before he came to America. After returning to Europe Ewald wrote seven additional items, on military subjects, that ran to a total of 2,214 pages in print. His *Journal* is narrative in style, being interrupted by insertion of month and day. It is more of a connected account than a series of daily entries, although undoubtedly composed on an almost daily basis. Ewald occasionally inserted a general discussion of several pages concerning movements not confined to a single day, as can be seen on pages 335-342.

The *Journal* provides a great amount of detail about British encounters with American armed forces and civilians from October 23, 1776, until the surrender at Yorktown, but readers will look for additional facts and viewpoints. Ewald paid attention mainly to military matters and took little note of manners and customs of the American people. Although being on duty in Philadelphia during the British occupation of the city he tells almost nothing about Loyalists and about British behavior in the Quaker City but does provide a paragraph on page 120 and another on 131 telling about life in Philadelphia during the occupation. He makes no mention of the Meschianza. It is scarcely conceivable that he was unaware of that extravagant entertainment given General Howe upon the General's departure from the city in 1778.

Even though much of the *Journal* is not exciting reading, Ewald on occasion exhibits a power of description. In a dramatic way he tells of the deliberate burning of two villages on December 6, 1776, near Philadelphia (p. 109).

Some entries are a mere sentence, but many are lengthy. The Battle of Brandywine, September 11, 1777, is described in detail in an entry extending through pages 81-87.

Ewald's *Journal* has a great deal of consistency. He was a keen observer, a strict disciplinarian, and apparently a faithful recorder. His *Journal* seems to be a reliable account of what he observed in America and probably is about as free from bias as any such writing can be. He records orders from his superiors and his suggestions to them, the placement of men under his command, and the general strategy, progress, and reverses of that part of the British and Hessian force with which he was closely associated, from the Hudson River to the James. He made some overall remarks about the war in America, such as this one: "On every occasion during this war, one can observe the thoughtlessness, negligence, and contempt of the English toward their foe" (p. 183). His comments are mainly those of a perceptive captain rather than those of a general officer.

Thirty full-page maps, two half-page maps, and several diagrams neatly drawn by Ewald and meaningfully labeled and explained by him provide detailed information about woodlands, open country, streams, rivers, bays, roads, buildings, docks, position of British vessels, and the placement of troops in his theatre of operations. For example, see his map, "Plan of the Action at Spencer's House, Seven Miles From Williamsburg [Virginia] (p. 311).

The notes added by Tustin, 928 of them, many exceeding 100 words in length, are superb. They refer to contemporary correspondence, former place names, etc. Tustin's Introduction, his extensive bibliography, and the comprehensive index, too, add to the value of the book.

Anyone interested in the military campaigns of the American Revolution will find much relevant and useful detail in the Ewald *Journal*, as translated and edited by Joseph P. Tustin.

*Rose Hill Seminars, Waynesboro, Pa.*

HOMER T. ROSENBERGER

*Physician of the American Revolution, Jonathan Potts.* By RICHARD L. BLANCO. (New York: Garland STPM Press, 1979. xv, 276 p. Illustrations, appendixes, bibliography, index. \$17.50.)

As a biography this account of Dr. Jonathan Potts is hampered by the brevity of Potts' life, the scarcity of information about him, and by the likelihood that there is not much to know.

In the absence of detailed biographical information, recourse is had to peripheral material. There are voluminous passages on colonial medical education, and on such contemporary figures as Dr. John Morgan and Dr. William Shippen, Jr., as well as the history of that portion of the American Revolution in which Dr. Potts was or might have been involved.

Within this matrix some essential biographical facts emerge. Jonathan Potts was born in 1745 in what is now Pottstown, Pa., the son of a wealthy, Quaker ironmaster. In 1761, he began a medical apprenticeship to Dr.

Phineas Bond of Philadelphia after signing, it is presumed, the standard agreement for prentices which specified that "He shall not commit Fornication, nor contract matrimony, within the said Term. At Cards, Dice, or any unlawful Game he shall not play." Potts spent five years with Dr. Bond and in his last year he and his fellow student, Benjamin Rush, accompanied staff physicians on their rounds at the Pennsylvania Hospital.

Since a medical degree from the University of Edinburgh was the ambition of every colonial medical student, Potts and Rush sailed for Scotland in 1766 and began the three-year course in November. But in February 1767, Potts learned that Grace Richardson, the girl he left behind him, was pregnant. He surrendered hope of medical distinction to return to Philadelphia and marriage, arriving just after the birth of a daughter. Young Potts had not had the advantage of Dr. William Osler's advice that medical students should keep their affections on ice until the age of forty.

To support a wife and an increasing number of children Potts took up general practice in his native village without benefit of an Edinburgh degree. In that day of primitive medical knowledge the loss was mainly one of prestige. No medical school taught the germ theory of disease, the conception of body cells, or the recognition of insects as the vectors of yellow fever, malaria, typhus and typhoid. In fact, typhus and typhoid had not been differentiated. There were only three therapeutic triumphs: fruit juice for scurvy, Jesuit's bark for malaria, and inoculation to prevent smallpox. For other ills bleeding, blistering, cupping, and purging were generously applied. Surgery was restricted to areas close to the surface of the body, or to setting broken bones and amputating limbs. There was no anaesthesia, no antisepsis, no blood transfusions.

In 1768, Potts returned to Philadelphia to earn a medical degree from the recently opened medical school of the College of Philadelphia. He was thus well qualified by the standards of the day to serve as a military surgeon in the Continental Army when the skirmishes at Lexington and Concord presaged the American Revolution. Dr. Potts met Benedict Arnold's army, defeated at Quebec and crippled by typhus and smallpox, when it reached the southern end of Lake George. He was surgeon to Mifflin's Pennsylvania Militia at the Battle of Princeton and was serving as Deputy Medical Director General for the Northern Department when Burgoyne's army was captured at Saratoga. In February 1778, when Washington's army was suffering from sickness, cold, and hunger at Valley Forge, Potts was named Purveyor General and Deputy Medical Director General of the Middle Department. His duties required finding medical supplies and supervising hospitals in churches, Quaker Meeting Houses, and barns rather than in the immediate care of patients.

Because of ill-health, Potts retired from the army in October 1780, and one year later died of unknown causes at the age of thirty-six. He left behind him a reputation as a diligent hospital administrator, a capable medical organizer, and a pioneering sanitarian. Perhaps his greatest claim

to fame is that he directed the first mass smallpox inoculation of American troops.

Imbedded and almost concealed in the narrative is all that may be known of our hero's life, but to read with a desire of following the story of Dr. Potts is to recall the opinion of Dr. Johnson that anyone who reads the novels of Samuel Richardson for the story would be driven by impatience to go hang himself.

*Philadelphia*

EDWARD S. GIFFORD, JR.

*Duty, Honor or Country: General George Weedon and the American Revolution.*

By HARRY M. WARD. (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1979. xi, 297 p. Illustrations, maps, bibliography, index. \$10.00.)

Dr. Ward's biography of George Weedon is well written and is based on sound research. It is particularly useful for the light which it sheds on the part played by Weedon in the defense of Virginia in 1781 when it was invaded by Generals William Phillips and Charles, Lord Cornwallis.

Although Weedon played a secondary role in the political and military history of the American Revolution, his thoughts and actions are well documented because he wrote frequently to men whose papers have been preserved—among them George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Nathanael Greene. Before gaining any claim to fame, Weedon was a Virginia planter and tavern keeper. But his civilian career was repeatedly interrupted by long periods of military service commencing with more than five years with the Virginia militia on the frontiers of Virginia and Pennsylvania during the campaigns of 1755 to 1760 against the French and Indians.

Service against the French prepared Weedon for a role as a brigadier general of Virginia Continentals during the struggle for America's independence. He and his Virginians took part in the battles of White Plains, Trenton, Brandywine and Germantown. He and his troops played a particularly heroic role in the fighting at Brandywine. But his star, insofar as it was a rising one, was clouded over by his retirement from active service in 1778 because of a bitter controversy between General William Woodford and himself over seniority (and, ultimately, over which man would be the first to attain the rank of major general).

Having left the service because he felt that his honor as a military man had been affronted, Weedon sulked at his home in Fredericksburg during the campaigns of 1778 and 1779. But he was recalled to active service during the British invasions of his "country" (Virginia). He played a key part in the unglamorous but important assignment of recruiting, arming, and training militia from the counties located in Virginia's Northern Neck (between the Rappahannock and Potomac Rivers). Also, he commanded

several thousand militia in the field on two occasions; however, he and his men were engaged primarily in "covering the country" against enemy raids and they participated in no actions more celebrated or bloody than minor skirmishes.

Toward the end of his military career, Weedon took part in the Yorktown campaign. But "glory" eluded him because he was assigned the secondary task of blockading the British outpost at Gloucester instead of participating in the siege of the fortifications of Yorktown. To make matters worse, he was soon deprived of his independent command and placed under the command of a French general, the Marquis de Choisy. Nevertheless, he and his Virginians had the satisfaction of contributing to the successful outcome of the siege of Yorktown.

All told, Dr. Ward has written an excellent biography of a onetime tavern keeper who became an active and useful officer during the American Revolution. Ward is to be commended for writing of Weedon's career without making him appear more important than he was. For Weedon played a subordinate role throughout his military career.

*Northern Arizona University*

GEORGE W. KYTE

*Alexander Hamilton: A Biography.* By FORREST McDONALD. (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1979. xiii, 464 p. Index. \$17.50.)

Forrest McDonald has attempted nothing less than a complete repainting of Alexander Hamilton's historical portrait. Not content merely to suggest minor adjustments, he has revised the background and changed the features of the subject himself. Gone is the Machiavellian proponent of government by the rich and well-born, respecter of privilege and status, and confidant of speculators. In his stead McDonald offers Hamilton the romantic ("a romantic to the core of his being" [p. 5]), a man of "natural optimism," hostile to hereditary power, privilege and status, enemy to speculators. Hamilton emerges here as a zealous advocate of liberty, an individual spurred on by a rigid sense of honor and decency. Never has the first Secretary of the Treasury received such a skillful, passionate and sustained panegyric to his abilities and accomplishments. Perhaps no historian writing today could make a better case for Hamilton than has Professor McDonald.

But McDonald is not altogether convincing. He is very selective in what he discusses and what he does not. Moreover, it is not enough for him to have readers embrace his sympathetic portrait of Hamilton, readers must also accept his unflattering sketches of Hamilton's opponents. John Adams is "eccentric," "pedantic," "erratic," a "pompous bore" (pp. 329, 330, 343). Madison appears as selfish, vindictive, hypocritical and philosophically inconsistent (pp. 175, 179, 200-201). Jefferson is portrayed as "malicious,"

"insidious," even "seditious" (pp. 242, 248, 256). He is also "lackadaisical," and guilty on most occasions of "legalistic pettifoggery," "obfuscation," and "sophistry" (pp. 202, 207, 219, 253). Washington manages to be vigorous and able when working in concert with Hamilton but is depicted as "somewhat addled" and "exasperatingly inert" when not (pp. 285, 290). James Monroe is unscrupulous. McDonald seems to imply that Monroe's role in the Maria Reynolds affair was even more villainous than Hamilton's (p. 336)!

Hamilton is unfailingly attractive and shrewd. He does not defeat his opponents, he "demolishe[s]" and "annihilate[s]" them by easily "dismantl[ing]" their strongest arguments (pp. 233, 278, 316). We learn that Hamilton could have written his Reports on the Public Credit "without advice from anyone and without references to any theoretical thinkers, and the end result would not have been drastically different," that Hamilton "was almost alone in having no petty personal interests at stake," and that "Hamilton saw things differently, and from more perspectives than other men did" (pp. 160, 165, 189). We are told that Hamilton was "alone among founders of the American republic" who wished to effect "a social revolution," that his perceptions and strategy during the Whiskey Rebellion were the only correct ones, and that the Maria Reynolds affair was simply "the grand passion" to be expected from a romantic like Hamilton (pp. 3, 229, 300-302). Finally, we are asked, as well, to accept McDonald's conclusion that America, which "reached the peak of its greatness in the middle of the twentieth century" has since become "increasingly Jeffersonian, governed by coercion and the party spirit, its people progressively more dependent and less self-reliant, its decline candy-coated with rhetoric of liberty and equality and justice for all" (p. 362).

James T. Flexner's *The Young Hamilton: A Biography* (1978) remains the best account of Hamilton's early years and despite important revisions regarding Hamilton and his career made by McDonald, readers will continue to profitably consult earlier biographies by Broadus Mitchell and John C. Miller. To his credit, McDonald's analysis of Hamiltonian economics and finance is the best available. His discussion of Hamilton's intellectual debt to thinkers like Francis Hutcheson, Thomas Reid, Emerich de Vattel, Jacques Necker and William Blackstone is also an important contribution. McDonald makes a convincing argument that Hamilton sought through his economic programs to destroy America's provincialism and agrarian values and to have success and status determined by the marketplace where "deeds and goods and virtues could be impartially valued" (p. 4).

There will be no neutral readers of McDonald's provocative biography. It will unsettle and enlighten, outrage and educate. There is much to think about here.

*Aaron Burr: The Years from Princeton to Vice President, 1756-1805.* By MILTON LOMASK. (New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux, 1979. xi, 443 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. \$17.50.)

Aaron Burr's life, John Quincy Adams wrote in 1836, "was such as in any country of sound morals his friends would be desirous of burying in profound oblivion" (p. 11). Although often prescient, Adams was in this instance not prophetic. For over a century and a half Burr's posthumous fate was more often obloquy than oblivion. The historical fame of other luminaries of this period—James Madison, Thomas Jefferson, Alexander Hamilton, John Adams, and, of course, Washington—is beyond dispute. But Burr's admirers have long fought an uphill battle on behalf of this intriguingly enigmatical man, who in the popular imagination continues to be primarily remembered as the duelist who shot Hamilton at Weehawken on the Jersey shore. Biographies by Nathan Schachner, published in 1937, and by Herbert Parmet and Marie Hecht, which appeared in 1967 (not to mention Gore Vidal's recent best-seller, *Aaron Burr: A Novel*) have sought with mixed success to demolish the stereotyped view of Burr as an unscrupulous, self-serving, wily, politician and inveterate philanderer. Milton Lomask's projected two-volume biography affords yet another persuasive attempt to furbish Burr's historical repute.

The first of these volumes, which covers Burr's career through his involuntary retirement from the vice presidency of the United States in March 1805, comprises the whole of his political and official career, except for the well-known Western Conspiracy of 1806. The broad sweep and length of Lomask's study is reminiscent of the majesterial multi-volumed biographies of the more prominent founding fathers that appeared over the decade and a half following World War II, a biographical genre no longer favored by many historians and most publishers. The issue, however, is not one of historical fashion, but whether or not the lavish detail that characterizes such works is of utility to scholars and of interest to the general reader. Probably not.

Such considerations aside, the question most essential to the historian-reviewer is: What is Lomask's interpretation of his fascinating subject? Is his account fresh and original? The answer is mixed: occasional flashes of creative insight are tucked into the interstices of an otherwise conventional recounting of well-known facts, especially background material.

Lomask meticulously relates what pro- and anti-Burrites have said about Burr's character and political career and often provides his own precariously balanced account. Appropos of the wellsprings of his subject's character, Lomask asserts that Burr was "the American incarnation of Lord Chesterfield" (p. 97), in the sense that the New Yorker exemplified "the intrepidity, the self-possession, the consideration for others, and the pursuit of knowledge" (p. 68) that Chesterfield commended. First set forth in James Parton's mid-nineteenth-century biography of Burr, the interpretation is

plausible, but open to numerous exceptions. As to the controversial public career of this man of "superlative abilities," Lomask argues that it was stymied by his independence of parties, his occasional "faulty judgment" (not his political trimming and self-serving) and his "unsuspicious nature," which often "led him into error" (pp. 154, 307). The first of these was of principal importance. "An independent and a loner by temperament," Burr's political troubles can, Lomask contends, be largely "attributed to a life-long inability to function within a conventional political framework," which rendered him "widely suspect in both political camps" (p. 153). Precisely how one accounts for this unique "temperament" and atypical "inability" the reader must determine for himself.

On this question as well as other mystifying ones, Lomask's ambitious biography demonstrates, in fine, the validity of his own observation that "never, perhaps, will it be possible to dispel all the shadows that cloak this affable, exasperating, often self-defeating but indestructible and somehow likeable man" (p. 99). Lomask has illuminated a number of such shadows, and that in itself is a major historiographical contribution.

*Lafayette College*

JACOB E. COOKE

*The Baron of Beacon Hill: A Biography of John Hancock.* By WILLIAM M. FOWLER, JR. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1980. xv, 366 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. \$15.00.)

The accepted view of John Hancock has been that he was a good-looking man of wealth without great abilities who accidentally became and remains conspicuous for his handsome signature as President of the Continental Congress upon the Declaration of Independence. It is also commonly suggested that he was a smuggler and that he was merely a tool of the abler Samuel Adams and aggressive defenders of American rights in Massachusetts during the tumultuous years preceding the outbreak of the War of Independence. There is much more to be said about him, and Professor Fowler says it very well. *The Baron of Beacon Hill* replaces earlier and less complete biographical studies of Hancock. Fowler has collected evidence from many sources, and his book will doubtless remain standard. Without the discovery of substantial new materials, not to be expected, there should be no need for another life of the Massachusetts Patriot.

One may quibble about minor matters. The author is inclined to believe that more streets and towns in America are named after Hancock than for any person other than Washington and Lincoln. More even than those commemorating Franklin? Was James Otis, Sr., unquestionably "swindled" out of the office of Chief Justice in Massachusetts by Governor Francis Bernard and Thomas Hutchinson? An English scholar would be surprised to learn that Bernard became a member of the House of Lords because he

was made a baronet. Fowler thinks that the troops sent out from Boston to Concord by General Thomas Gage in April 1775 to destroy the military stores gathered by the Patriots in that village had a second mission, to apprehend Hancock and Samuel Adams. Gage was indeed authorized to arrest rebellious leaders, but there is no direct evidence and no important indirect evidence that he made use of the authorization. Loyalist Peter Oliver, who was in Boston at the time and who may well have known about Gage's intentions, tells us that Hancock and Adams, who happened to be near the British line of march, wished from self-importance to be known as men who had fortunately escaped British clutches, but that they were not targets of the redcoats.

Too much ought not be made regarding a few matters of detail. Fowler approaches Hancock with that measure of sympathy that the subject of a biography ordinarily deserves. He does not ignore evidence that may reflect adversely. For example, he points out that Hancock as treasurer of Harvard College for one reason or another withheld moneys of the college. He does not portray Hancock as an intellectually gifted man, nor does he insist that Hancock devoted himself exclusively and unwaveringly to the defense of American rights before 1775. On the other hand, Fowler judiciously concludes that Hancock was not just a tool of Samuel Adams, and properly discounts attacks made upon his character and behavior by enemies.

The Hancock who emerges from Fowler's work was a gentleman, living handsomely, in large part upon the fortune he inherited from an uncle. The documents do not permit close assessment of his wealth or of his acumen as a merchant, and Fowler says so. Fowler gives little attention, rightly, to the charge that Hancock was a smuggler. Hancock did not play a large part in the Continental Congress. Fowler does not try to exaggerate his services on the national scene, but points out appropriately that Hancock served as governor of Massachusetts for several years, that he was obviously a respected citizen in his own state. He agrees with earlier chroniclers that Hancock was not without vanity. This reviewer finds no fault in Fowler's many analyses of the stands taken by Hancock regarding the various political issues which confronted him before and after 1775.

In sum, *The Baron of Beacon Hill* is a judicious and attractive biography.

Duke University

JOHN R. ALDEN

*William Paterson, Lawyer and Statesman, 1745-1806.* By JOHN E. O'CONNOR. (New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1979. xv, 351 p. Bibliographical note, index. \$23.50.)

William Paterson came to the New World before his second birthday, when his parents emigrated from Ireland. His father prospered through both merchandising and real estate, and young Paterson was able to attend

the College of New Jersey and to study law. At the age of thirty he was a deputy in the New Jersey Provincial Congress. From then on he rose rather rapidly up the political ladder: assistant secretary and then secretary of the Provincial Congress, attorney general of the state of New Jersey, and a delegate to the Federal Convention of 1787 where he played an important role as defender of the interests of the smaller states.

Paterson served as United States Senator from New Jersey in the First Congress and played an important role in support of Hamilton's financial program and in drafting and passing the Judiciary Act of 1789. Then came the governorship of New Jersey, at least two offers of a position in Washington's Cabinet, which he declined, and, in 1793, appointment to the Supreme Court. His thirteen years on the nation's highest court witnessed important if not always distinguished service. He presided at the trial of several offenders at the time of the Whiskey Rebellion and he also presided over the trial of Matthew Lyon for alleged violation of the Sedition Act.

The author of this, the first really adequate biographical treatment of Paterson, seems justified in writing, "Paterson was an independent spirit who . . . developed his own rationale to guide him through the political storms of the young republic . . . (p. 283)." O'Connor tells us that Paterson "saw the war not as a social revolution, but as a way to preserve the traditional structure of colonial life (*ibid.*)." True, he made mistakes; at times he was both petty and plagued by a partisan spirit. But, the author concludes, "part of the greatness was his ability to grow and learn (p. 284)."

This is an unusually fine biography. Others writing about Paterson have been plagued by the paucity of manuscript materials. Diligent research and keen analysis have helped to overcome this lack. Many biographers of secondary characters yield to the temptation to fill out their study by elaborating on "the times," sometimes almost to the exclusion of their subject. Dr. O'Connor has not yielded to this enticement. The research has been meticulous and the documentation is splendid. The developing personality of Paterson is adequately covered. The author's style is clear and direct.

Paterson never appears greater than in the period after 1799 when he becomes neither bitter nor discouraged after Adams appointed John Marshall, rather than Paterson, to be Chief Justice. Nor did Paterson follow Hamilton, Dayton, and other "hard-line Federalists" in denunciation of Adams in the summer of 1800. The author concludes that "It was men such as Paterson, men who knew when to stand firm and when to compromise, who enabled the young republic to grow more democratic gradually, without a social upheaval, and without completely losing touch with its Whiggish origins" (p. 285). William Paterson would seem to deserve inclusion among the great Federalists.

*State University of New York,  
College at Cortland*

RALPH ADAMS BROWN

*Horace Binney Wallace.* By GEORGE EGON HATVARY. (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1977. 173 p. Bibliography, index. \$9.50.)

The life of Horace Binney Wallace (1817-1852) is an enigma wrapped in a cloak of mystery. Why did this brilliant young Philadelphian, well connected on both sides of his family, educated at Princeton, trained in both the law and medicine, a friend and to some degree a disciple of Auguste Comte, a voluminous writer on many subjects—why, one asks, did he virtually consign himself to oblivion? He never signed any of his numerous magazine pieces. His novel, *Stanley* (1838), is anonymous. He was twice a ghost writer at the behest of his friend Rufus Wilmot Griswold, critic and anthologist. He employed many pseudonyms—"Cosmopolite," or "L," or "William Landor," or "Junius," or "William S. Somner." Though his magazine writing was well received, he never collected any of it. When his devoted older brother, John, edited most of this work after Horace's death, there was enough material to fill two good-sized volumes—*Art and Scenery in Europe, With Other Papers* (1855 and 1857), and *Literary Criticisms and Other Papers* (1856). With their appearance the seal of anonymity was, of course, broken, and readers could now identify the author with the name that had appeared on the title pages of the thirty-one volumes of selected law cases of which Wallace had been co-editor.

The enigma is Wallace's suicide on December 16, 1852. He cut his throat at the Hotel des Bains in Paris. He had come to Europe on a second trip to try to recover from deep depression. Though Professor Hatvary has looked into the tragedy as deeply as one can at this distance in time, we again ask Why? Had Wallace's life of annihilation by anonymity turned into a need for self-destruction? The question is not idle, for this final act had cut down at thirty-five one of the most promising writers of the day.

This is a bold statement, but I believe it will stand up. Wallace was remarkably observant and well informed even at the age of twenty. These qualities appeared in nearly everything he wrote; nowhere more fruitfully than in his pieces on Gothic architecture. He was a forward-looking writer, much concerned with the state of American culture; our relations with Europe; how art was to be made to flourish here; what we had already accomplished in other fields, such as science and technology (ship-building, for example). Wallace reminds one of Edmund Wilson in our time. Both men wrote boldly and with authority on any subject which engaged their attention.

Professor Hatvary's book, the first full-length study of Wallace, makes good on the promises in his preface. He carried on a rewarding search for letters by and to Wallace. He has explored thoroughly the relationship, personal and professional, between Wallace and Griswold. He had already uncovered the extent to which Poe, that fierce enemy of all plagiarists, passed off sections from *Stanley* as his own and appropriated many of Wallace's ideas. Professor Hatvary supplies us with so full an account of

Wallace's concealed career that one wishes his book were much longer. He needed more space for comment on the variety and quality of the writing.

We can now see in print a new piece by Wallace and Charles J. Biddle (Princeton 1837). Nicholas B. Wainwright informs me that it is an unsigned, three-page spoof called *Centennial, Biennial Celebration* (1834). It was written when Wallace was seventeen and Biddle fifteen and is published on pages 242-244 of this journal. Wallace drew the cloak of anonymity around him at an early age!

*Princeton University*

WILLARD THORP

*John Notman, Architect, 1810-1865.* By CONSTANCE M. GREIFF. (Philadelphia: The Athenaeum of Philadelphia, 1979. 253 p. Illustrated, bibliography, index. \$20.00.)

The name of Constance Greiff raises up a great prick of conscience. Her previous book, *Lost America*, widely read, is an evocation of fine buildings from the American past which have disappeared, largely through needless demolition. It is a pessimistic chronicle and a telling national indictment. Greiff's *John Notman, Architect* details other houses, churches, and public buildings designed by a major nineteenth-century architect which have gone, but, at the same time, retrieves for us numerous glories of the Notman repertoire which, thank goodness, still stand.

The present biography-catalogue identifies Notman, lists his works and relates them to the artistic and technological development of the period. John Notman was born in Edinburgh and arrived in Philadelphia as a young carpenter in 1831. His rebirth as an architect in the wake of his first major design—the building and landscaping of Laurel Hill Cemetery (1836-39)—coincided with the boom construction years of the 1840s and 1850s. Notman secured commissions in six states and in London, was one of the founders of the A.I.A., and died in 1865.

John Notman was much influenced by his early training, following distinctly English and Scottish prototypes far more closely than any of his American contemporaries, but he achieved some of the most significant architectural "firsts" of his time. From Laurel Hill, which was the country's pioneer "architect-designed, park-like" rural cemetery, he moved on to introduce the Italianate villa (Riverside, at Burlington, N. J.), the Renaissance Revival club house (the Athenaeum of Philadelphia), the first "modern psychiatric hospital" (Trenton, N. J.), the "picturesque" city park (Capitol Square, Richmond) and the first Gothic and Romanesque churches faithful to mediaeval or ecclesiastical origins. The architect's great, solid, unyielding downtown Philadelphia churches dedicated to St. Mark, St. Clement, and the Holy Trinity, also reflect technological innovation, the use of sandstone rather than marble, and of polychrome stone-

work, the bravura handling of masonry in combination with ironwork. Notman's handsome villas, of which Princeton happily retains a true ensemble, illustrate what may be the architect's most subtle and lasting influence on all of American architectural design, the functional approach to interior planning. Notman created houses lighted from ground floor to sky, their rooms given size and position according to function. He broke away from the restraints of American classicism to introduce open, fluid planning of interior space and related overall siting, proportion and form to climate, natural light and vistas.

Mrs. Greiff's book puts all of this in scholarly perspective. She follows a sound catalogue format: biographical essay followed by an illustrated list of some 100 works (documented and attributed), a bibliography and an index. The Greiff catalogue of commissions is unquestionably a model of its kind (name, location, date, client, project description, details of surviving drawings, other early illustrations, documentation and present status); one hopes it will be imitated forever. The illustrations are absolutely right: every known rendering by the subject, early views, good recent photographs.

*John Notman, Architect* is entirely a handsome affair. It represents an extraordinarily compatible partnership of the author, of the Athenaeum, whose architectural historian-Librarian supported the study and the exhibition of which it is the record through his library's Ella West Freeman Foundation publication fund, and of the National Endowment for the Arts. The NEA recognized a winner and paid the tab.

*The University of Pennsylvania Archives.* FRANCIS JAMES DALLET

*The Idea of a Southern Nation: Southern Nationalists and Southern Nationalism, 1830-1860.* By JOHN MCCARDELL. (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1979. xi, 394 p. Illustrations, bibliographical essay, index. \$16.95.)

Among historians, southern nationalism appears to be an idea whose time has come. Professor McCardell's book comes on the heels of Emory M. Thomas' *The Confederate Nation, 1861-1865*, and Paul D. Escott's *After Secession: Jefferson Davis and the Failure of Confederate Nationalism*, and monographs on related subjects are surfacing in rapid succession. McCardell describes his work, which won the Allan Nevins dissertation award, as a "synthesis" of information about the emergence of southern nationalist ideas, building on past monographic studies and intended to inspire future ones.

Without undertaking a grand theoretical analysis of the phenomenon, McCardell traces the courses of different intellectual currents that fostered belief in nationhood for the Old South. He devotes his first chapter to the origin of southern nationalism among Nullifiers who opposed the 1833

Compromise, and his last to Southern Rights politics in the 1850s, culminating in formation of the Confederacy. Chronologically parallel chapters explore the development of separatist ideas in proslavery ideology, commerce, literature, religion and education, and proslavery expansionism. Most chapters note an intensification of southern militance about 1840-1845. "Slowly the movements merged," McCardell writes, "so that by 1860 the 'Southern nationalist' was characterized by a distinct set of beliefs" (p. 8). Diverse ideas converged in a nationalist ideology.

Earlier historians considered southern nationalism an intellectual's fantasy. Some now think that a real basis for southern nationality was developing, although Confederate experience showed its fatal limitations as well as its reality. McCardell gives each view some credence. He criticizes Avery O. Craven for giving the impression "that Southern nationalism was non-existent" (p. 8n). His account of the growth and confluence of movements suggests a powerful social and ideological tendency. By 1850, he argues, the course of events was winning converts to ideas a few thinkers had first propounded. He sees slavery as "the *sine qua non*" but "not the only component" of sectional ideology (p. 7).

On the other hand, even when McCardell invokes Clifford Geertz, he apparently adheres to the "strain theory" of ideology that Geertz rejects. He finds a major source of southern nationalism in the insecurity engendered by nineteenth-century social change. In describing individual thinkers, he emphasizes signs that their southern identity was marginal or questionable. He points out that most Confederates in 1861 did not espouse southern nationalism as an ideology. Both rational and irrational factors figure in his portrayal of southern nationalism.

In the course of his account McCardell draws conclusions about many subjects. His assessment of the relation between different forms of proslavery ideology will stimulate a discussion that is already active. McCardell argues that after 1840 a racist form, winning popular support, largely displaced paternalistic proslavery social theory. He attributes that form to particularly southwestern concerns and associates it closely with southern nationalism. McCardell sometimes seems to objectify the association of ideas, pitting young, southwestern, racist southern nationalists against old, Virginian, paternalistic national Democrats. For the most part, he limits his claims and describes an eclectic relation between the two forms.

A book that touches so many bases will naturally draw criticism about some specific assertions. This one deserves credit for the new light it casts on such topics as the activities of John A. Quitman, the political stance of James H. Hammond, and the founding of the University of the South. McCardell's primary achievement, however, is to comprehend so many related currents within his general account of the emergence of southern national consciousness.

*University of Oregon*

JACK P. MADDEX, JR.

*The Democratic Art, Pictures for a Nineteenth-Century America: Chromolithography 1840-1900.* By PETER C. MARZIO. (Boston: David G. Godine in association with the Amon Carter Museum of Western Art, 1979. xiv, 357 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. \$50.00.)

In this important book Peter Marzio explores the development in America of the art, craft, and social significance of lithographic color printing. He proceeds from its inception around 1840 to the end of the century when for the first time the camera began to exert authority in a realm that until then had been the province of highly skilled draughtsmen and pressmen. While the major concern of the book is with the persistent but only occasionally successful attempts of American lithographers to reproduce faithfully fine art oil paintings and watercolors, a good deal of attention is also paid to original prints in popular idioms.

The subject is an inherently untidy one. It demands as much understanding of the histories of popular taste, printing technology, and mass merchandising as of the history of art. It also demands a critical and patient eye, since the producers of chromolithographs brought forth many tawdry prints, so many that the subject of nineteenth-century color printing has until recently been in bad odor among most historians of the graphic arts. Marzio has helped redeem the subject by taking it seriously and by digging deeply into archives, some of them newly-discovered. He has cast his material mainly in terms of cultural history. The result is a comprehensive, sympathetic study of a complex subject, and a major contribution to the literature of the graphic arts.

The book is not flawless. As is perhaps to be expected of a pioneering study, a good many meaty issues are raised but few are discussed very fully. Over 150 lithographs are reproduced, most of them in color, but a number are taken from badly stained or otherwise imperfect impressions. In a few instances pointed comparisons are made between a print and its source painting, but even closer examinations, and more of them, would have illuminated the shadowy boundaries between the fine and popular arts. It would be interesting to know, for example, why in his color reproduction (1867) of Eastman Johnson's painting *Barefoot Boy* Louis Prang turned the boy's eyes upward as in a daydream, eliminating that directness of gaze which is so strong a feature of the original (private collection, not reproduced in the book), and through this single alteration giving the print a far greater quotient of sentimentality than the painting possesses.

As a survey of firms and individuals, *The Democratic Art* is of necessity uneven, for while the archives of a very few firms, such as the Strobridge Company of Cincinnati, have been preserved, and a few individuals, such as Prang, took the trouble to prepare accounts of their careers, most firms, artists, printers, and publishers left little behind them useful to historians other than prints. One of the great strengths of this study is the impressive number of notices of chromolithographs Marzio has located in contemporary

magazines and newspapers, including some vituperative criticisms of both specific prints and reproductive lithographs in general. Marzio's notes teem with valuable and fascinating scholarly information and his bibliography is a model of its kind. His discussion of the technology of color printing is lucid. His prose style is engaging and fast-moving. In an epilogue he lists fifty-odd prints that he considers the "most important"; the majority of them are significant primarily as documents of the history of technology and popular taste, but some of his choices—and others as well—can hold their own as fine prints, works whose value transcends the context of their creation. They—and this handsome book—bring a new respectability to a too-often maligned art.

*Syracuse University*

DAVID TATHAM

*The Union Cavalry in the Civil War: Volume I, From Fort Sumter to Gettysburg, 1861-1863.* By STEPHEN Z. STARR. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1979. xiv, 507 p. Illustrations, maps, bibliography, index. \$27.50.)

Many of the Civil War tales on which I was nurtured were those of the 7th Pennsylvania Cavalry, in which a brother of my paternal great-grandfather served. I was therefore no longer quite the objective reviewer when very early in this history of the Union cavalry, I found that the first reference to the 7th Pennsylvania gratifyingly confirmed family tradition about the sort of regiment it was. "Few cavalry regiments on either side," says Starr, "had a more distinguished record than the 7th Pennsylvania"; and a lengthy note goes on to record in detail many of the exploits of the regiment's service with the Army of the Cumberland, including Major General David S. Stanley's testimony about a charge at Shelbyville against "a battery ready loaded and waiting, supported on either flank by riflemen," the troopers riding "at the muzzles and guns and through them." Stanley said that "there can scarcely be instanced a finer display of gallantry than the charge made by the 7th Penna. Cavalry" (p. 22n).

This personally satisfying beginning proved to be followed, however, by many other references to the 7th Pennsylvania that are noteworthy on altogether different grounds. There remains a tendency remarkable in many otherwise sober military historians to share sufficiently in a nostalgia for old-fashioned, presumably gentlemanly warfare, that anything having to do with horse cavalry still takes the troopers riding through a purple cloud of romance. Starr will have none of this.

Thus, of what he himself considers one of the "more distinguished" Union cavalry regiments, he goes on to write of the 7th Pennsylvania, in various contexts, that the physical examinations of its recruits were so careless that they led to rejection of only one enlistee out of eighty; that the firearms initially issued to the resulting dubious assortment of soldiers were obsolete

Belgian rifles about as dangerous to the user as to his target; that training before entry into combat, particularly in marksmanship, was rudimentary to nonexistent; that what it was that distinguished the officers might have been bravery but was hardly sobriety, and that their example of habitual drunkenness was widely adopted by the men; that routine camp duties such as grooming and watering the horses were neglected systematically; that unauthorized absence from camp, wearing nonregulation clothing, negligent performance of guard duty, and straggling were as habitual as excessive drinking; that weapons were discharged promiscuously all over the camps, and cartridges swept into fires; that dirty camps and filthy kitchens had 70 percent of the regiment on the sick list in February 1862, mostly with diarrhea. The regiment might rouse itself for a gallant charge in a big battle, but in an incident all too characteristic, a lieutenant took a thirty-man escort for a forage train without bothering to check whether the men were properly armed. About a third left their carbines behind and many their sabers and revolvers. There was no effort to keep the column closed up. The train was pounced on by Confederate cavalry and captured, with only four troopers and a few teamsters escaping. If this was the record of a distinguished Union cavalry regiment, what were the mediocre regiments like?

Starr does not spare us realistic answers. Almost until Gettysburg, the cavalry was a neglected stepchild of the Union Army. The pre-Civil War United States Army had little in the way of a cavalry tradition. The best military administrator in the early phases of the war, Major General George B. McClellan, favored the cavalry with almost none of his attention. Rather, McClellan broke up cavalry formations into dribblets of regiments and companies for headquarters escorts and auxiliary service to the infantry. Without a coherent, unified force, the Union cavalry offered few prospects for a talented officer's advancement. The effects of the absence of a cavalry tradition were thereby aggravated; the level of cavalry leadership was rarely high.

In amassing his evidence for a depressing but convincingly detailed chronicle, Starr followed Bruce Catton's example by making skillful, discriminating use of the often-neglected source material crammed into the old regimental histories. In amassing the evidence, he also collected enough material on the Confederate cavalry to provide an interesting chapter of comparisons and contrasts. Also handicapped by the old army's lack of a cavalry tradition, the Confederate mounted arm does not look very much better than the Union in Starr's portrayal, the South's legacy of horsemanship notwithstanding. In the flaws of the Confederate cavalry, and in the ability of Union regiments like the 7th Pennsylvania to rise to a crisis despite their own flaws, lay the seeds of the happier episodes that Starr will survey in two subsequent volumes. Meanwhile, this volume is the best work of an already notable Civil War historian.

*1866: The Critical Year Revisited.* By PATRICK W. RIDDLEBERGER. (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1979. xiii, 287 p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. \$18.95.)

As its title suggests, *1866: The Critical Year Revisited* is an account of the major events of that twelve-month period which Howard K. Beale, in his 1929 study, regarded as the crucial moment in post-war Reconstruction. From the assembling of the 39th Congress in December 1865 until the congressional elections of the fall of 1866, the control and shape of national Reconstruction policy was in the balance as Andrew Johnson and the Republican majority in Congress maneuvered for dominance. With the defeat in those elections of the President's initiative, the course of Reconstruction was virtually set.

This is an exceedingly familiar story to historians of the Reconstruction period and of American political and constitutional history. Mr. Riddleberger tells it again because he feels that there is a need for a "clear narrative" of these seminal events and because he wants to offer a synthesis of Beale's thesis and the line of interpretation which the Revisionists of the 1950s and 1960s have advanced. The trouble is, though, that it is not at all obvious what a clear narrative is or why it is so necessary. Nor is it apparent why historians of the late 1970s need to reconcile and synthesize a 1929 interpretation with the rather different findings of a group of recent historians.

In fact, since Beale's work, which was laudatory of Johnson and very critical of the Republicans, was only a more sophisticated version of the southern orthodoxy which the Revisionists had set out to refute, it is hard to see how a synthesis can be achieved or even whether anything is to be gained from such an endeavor. The account that Riddleberger eventually provides is one in which Andrew Johnson's motives are a little more understandable and consistent than the Revisionists were prepared to concede, while his Republican adversaries were perhaps less sure of themselves and less worthy in their intentions. But these gains in knowledge and insight are marginal and hardly justify the retelling of this well-known story.

Not only are the results insubstantial but the whole attempt at synthesis does not succeed. The Beale interpretation is essentially rejected by the author; and the book is a rejoinder and a qualification of the Revisionist position, with scant reference to Beale. Only in the last chapter does Beale receive any attention when Mr. Riddleberger ponders the possible impact on the 1866 election if Andrew Johnson had injected economic issues into the canvass. One of Beale's major contributions was his assertion that the Republicans were motivated by economic concerns, not by principle and humanitarianism. But, although economics is raised in this last section, the author is not discussing Beale's main thesis. Instead, he is considering a minor matter and, after enumerating the possible issues—a reduced tariff and an inflationary monetary policy—he concludes that "Knowing what

we do about Andrew Johnson and the impact of his battle with Congress over Reconstruction, it would have been asking too much of him to conduct such a campaign" (p. 247). Clearly, this is academic and a rather strained attempt to reintroduce the Beale thesis so that the intended synthesis with the Revisionists is still viable.

A final comment is that Professor Riddleberger seems not to be aware of the Reconstruction scholarship of the last decade which has gone beyond the Revisionist perspective and either expanded and deepened its insights or else criticised and countered it. Rather it is as if he feels that Reconstruction scholarship ended with the Revisionists of the 1960s and that the need for historians now is therefore to look back and make peace with the southern school and Beale and Charles Beard rather than to move on to more creative and innovative tasks, many of them stimulated by the Revisionists' discoveries. A significant Revisionist himself, it is a shame that Patrick Riddleberger's well-written and handsomely produced new book has not furthered the investigations he helped initiate.

*Charles Warren Center, Harvard University*

MICHAEL PERMAN

*Violent Death in the City: Suicide, Accident, and Murder in Nineteenth-Century Philadelphia.* By ROGER LANE. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1979. xiii, 193 p. Index. \$16.50.)

The subtitle of this interesting book would imply that the author, professor of history at Haverford College, deals solely with deaths by violence in the eighteen-hundreds, but he also devotes a chapter to comparisons with similar events in the present century. This part of his study will have to be ignored in this review for lack of space, and attention centered on the original research, which permits the author, and justifiably so, to claim that "no published study has analyzed homicide or suicide as thoroughly as this one for any considerable period of the twentieth century." The research covers the sixty-three years of 1839-1901. Official data for earlier years were too scanty or defective to be of use. The opening year of the period studied may have been chosen because in 1839 the Philadelphia *Public Ledger's* local news columns began to feature notices of deaths by violence.

The research was undertaken for the purpose of demonstrating the usefulness of indices of suicide, accident, and homicide as measures of violence, and to indicate the relative impact of population growth and other influences on such behavior, and since violence in the twentieth-century might be related to patterns originating earlier, the author also wished to establish and interpret these patterns, on the significance of which sociologists and historians have been at odds.

The nineteenth-century data were extracted chiefly from official records

maintained by the Board of Health, which is the depository for death certificates, the Coroner's office, and the docket books of the Court of Quarter Sessions. The problems raised by various deficiencies and omissions in these sources are frankly discussed by the author, whose caution in the evaluation of the data is highly commendable. More emphasis is placed on the manner of recording official statistics and the reality behind them than on the statistical manipulation of the figures. Tests of significance have been avoided, because the findings should be fully accessible to readers, who are "uncomfortable in the presence of statistical data." Rates per 100,000 population are generally presented for nine consecutive groups of years, permitting an appreciation of both the volume and the trend of each class of death examined. Some rates standardized for age are also given.

The suicide rate doubled by the end of the century and was higher for the immigrant than for the native population. It was also generally higher for the "upper classes," but relatively low for minors, women, and blacks, although the rate for blacks would begin to rise after the Civil War. In accidental deaths, the railroads would become increasingly involved.

For the measurement of changes in homicidal behavior, the author erroneously claims that criminologists today rely on arrest rates for index purposes. They use the number of homicides known to the police, when available, because arrest rates are based on offenders and not on victims. Unfortunately, the police records of the last century proved so inadequate that reliance had to be placed on the number of persons indicted and processed by the grand jury and the court for homicide. In general, the rates showed a decline, which would have been even steeper if medical and surgical knowledge had not progressively saved more and more assault victims from death, who in earlier years would have died. This decline in violent behavior is largely attributed to "the discipline demanded of the industrial revolution and taught in the classroom, on the railroads and in the factories and offices of nineteenth-century America."

*University of Pennsylvania*

THORSTEN SELLIN