

BOOK REVIEWS

Pastors and People: German Lutheran and Reformed Churches in the Pennsylvania Field, 1717-1793. By CHARLES H. GLATFELTER. (Breinigsville: The Pennsylvania German Society. Volume I, 1980, xv, 551 p.; Volume II, 1981, xix, 544 p. Illustrations, maps, indices. \$25 per volume.)

In these volumes the author presents biographies of 250 Lutheran and Reformed pastors, histories of 525 congregations, and a narrative history from the early beginnings of the two churches to their establishment as independent American organizations.

In Volume I the pastors' biographies, arranged alphabetically, normally include data on birthplace, type of education, marriage and congregations served. The congregational histories, arranged by state (covering an area from New York to Virginia) and alphabetically therein, usually include information on the founding of the congregation, the church buildings, the early pastors, and the present status of the congregation. Since all this information is set in small type, the entries are often quite detailed, with the average being about five hundred words.

In Volume II, which can stand by itself, the author shows a broad understanding of the church situation in Europe and America in the eighteenth century. Obviously some discussion of doctrinal differences between the two groups and between "orthodox" and "pietists" must be included, but the author finds more similarities between the Lutherans and the Reformed than he does differences. Both were strongly influenced by pietism; both were involved in many joint projects; and both faced the same problem: how to secure trained pastors for their scattered flocks.

Both groups soon found it necessary to ask for assistance from Europe. The Lutherans' main connections were with Halle in Germany. The Reformed became a missionary enterprise of the Dutch Reformed Church in Holland. The European authorities interviewed candidates for service in America (many of the Lutherans matriculated at Halle; many Reformed came from Heidelberg, from Switzerland, and from other traditional Reformed areas) and donated funds to the fledgling church organizations in America. They also exerted control, especially in respect to ordination. For most of this period all candidates—even those trained in America—theoretically had to be approved for ordination by the church fathers in Halle or Amsterdam. The pastors sent from Europe became the leaders of the churches in America, although they were not in the majority. The author points out that due to a lack of trained personnel, a large group of "irregulars" served churches without proper training or officially authorized calls.

The history points out clearly how important a theological school is for a denomination, by its presence (the Presbyterians) or by its absence (the Germans). By the end of the eighteenth century, despite serious efforts, neither German group had its own theological institution.

Glatfelter's work contains some surprises, but generally agrees with commonly accepted historical theses. Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg still emerges as the most important German church leader in early America. One surprise might be the influence of the Moravians, who constituted a major threat to the Lutherans and the Reformed during the 1740s. Other groups interacting with the German churches (usually positively) were the Swedish Lutherans and the Dutch Reformed, who were on the American scene at an early date, and, near the end of the period, the Methodists. The German Methodists drew pastors and members from the ranks of the Lutherans and the Reformed.

Anything one might want to know about the German churches in the eighteenth century is likely to be here: pietism, the Great Awakening, union churches, establishment of primary schools, the churches and the Revolution, treatment of Indians and blacks, the early history of Franklin College. This, in short, is now the best work available on the mainstream of German church life in early America.

Anyone who doubts that the Lutherans and the Reformed do in fact constitute this mainstream should refer to the author's statistics. In 1776 there were, in Pennsylvania alone, 126 Lutheran Congregations, 123 Reformed, 112 Presbyterian, perhaps 60-65 Mennonite meetings, about 60 Quaker meetings, and many smaller denominations. Thus the Lutherans and the Reformed were the largest Pennsylvania church bodies as of that date, less than sixty years after their start.

The volumes are well-illustrated except for the maps, which seem difficult to use.

The Moravian Archives

VERNON H. NELSON

Friends and Neighbors: Group Life in America's First Plural Society. Edited by MICHAEL ZUCKERMAN. (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1982. v, 255p. Maps, tables, index. \$27.50.)

In the vigorously polemical introduction to these stimulating essays, the editor, Michael Zuckerman, argues that early American historians too frequently pursue the peculiar and the unique at the expense of the common and the prophetic. They concentrate too fully on Puritan New England and too little on the dynamic, heterogeneous cultures of the middle Atlantic colonies that came

closer than any others to predicting the shape of the American future. Certainly, these solid, often sprightly, essays go far to demonstrate that what Zuckerman aptly terms "America's first plural society" proves, indeed, to have been an interesting and significant society as well.

Zuckerman's enterprise is risky because so many anthologies collapse under the weight of their own formlessness. But here the theme is pluralism, and the almost aggressive eclecticism of subject and method borne in these essays only reinforces Zuckerman's claim that much of modern American pluralism originated in early Pennsylvania and the Jerseys. Where else can one read in a single volume (or in several) about Quaker origins of the modern loving family, about the persistence of Old World habits among East New Jersey Scots, about government in Philadelphia's prestigious Christ Church or rising individualism among Burlington Friends and growing tribalism among Pennsylvania Quakers, about the significance of visiting among wealthy Quaker women, the ramifications of diversity in eighteenth-century Reading, or the political savvy (and patriotic reticence) of Revolutionary-era Pennsylvanians? Seldom have pluralism and diversity proved so coherent.

These pieces would be important even if editor and essayists could demonstrate only that Pennsylvania and the Jerseys presaged modern American pluralism. But the essays here also reveal that the middle Atlantic region shaped other significant aspects of American life as well. Barry Levy's elucidation of affective Quaker family life might make us wonder why, aside from a love for the bizarre, historians have so long concentrated on New England's less influential Puritans. Deborah Gough's sketch of competing lay interests at Philadelphia's Christ Church points up the complexities of laicization in nineteenth-century American Protestantism and forecasts the fascination for hierarchy strangely common to the preeminent democracy in nineteenth-century Western culture. And the essays by Ned Landsman, Laura Becker, and Wayne Bodle point up so many anomalies in the political and social experiences of middle colony settlers that they remind us, again, how dangerous it is to trace that familiar but erroneous line from emigration to ethnicization, church membership to piety, and aristocracy to democracy as we write America's history.

True, conundrums pop up here. Quakers who seem to be moving with herd-like unanimity toward loving families and Meeting tribalism in some essays evidence intellectual independence and a group shattering exogamy in others. The emphasis on family and institutional affairs in the essays obscures interrelationships among the young, unmarried European immigrants whose social experiences operated through perhaps different agencies, especially after 1720. And, paradoxically, the sometimes sparse references to previous scholarship, especially in the notes, might induce some readers to infer that the

condition of history in the middle colonies is more desperate than is actually the case.

Still, Zuckerman encourages his readers to luxuriate in this "tangle of confirmations and contradictions" (p. 17); it is part of the challenge of rediscovery. But it can be hoped that readers with the requisite power and authority also will respond by encouraging more new books, additional articles, and, especially, better guides to source materials and microfilm and letterpress editions of the many neglected and hard to use middle colony records so the scholarship of this region need no longer lag behind that of New England and the southern colonies. Certainly, we should be embarrassed to respond in any other fashion to this fresh collection of fresh essays by fresh, intelligent, young historians.

University of Illinois
Chicago

JON BUTLER

The Papers of Benjamin Franklin. Volume 22, *March 23, 1775, through October 27, 1776*. Edited by WILLIAM B. WILLCOX ET AL. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982. liii, 726p. Illustrations, chronology, bibliographical notes, index. \$45.00.)

Volume 22 of *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin* covers that extraordinarily busy interval that Franklin, aged 69 and 70, spent in America, following a decade in England and preceding a decade in France. During his sixteen American months, Franklin was elected to the Continental Congress (where he was appointed to several of its most important committees, including the committee on secret correspondence), served as Postmaster General, conferred with George Washington at the army's headquarters in Cambridge, was elected to the Pennsylvania Assembly, journeyed to Canada at the behest of the Continental Congress, served as President of the Pennsylvania Convention, negotiated with Lord Howe on the possible terms for peace, and was elected a commissioner to France. Among its numerous contributions to Franklin scholarship, this volume proves that Franklin was a consistent and early advocate for independence, frequently urging this radical course in public and private throughout 1775. He wrote to Silas Dean on August 27, 1775: "When we are no longer fascinated with the Idea of a speedy Reconciliation, we shall exert ourselves to some purpose. 'Till then Things will be done by Halves."

Despite a whirlwind of official activities involving him in hundreds of committee meetings and committee reports, Franklin nevertheless found time to demonstrate his splendid literary artistry. His best compositions of the

period are the letter of July 5, 1775 (never sent), to his old friend William Strahan, concluding "You are now my enemy, and I am, Yours, B. Franklin"; his burlesque song "The King's Own Regulars," published November 27, 1775, which, as Charles Carroll of Carrollton said, "abounds with good wit"; the mock epitaph on John Bradshaw, a regicide responsible for the execution of Charles I, which concludes with the sentiment Thomas Jefferson adopted as his life-motto, "REBELLION TO TYRANTS IS OBEDIENCE TO GOD"; and the letter to Lord Howe of July 20, 1776, which calls the British Empire "that fine and noble China Vase." All these, except the song, are frequently reprinted in selections from Franklin's writings. Although the song has appeared in such standard anthologies as Frank Moore's *Diary of the American Revolution* (1860) and Edward A. Dolph's *"Sound Off!"* (1942), it has not hitherto been attributed (except by specialists) to Franklin. I wish the editors had printed the excellent introduction to the song which appeared in the *Pennsylvania Evening Post* for March 30, 1776, for it too, I believe, was by Franklin. Although the editors puzzle over "what tune he had in mind" for "The King's Own Regulars," the varying length of the lines makes it apparent that the song could not have been sung to a set tune; and the *Post* text explains that the tune named "is a kind of recitativo, like the chaunting of the prose psalms in cathedrals."

I also believe that Franklin wrote two fine essays on early American symbols which, chronologically, belong in this volume. Since no modern scholars have, to my knowledge, attributed these essays to Franklin, I do not fault the editors for not including them. The first, a fascinating essay on "*the Devices on the Continental Bills of Credit. . .with my Conjectures of their Meaning*" by "CLERICUS," appeared as the lead article in the *Pennsylvania Gazette* for September 20, 1775. As the pseudonym "CLERICUS" implies, the tone is formal, learned, and explanatory. The subject had long interested Franklin who, more than twenty-seven years earlier, had designed at least twenty "Devices and Mottoes" for the flags of the Associator Companies. Contemporaries such as William Browne (Harvard, 1755) attributed the devices and mottos on the Continental currency to Franklin; and, although it is known that Francis Hopkinson designed some of the currency, it seems likely that he had Franklin's advice and help. At any rate, the essay by "CLERICUS" is on a subject of great interest to Franklin and possesses his characteristic opinions. It enjoyed considerable contemporary fame. Francis Hopkinson wrote a follow-up essay "On the Use and Abuse of Mottos," *Pennsylvania Magazine, Supplement* for 1775, which he reprinted in his *Miscellaneous Essays*; and Joseph Stansbury, the Philadelphia Loyalist poet, devoted a sixty-eight-line poem to the "CLERICUS" essay, which, he noted, was "supposed to be written by the celebrated Dr. Franklin."

The other piece on American symbolism is more fun. A long, tongue-in-cheek analysis of the rattlesnake as an emblem of America by "AN AMERICAN GUESSER" appeared as the lead essay in the *Pennsylvania Journal* for December 27, 1775. The rattlesnake as an American patriotic emblem was, of course, one of Franklin's numerous original iconographic creations, and the splendid piece in the *Journal* contains that inimitable naïveté of tone that John Adams so admired in Franklin's writings, as well as the extraordinary fertility of imagination and distinctiveness of opinion that characterize Franklin.

Although it is not surprising that the editors ignored these two essays, I did expect them to print his "Method of making salt-petre at Hanover, 1766," for Edwin Wolf, 2nd, suggested in his *Annual Report of the Library Company of Philadelphia for 1965* that it was by Franklin. This brief piece appeared in a pamphlet published by the Continental Congress (Franklin served on its committee to encourage the domestic production of saltpeter, an essential ingredient of gunpowder), entitled *Several Methods of Making Salt-Petre* (Philadelphia: Bradfords, 1775), pp. 7-8. Although the short description of the Hanover manufactory is anonymous, Benjamin Rush, on p. 9 of the same pamphlet, says that Franklin has described for him the extremely simple method by which saltpeter was made in Hanover. But there is better evidence than Rush's implied attribution, for the piece first appeared in the *Massachusetts Spy* for August 2, 1775. In the prefatory letter, Joseph Palmer (a Massachusetts manufacturer and correspondent of Robert Treat Paine, who was on the saltpeter committee with Franklin) said that "the following method of making it, as practiced in Hanover. . . is related, in substance, by Dr. Franklin." And when Thomas Paine reprinted the piece in his *Pennsylvania Magazine* for August, 1775, p. 360, he too said it was "related by Dr. Franklin."

With their usual expertise and intelligence, the editors have written dozens of excellent brief headnotes and splendidly annotated innumerable references throughout the volume, but such is the perversity of reviewers (and of human nature) that I nevertheless fault them on two counts. First, they evade the most interesting single question that a student expects them to answer in this volume: What changes did Franklin make in Jefferson's draft of the Declaration of Independence? Although the editors say at one point that "His contributions to Jefferson's draft are discussed in the headnote on the latter's note to him" (p. 474n), that headnote only says that both Adams and Franklin "made small changes in phrasing." They do not say what these "small changes" were, and a footnote tells the reader that "Authorities differ on the question" (p. 486n). Since the question of Franklin's contributions turns upon the identification of Franklin's handwriting in Jefferson's rough draft of the Declaration and since the editors are great authorities on his handwriting, they are the logical people

to give us their opinion. Besides, I do not consider Franklin's insertion of the words "abolishing our most valuable Laws" merely a small change in phrasing. There is no comparable clause in Jefferson's original, and this addition was kept throughout the later revisions by Jefferson and by Congress. But perhaps the editors do not accept James Munves's argument in *Thomas Jefferson and the Declaration of Independence* (1978), p. 74, that Franklin made this addition. Who knows?

Finally, the editors are, as usual, weak on Franklin's devices and emblems. In this volume, there are two signal instances of Franklin's penchant for designing appropriate visual images: his work on the Continental paper currency and on the Great Seal of the United States. All persons interested in the subject will be delighted with the editors' discovery of three drawings among his papers, two of which are sources for the designs on the one-sixth, one-third, one-half, and two-thirds of a dollar, Continental paper currency, in 1776. But, alas, their treatment of these drawings is skimpy. No one can be expert in all fields, but why could not the editors consult some specialist like Dr. Frank H. Sommer of the Winterthur Museum on the visual materials? Indeed, one feature that *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin* has needed from its inception has been a series of advisory specialists such as A. Owen Aldridge on literature, I. Bernard Cohen on science (he was added to the "Editorial Advisory Committee" beginning with volume 15), Frank H. Sommer on iconography, and Edwin Wolf, 2nd, on Franklin's books. Readers would like to know how original was Franklin's design of that interlocked series of thirteen circles symbolizing the union of the colonies, and they would be interested to learn that it was wonderfully successful, appearing in numerous later places, including the flag of the Second New Hampshire Regiment of 1777 and Josiah Wedgwood's china. And what about that third drawing? Was it, as it appears to be, the original sketch for the design and mottos on the \$20 Continental currency of 1775? How could it be, if it were not drawn until after February 21, 1776? . . . Such questions, unfortunately, are passed over in silence. The editors are consistently excellent on Franklin's politics and its historical contexts but consistently uninformative on some areas of Franklin's universal genius, including iconography.

University of Delaware

J. A. LEO LEMAY

The Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin: A Genetic Text. Edited by J. A. LEO LEMAY and PAUL M. ZALL. (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1981. lxiv, 228 p. Illustrations, appendices, index. \$28.00.)

Before the current recession all one had to do was form a company with “Genetic” in its name and a boomlet took off. The breaking down and reconstruction of DNA, the replicative code of living cells, have awesome implications. The breaking down and reconstruction of a literary classic are fascinating exercises in textual historiography.

It has long been known that the writing of Franklin’s *Autobiography* was an interrupted, long-term project that he never completed, and that the early printed texts were varied, some incomplete, others with occasional obvious errors, their origins obscure. Lemay and Zall have printed the text of and based their research on the autograph manuscript in the Huntington Library, the only one in Franklin’s handwriting. By a scrupulous examination of the color tones of the ink, changes in Franklin’s handwriting and the size, sizing and watermarks of the paper, the editors have been able to revise the chronology of some of the composition—notably a section dealing with the Pennsylvania Hospital and other of Franklin’s civic enterprises—and have recorded changes from first thoughts and aborted statements crossed out. Going to the text’s origins by breaking down its components, the discrete elements of the textual DNA, Lemay and Zall have established the sources of the published versions and account for their adulteration. It is a masterful accomplishment of textual sleuthing, set forth in full in the Introduction.

There were five early manuscripts of the *Autobiography*, only two of which are known to have survived. Of course, the key document is the only holograph one, the Huntington manuscript, composed by Franklin in four time-separated parts and emended by him on and off towards the end of his life. The first part was written in the summer of 1771 while Franklin was staying with Dr. Richard Price in England. It was in the chest entrusted to Joseph Galloway when Franklin went to France and returned to him by Mrs. Galloway’s executor, Abel James, after he came back home in 1785. He wrote the second part at Passy probably in the late spring or early summer of 1784, the third in Philadelphia from August 1788 to May 1789, and the final bit between November 1789 and March 1790. Franklin died on April 17, 1790.

While the first part was in the hands of Abel James an unauthorized copy was made. This became the basis for the first published texts. Late in 1789 the aged statesman sent copies of the first three parts, one to the Duc de la Rochefoucauld and the other to Benjamin Vaughan, for comments by them and, respectively, Louis-Guillaume Le Veillard and Dr. Price. They were specifically instructed not to allow them to be published. Ingeniously, Lemay and Zall have posited that these consisted of a copy of part one made by Franklin’s grandson, Ben-

jamin Franklin Bache, because the original was on hard-sized paper and could not be duplicated by pressure. Parts two and three were, however, on lightly sized paper and were sent abroad in press copies. Neither of these transmitted copies has survived, although that which came into the hands of Le Veillard had progeny in print. The fifth manuscript, now in the Library of Congress, is a translation by or for Le Veillard of the copy sent in 1789 with the addition of part four. This he saw for the first time when William Temple Franklin in 1791 exchanged the original manuscript he had inherited for Le Veillard's copy as being easier for a publisher to print from. All this is spelled out in detail by the editors.

The history of the publication of the text is even more complicated. The *Autobiography* first appeared in print in the *Universal Asylum and Columbian Magazine* shortly after Franklin's death in 1790 in the form of a paraphrase by Henry Stuber of the unauthorized, unrevised James text of the first part. Shortly thereafter, Mathew Carey condensed for his *American Museum* the four-part manuscript, access to which had been granted him by Temple Franklin. To this Carey added material, also in Temple's possession, contained in the outline for the *Autobiography* copied by James's partner, Henry Drinker, and sent by James in 1782 to Franklin who made corrections on it. The original holograph manuscript of the outline, once with the Huntington manuscript has disappeared; the Drinker copy is in the Morgan Library.

The first book printing was a French translation of the unauthorized text of the first part issued by the Paris publisher Buisson who obtained it from some still unknown source. Two translations into English from the French translation appeared in London almost simultaneously in July 1793. One, published by J. Parsons, although it included interesting supplementary material also translated from the French, was not reprinted. The other was issued by G.G.J. and J. Robinson in London as the first volume of Franklin's *Works*. It was given authenticity by a prefatory letter by Dr. Price, but scattered textual evidences of authority, Lemay and Zell suggest, come not from Price's betrayal of his trust but stem from the Robinsons' knowledge and use of the American periodicals. The Robinson text became the popular version and was almost universally used and translated into many languages.

When Temple Franklin published his edition of Franklin's collected works, the *Autobiography* was issued in 1818 in volume one. He had the opportunity of presenting an authoritative text, less Part Four, because he had Le Veillard's manuscript with the Bache transcript of the first part and the press copies of the second and third parts. However, he decided to improve on what he had by making eclectic changes culled from the Buisson or the Robinson printings. This is a major new finding by Lemay and Zell which they document in detail.

The French translation of Part Two made by Le Veillard from the manu-

script he had received from the Duc de la Rochefoucauld—its first book appearance—was included in a 1798 Paris edition of the *Vie de Benjamin Franklin* that was something of a hippogriff. Part One was a new translation into French of the Robinson 1793 English translation from the French of the 1791 Buisson translation of the unauthorized copy. A translation of Part Four—its first book appearance—made from the original manuscript was published in an edition of the *Memoires* at Paris in 1828, courtesy of M. de Senarmont, Veuve Le Veillard's nephew, who after her death in 1834 inherited the manuscript.

It was acquired from a De Senarmont in 1867 by John Bigelow, American diplomat and historian, who put out his own edition of it a year later. Max Farrand was the next important user of the by-then Huntington manuscript; his text appeared posthumously in 1949. A more recent redaction was the 1964 one of Leonard W. Labaree and his associates of the Franklin Papers. Lemay and Zall state that these three American editions, successively hailed as definitive, did in fact “selectively” print Franklin's cancellations and revisions.

There is nothing selective about the present editors' version, nor of their exhaustive printing of and commentary on all relevant collateral material. It does, however, present a reading problem. Franklin wrote his composition in a column occupying only the right half of a folio page. In the left half he added what were frequently extensive paragraphs to be inserted where he keyed a sigil. He lined through words and made superscript additions in both columns. Angle brackets to indicate what was stricken out will not bother the hardened textual scholar. They may hesitate a bit—and the inexperienced will certainly stumble—in encountering single arrows up and down to enclose interlinear additions and double arrows to enclose columnar ones, particularly when interlinear additions occur within the columnar ones. There are other less frequent conventions, fully explained and annotated. Fascinating is the editors' classification of three inks to indicate when certain emendations were made from the summer of 1788 to the winter of 1789-90. This is characteristic of their use of the physical evidence of the manuscript to print the genetic text and explain its history and that of its descendants.

Nothing relevant has been omitted. The appendices include the note on the name of Franklin, the poems of the author's uncle Benjamin Franklin, remarks on an editorial in the *Pennsylvania Gazette*, letters from Abel James and Benjamin Vaughan, the “Golden Verses” of Pythagoras, a 1755 advertisement for wagons, and the outline of the autobiography. All except the last had once been tipped in the manuscript in one form or another and were intended for inclusion in the text as notes requiring their insertion in the original manuscript indicate. Would it not have been appropriate in a definitive text to have inserted them? All these documents were subjected to the same textual scrutiny

as the main text.

In addition there are notes on the main text elucidating and dating some of Dr. Franklin's emendations and commenting on differences with the Buisson and William Temple Franklin editions. Conjectural readings of incompleting words are given; the measurements in millimeters of longer dashes, frequently used by Franklin in all manuscripts and seldom in his printed works, have been recorded (was this really necessary?); and comments on the use of quotation marks and hyphens, with a long list of line-end hyphenation, constitute the final critical explanations.

There can hardly be any more juice in that orange. Dr. Lemay's expressed hope "that the *Genetic Text* will not only become the standard scholarly edition of the *Autobiography*, but will also significantly advance the study of Franklin's life and literary art" is certainly justified with, perhaps, a shading of the adverb, "significantly." Each Franklin aficionado will find his own tidbits of information in this work of scrupulous scholarly erudition. I am delighted that Joseph Breintnall, the Library Company's first secretary, was Franklin's "Fa[vorite]."

Library Company of Philadelphia

EDWIN WOLF 2nd

Diary of John Quincy Adams. Volume 1, November 1779-March 1786; Volume 2, March 1786-December 1788. Edited by DAVID GRAYSON ALLEN, ROBERT J. TAYLOR, MARC FRIEDLAENDER, and CELESTE WALKER. (Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1982. Volume I, lxii, 415p.; Volume II, xiv, 521p. Illustrations, chronology, index. \$60.00.)

"This morning at about 11 o'clock I took leave of my Mamma, my Sister, and Brother Tommy, and went to Boston with Mr. Thaxter, in order to go on board the Frigate the *Sensible* of 28 twelve Pounders." Thus begins the most famous of all American diaries, as the twelve-year-old John Quincy Adams records the beginning of his second voyage to Europe in 1779. The last entry would be made nearly seventy years later, a few weeks before the author's death in the halls of Congress in 1848. With these initial volumes, the editors of the Adams papers begin one of the most formidable of their many challenges.

Although the entire text of the Diary has been available to the public since 1954 in the microfilm edition of the Adams papers, over half of the material contained herein has never been printed before. Charles Francis Adams chose to omit these years from the edition of his father's *Memoirs* that appeared in the 1870s. It is easy to see why. Although the young John Quincy was already

brushing up against many of the great personages of his day (Franklin, Jefferson, Lafayette), he was not yet playing a public role. The earliest entries are descriptive and narrative, tracing his travels with his father from Spain to France to the Netherlands, as the senior Adams engaged in the negotiations that would eventually result in Dutch financial support for the American colonies.

In 1781 Adams left his father for two years, most of which were spent in St. Petersburg in the capacity of secretary and interpreter to Francis Dana in the latter's futile diplomatic mission to the court of Catherine the Great. Adams rejoined his father in 1783 (making the journey via Sweden and Denmark by himself). He visited England three times in 1783-84 before returning home to Massachusetts (again alone) in 1785, at the age of eighteen.

By this time, as the editors note in their Introduction, the Diary changes from a strictly narrative and occasionally monotonous record to a more introspective account of his own character and those around him. John Quincy had his hands full coping with the usual problems of late adolescence. One reads of his slow but steady discovery of the charms and mysteries of the opposite sex, his insecurity in the presence of more vivacious contemporaries, and the growth of the haunting fear that he was somehow, even at this age, wasting his life.

The entries for the Harvard years reveal an ambitious, slightly priggish student, yet one who was not hesitant to criticize (privately) both the faculty and officers of the College for alleged incompetence and arbitrariness. Denied the top honors at graduation in 1787, he had to settle for something like second place, which rankled him for many years to come.

College life was followed by three years of study in the law office of Theophilus Parsons in Newburyport. These were bittersweet times, as Adams and a small number of lawyers-to-be alternated a Cratchit-like existence in Parsons's outer office in the daytime with dances, sleighrides, and occasional drinking-bouts at night. There is a record of at least one two-day hangover. "Indolence, indolence, I fear will be my ruin," wrote the twenty-year-old Adams, not for the last time. It would still be another six years before his first diplomatic assignment (as Minister to the Hague in 1794), but already in these volumes one can detect the emergence of the solemn, studious, occasionally forbidding but thoroughly human being that was John Quincy Adams.

A word should be said about editorial technique. By common consent, the standards established in the past by the late Julian Boyd in the Jefferson papers and the late Lyman Butterfield in the Adams papers have set the mark for scholarship in the editing of historical manuscripts. For the most part, these volumes carry on the Boyd-Butterfield tradition, but with certain economies that are evident when they are compared with earlier volumes. For example, where one might have expected follow-up references to individuals or events

mentioned in the Diary that attain significance in Adams's later life, often there are none. Where previously most identifiable individuals were given birth-and death-dates, the practice now seems to be restricted to members of the Adams family.

There may be valid reasons for these and other departures. One would hope so, given the definitive nature of this project. Posterity should not be deprived unnecessarily of the fullest explication of a document that is a guidebook to the changing political culture of the early Republic, a monument to Yankee civilization, and a piece of American literature, all rolled into one.

*State University of New York
Brockport*

LYNN HUDSON PARSONS

Transcendentalism as a Social Movement, 1830-1850. By ANNE C. ROSE.
(New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981. xii, 269p. Appendices, bibliography, index. \$22.50.)

Anne C. Rose makes three basic points in her "Preface" to *Transcendentalism as a Social Movement, 1830-1850*. The first is that her study is "frankly revisionist" because it argues that the key figures "engaged wholeheartedly in the reforms of their day." The second is that our recent political history has taught us that established institutions are often inflexible, that extra-institutional means to social change are often necessary, and that early nineteenth-century Americans, including the Transcendentalists, also made the discovery. The third point is methodological. Her book, we are told, is a "social history of intellectuals," a "coordination of social and intellectual history" that advances recent historiographical trends somewhat by focusing on "the extraordinary man or woman" instead of the "quantifiable common man." That is, Rose has a quarrel with what she perceives as the banality of conventional social history. It is, to her, "faceless history" that contains a "passion for technique. . . too mundane to sustain an intellectual's interest." So she attempts to engage certain of the Transcendental elites—Orestes Brownson, George Ripley, Elizabeth Peabody, Margaret Fuller, Bronson Alcott, and Ralph Waldo Emerson—without forsaking the methods of the social historian. Why these methods should prove useful in dealing with the very articulate, however, is not made clear.

Despite the tone of discovery with which they are asserted, Rose's first two points do not astound. Readers with some awareness of the primary literature and with the large scholarship on the subject will not be at all surprised to learn that Transcendentalism was reform-oriented; indeed, it is conventional, not

revisionist, to think of it as "social criticism" (if not, admittedly, as a "social movement"). Historians familiar with the early nineteenth-century cornucopia of moral reform, utopian socialism, agrarian communism, and so forth, will not be surprised by Rose's second point, either. It too is conventional. And the surface congruence of the 1960s with, say, the 1840s is a truism that scarcely needs restating.

Its claims aside, is Rose's book an addition to the scholarship? One searches for new ways of understanding the Transcendentalists but comes away thoroughly disappointed. The central chapters take up the conflict between privatism and public reform that so often disturbed the Transcendentalists, the evolution of Unitarianism, the anarchic Fruitlands experiment, the influence of Fourier (here, Pennsylvania readers will find some good passages on the Sylvania community), Brook Farm and its difficulties, sexual relationships, work and leisure, and the causes of failure and decline of Transcendentalism. These are all familiar subjects to specialists and, I suspect, to others as well; and the conclusions drawn are usually all too familiar. As a review of the intellectual development of some of the key Transcendentalists, all of this might serve some purpose. But even within this broad framework there are serious problems. The literary analysis of the book is often reductive. Emerson is simply a series of ideas, Thoreau is given a quick couple of pages of paraphrase, and the influence of Transcendentalism on other writers (Melville and Whitman, for example) is hardly mentioned. Furthermore, Rose's closing argument that capitalism came of age in America when the energies of Transcendentalists and other reformers dissipated, and that all of this took place in the early 1850s, is so simplistic and so patently ahistorical that debate is nearly impossible.

Was Transcendentalism a social *movement*, as the author contends? There are difficulties if we are called upon to imagine large numbers of people and a sustained body of thought. Could non-elites have been deeply involved? Rose thinks so and argues as much; one of her appendices is a chart suggesting that many people at Brook Farm, the most practical experiment of the "movement," were ordinary "working people." Unfortunately, the term as used here means "all manual trades," a category comprised mostly of various skilled artisans and farmers. If these are the "working people," who, then, are the unskilled and semi-skilled workers and what place did they have in Brook Farm? The problem, of course, is one of definition that greater attention to the methods of social historians, whatever the mundanities involved, might have resolved. But, in addition, further research might have suggested to Rose that some of her "working people" were actually of a higher economic status than some of the elites (the Hosmers of Concord, for instance, a few of whom were at the Farm, were a rooted, economically powerful family). Rose's slight foray

into social history, in other words, is unconvincing. The main contention of the book remains unproven. The book, in fact, that places Transcendentalism in its proper, complex historical setting and that does so by showing the dynamic interplay of social and intellectual forces, remains unwritten.

Temple University

PHILIP R. YANNELLA

Working Class Life: The "American Standard" in Comparative Perspective, 1899-1913. By PETER R. SHERGOLD. (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1982. xvii, 306p. Tables, appendix, index. \$21.95.)

American workers enjoyed a higher real standard of living than European workers. This proposition has been a fundamental assumption in American economic and social history for decades. And yet, rarely has anyone made the effort to carefully examine the truth of that statement. Peter Shergold's meticulous study is the first effort to carefully test that "fact" using disaggregate data and examining different occupational groups separately. The results are impressive and have important ramifications for American labor and economic history.

Shergold compared the material standard of living of workers in Pittsburgh with those in Birmingham and Sheffield, England from 1899-1914. He calculated hourly wage rates and average hours worked per week for each occupation separately. He argues this research design comes as close to a controlled historical comparison as could be expected. One might argue that he should have chosen an Italian or Polish city instead, since most of Pittsburgh's unskilled immigrants came from those places. But the English cities provide a more meaningful comparison with Pittsburgh's skilled artisans.

The bulk of the study consists of a detailed and painstaking analysis of wages, hours, the contribution of other family members to total income, rents, and prices for food, fuel, clothing, and furniture. In presenting and evaluating his data, Shergold revealed a good deal about the spending, eating, and consumption habits of English and American workers. He noted, for example, that workers did not always take advantage of the best prices because they bought in small quantities from corner grocers who extended credit and literally spoke their language. He indicated that Birmingham women worked in much larger numbers than Pittsburgh women, and that boarders and lodgers in Pittsburgh made only a small contribution to family income. Although the study has sixty-five tables, it conveys a sense of the texture of everyday life which many volumes on social mobility and labor history lack.

Shergold found that the disparity between the earnings of skilled and unskilled labor was vastly greater in Pittsburgh than in Birmingham or Sheffield. In terms of real hourly wages, unskilled laborers in Pittsburgh were only slightly better off than their English counterparts, while the most highly skilled artisans in the construction trades enjoyed a real hourly income fifty to seventy-five percent higher than similarly skilled men in the English towns. Shergold also developed estimates of total family weekly income. In the English towns almost all workers labored between fifty and fifty-four hours per week. In Pittsburgh, however, many highly skilled craftsmen worked less than fifty hours, while common laborers in the steel industry (a large fraction of the total workforce) toiled seventy-five to eighty-four hours per week. Those differences partly offset the wide gap in hourly earnings. When those factors and the cost of living are taken into account, unskilled laborers in Pittsburgh were not significantly better off than English laborers. But at the other end of the spectrum, the skilled Pittsburgh men enjoyed real weekly family incomes twenty to fifty percent higher than Englishmen in the same trades.

Shergold argues his findings cast doubt on the thesis that American workers were more socially and politically conservative than those in Europe because of their higher standard of living. Only the small number of skilled artisans enjoyed such high real incomes. However, Shergold also notes that the upper ranks of the working class often provided the leadership and drive for labor activism. It would seem, therefore, that the traditional interpretation remains valid: the conservatism of the American labor movement was partly a function of the high standard of living. The rewards accrued disproportionately to the skilled elite, who were also primarily of British or German origin. They felt neither dispossessed nor very empathetic towards the newer unskilled immigrants. They could not make common cause with people they despised. Since many of the skilled artisans did enjoy a measure of upward social mobility, or so it appeared to them and the newer immigrants, the hope of mobility further deterred class radicalism.

Shergold's findings provide support for the argument of historians of technology and economic historians that the high cost of labor shaped the character of technological change in America. Although the argument usually applies to earlier decades, the beginning of the twentieth century witnessed the emergence of scientific management and the moving assembly line. Those efforts, along with other new technologies, sought to reduce the autonomy and importance of the skilled worker.

Some scholars may argue with the author's assumptions which lay behind his calculations, or with the quality of some of his data, but on balance this is a careful and judicious study. Now that Shergold has demonstrated the feasibility of this research, further studies with other European countries should be undertaken.

Pennsylvania's Little New Deal. By RICHARD C. KELLER. (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1982. iv, 414p. Bibliography, index. \$50.00.)

This book is one of several doctoral dissertations on "Modern American History" to be recently snatched from the clutches of oblivion by Garland Press and its series editor, Frank Freidel. Photo-offset on acid-free paper, the Garland/Freidel project seeks to disseminate such dissertation scholarship more widely than University Microfilms. However, the reviewer is constrained to judge the volume for its significance as a contribution to American history and not as a twenty-year old unrevised dissertation.

Keller's study treats the years 1929-1938, encompassing the administrations of governors Gifford Pinchot and George Earle. Although the author purports to extend his province to embrace social and economic events, the book is principally political history and focuses mainly on the legislative battles over social reform in Pennsylvania during the Great Depression era.

The author buries his thesis within his straightforward narrative, but it is there. According to Keller, Pennsylvania's "little New Deal" was rooted in the Progressive tradition, which, although never explicitly defined, he interprets to be the politically pragmatic response to the socioeconomic inequities flowing out of industrial capitalism. In the Keller scenario, such Progressive-minded politicians as Pinchot and Earle battle Old Guard Republicans, who, undaunted by the ravages of the Great Depression, resist efforts to reform ancient sumptuary laws or to remodel outmoded relief structures.

In Keller's own words (p. 1) his survey of Pennsylvania's depression political history is "sketchy." It suffers, moreover, from the unpruned, undigested, and unbalanced nature of the dissertation form. The study barely touches such crucial issues as Pennsylvania's sick industry, unemployment relief, and the emanations of radicalism; on the other hand, it affords disproportionate detail to such subjects as the state's blue law controversy and such political scandals as the Margiotti affair. Further, Keller ignores the broader historical forces of urbanization and modernization which shaped Pennsylvania's unique political conservatism and which established the parameters for the progressive reform struggles of the 1930s. Beneath the rock ribbed conservatism of the state's Old Guard business establishment lay the beleaguered and battered corpse of its once mighty textile, coal and metal manufacturing industries.

It may also be appropriate to treat Pennsylvania's "little New Deal" as an effort to modernize the state's antiquated welfare structure. But the considerable ideological struggles that marked this effort are not mentioned by Keller. Pennsylvania's legislative battles over the relief issue pitted efficiency-minded professional altruists against not only Old Guard Republicans, but also the resurgent Democrats who also viewed relief as a legitimate tool of politics.

Finally, contrary to Keller's assertion in his brief foreword that little has been written to persuade him to modify his opinions, more recent scholarship has ably illuminated the Pinchot-Earle years. Notable are Albert Romasco, *The Poverty of Abundance: Hoover, the Nation, the Depression* (1965), Mark I. Gelfand, *A Nation of Cities: The Federal Government and Urban America, 1933-1965* (1975), and James P. Johnson, *The Politics of Soft Coal: The Bituminous Industry from World War I Through the New Deal* (1979).

Richard C. Keller has certainly linked the Republican progressivism of Gifford Pinchot with the Democratic progressivism of George Earle. He has also capably established the significance of the legislative reform achieved during their combined eight years in the Pennsylvania governor's office. Nevertheless, it remains for historians to examine the legislative record of those years more analytically, and to weigh its significance against the panorama of socio-economic and political forces which during the 1930s were wrenching Pennsylvania from nineteenth century industrialism into twentieth century post-industrial society.

California State College

JOHN BAUMAN

The Papers of George Catlett Marshall: Volume I, The Soldierly Spirit, December, 1880-June, 1939. Edited by LARRY I. BLAND and SHARON R. RITENOUR. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1981. 742p. Illustrations, chronology, index. \$30.00.)

As Army Chief of Staff during World War II and Secretary of State and Defense during the formative years of the cold war, George C. Marshall is clearly one of the most important figures in American military and diplomatic history. He is also one of the most impressive. Contemporaries stood in awe of him and filled their assessments with unprecedented superlatives. Many considered him the greatest soldier-statesman since George Washington, and one president feared he could not sleep at night with Marshall out of Washington.

Despite such praise, full recognition of Marshall's importance and brilliance has long been delayed, just as it was during his lifetime. Before 1939, his rank was consistently below what superiors thought it should be, and even as wartime Army chief he was overshadowed in the press and the public mind by the field commanders he had done so much to shape and promote. In the postwar years, one need only compare the numerous multivolume biographies and edited paper collections of other twentieth century soldiers and statesmen with the paucity of published material on Marshall to realize this pattern has continued.

Forrest Pogue has done much to rectify this situation in his superb and definitive multivolume biography of Marshall (three of four volumes published to date), and in helping as a director of the Marshall Foundation to collect and organize Marshall's papers. Under the overall guidance of present director Fred L. Hadsel, Foundation staff members Larry I. Bland and Sharon R. Ritenour have now carried these efforts an important step further by editing the first of a projected six volumes of those papers. The quality of their work clearly matches the high standards Pogue has already set.

Covering the years from Marshall's birth in 1880 to his 1939 appointment as Army Chief of Staff in nine chronological sections, the volume consists of 506 documents, almost all of which Marshall wrote or dictated, along with editorial introductions and footnotes. Representing only three to fifteen percent of what is available at the Marshall Foundation, the documents have been carefully selected from a wide variety of sources ranging from manuscript collections to official government records. The highly informative introductions and footnotes make extensive use of an even wider variety of sources, including Pogue's oral histories with Marshall, and add immeasurably to the quality and overall coherence of the volume.

The documents and editorial comments make clear that the superlatives heaped upon Marshall were offered at virtually every stage of his career. As early as 1901, the commandant of VMI called him "one of the fittest pieces of food for gunpowder turned out by his mill for many years." Thirteen years later, his immediate superior stated he would "be glad to serve under him," a comment repeated with emphasis by another superior in 1917 who concluded that the then-Captain Marshall was a military genius who should be promoted to general immediately. Marshall's letters to some of these superiors also make clear their importance in shaping his ideas and promoting his career. Generals John J. Pershing and John McA. Palmer are especially noteworthy in this regard.

The volume also illustrates Marshall's consistent responsibilities beyond his position and rank, his professional frustrations, and a basic irony in his career. A tactical expert most comfortable commanding troops, Marshall loathed desk jobs and considered them his "pet abominations." So good was he at staff reforms and functions, however, that they soon became his *forté*, thereby depriving him of the field commands he so desired.

Unfortunately, the volume does not provide much information to explain how and why Marshall was so brilliant, or offer much insight into his personality. This is by no means the fault of the editors. Marshall disliked publicity, never wrote a complete memoir, and was extremely reclusive as to his private life and feelings. He also practiced what he preached regarding brevity in writing. As a result his official and personal papers are frustratingly

devoid of detailed analysis and emotion. Wherever possible the editors have included material to exhibit his professional ideas and "human" side. Most notable in this regard are his rejection of the false "lessons" of World War I, recognition of the importance of mechanization in restoring maneuver to the battlefield, willingness to disagree with superiors, deep interest in the citizen-soldier concept, concern despite the dislike for publicity in advancing his own career, and frustration with the slow pace of that career as well as such mundane matters as worthless automobile warranties. This material is all too rare, however, and the reader is thus left with an individual whose extraordinary qualities were widely recognized but seldom illustrated on paper.

Given such restrictions, the editors have done an excellent job in presenting as much of Marshall as possible in a comprehensive, detailed and impressive collection. One eagerly awaits the next volume on Marshall's extraordinary work as Army Chief of Staff.

University of Vermont

MARK A. STOLER

Philadelphia Communists, 1936-1956. By PAUL LYONS. (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1982. xii, 244p. Bibliography, index. \$22.50.)

Why did so many join the Communist Party in Philadelphia during the 1930s? What kind of people were they? Why and when did they leave? What has happened to them since? What was life in the party like?

These are the questions that Paul Lyons deals with in *Philadelphia Communists, 1936-1956*. The book is more sociology than history, though mercifully it is free from the awful jargon one expects of sociologists. The data and conclusions are derived from Lyons's interviews with thirty-six men and women who joined the Party in Philadelphia during the Depression years. Most left in the traumatic 1950s, but seven of the thirty-six are still members, Lyons says. While statisticians might cavil at the sample, I think the author has drawn an honest picture and accurate conclusions. With two exceptions the anonymity of the thirty-six is preserved by pseudonyms. It's fun for those of us who knew some of the Philadelphia Reds to try assigning names to the case histories and quotations with which the book abounds. Lyons, who declares himself in the introduction to be an "advocate of democratic socialism and a Marxist approach to the study of society," says he approached his subject with some contempt for the "old Reds," but through the interviews developed an admiration for them. This admiration is apparent, but I believe that Lyons maintains his objectivity.

In 1938, Lyons tells us, there were about 3,500 card-carriers in the Philadelphia area, and by 1956 there was a mere handful. About half the Philadelphia Communists in the Party's heyday were of working-class background, mainly the children of immigrants, and for the most part Jewish. Only about eleven percent were black. The party was so desperate for blacks that some were recruited without proper indoctrination, and were kept in tutelage, where they felt resentment at the patronizing attitude they sensed.

The "average" Communist emerging from Lyons's profiles was not a rebel against his parents. He more likely absorbed radicalism with his mother's milk, and turned to the Party during the Depression and the threat of Hitler because the Communists seemed to offer a practical channel for his idealism. Party members, by and large, were rather old-fashioned in their personal lives: they raised children and they went to ball games when they were not attending six or seven Party or front-group meetings each week, or peddling the *Daily Worker* in Kensington. Although there were many women members, and although Party rhetoric was supportive of women's rights, women in fact were relegated to subordinate roles.

The Party provided an all-encompassing social life for its members. One's circle of friends tended to be almost exclusively other Party members, and many chose their spouses from among the faithful. This network of friendship and contact survived the collapse of the Party, and is still sustaining and important for most ex-members. Lyons insists that few Philadelphia Reds followed the path made famous by Budenz, Chambers or others who violently repudiated their past. Indeed, says Lyons, there is little truth in the stereotype of the Communist as a neurotic individual who rushes from one form of totalitarianism to another because of his need for an authority figure.

Indeed, Lyons asserts that most ex-Communists have remained active in reformist causes, playing an active role in the peace and civil rights movements. Though disillusioned with Stalinism and the Party, they continue to be non-doctrinaire Socialists, and to maintain a somewhat naive faith in "Progress, Science, and Reason." Lyons astutely observes that old Communists tend to be one-dimensional and pre-Freudian in their psychic lives. The Party itself rode roughshod over sensibilities, and individual Communists show little insight into the complexities of human behavior; after all Marxist theory has no place for any explanation of behavior except the economic imperative.

In his last chapter, Lyons traces what has become of the former Party members he interviewed. Almost all have remained active politically, but only seven are still in the Party. Most ex-Reds have done well for themselves, and a few are rich. They have retained their old-fashioned personal values, and are more like their parents than they are like their children, many of whom endorsed the prevailing liberated life-styles of the 1960s.

The book is well-annotated and indexed, and has a compendious annotated bibliography, which unaccountably omits any mention of Theodore Draper's important writings on the Communist Party.

Those of us who lived and struggled with social issues during the period covered by this book (often tangling with the Communists), would welcome a fuller historical account of the Party's activities in Philadelphia. Lyons tells us something, but not much, about how the Party was organized and about what was expected of the cadres and the rank-and-file. He mentions, but does not detail, the high human price that the Party's ruthlessness and intellectual dishonesty exacted from its members. The ideological struggles and tensions within the party are adumbrated. He asserts that the Communists played an important role in the labor unions, but failed almost totally to lure blue-collar workers into the Party. He says just enough about the McCarthy period (including the trial of the Philadelphia Communist leadership) to explain the collapse, but not enough to satisfy our interest. I hope someone with Lyons's perceptiveness will write the definitive history.

Antioch University, Philadelphia

SPENCER COXE