

BOOK REVIEWS

King and People in Provincial Massachusetts. By RICHARD L. BUSHMAN. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1985. 280p. Appendix, index. \$25.00.)

In 1967 Richard Bushman published *From Puritan to Yankee: Character and the Social Order in Connecticut, 1690-1765* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press), an ambitious, brilliant book in which he argued that the norms of New Englanders' behavior changed dramatically within a single lifetime. He traced the changes in character and measured their social consequences by examining the way in which land, money, and religion successively became issues that involved ever-larger numbers of colonists in Connecticut politics; and concluded that a culture that had restrained aggressive, acquisitive impulses and promoted deference and communal harmony had been transformed by the 1760s into a culture in which assertive individualism was the dominant motif. Now, in *King and People in Provincial Massachusetts*, Bushman examines Connecticut's northern neighbor in essentially the same period (from 1691 to ca. 1780), once again analyzing politics as a means of measuring cultural change. But despite their broad similarity in approach and the continued attention Bushman pays to the relationship between character and social order in New England, these two books could scarcely be more different.

In his first book, Bushman asked what had made New Englanders into Yankees, people with an identifiably modern character. In this one, he asks what made Yankees into republicans by the time of the American Revolution. In the first book, he stressed change in his discussion of the growing fragmentation of Connecticut society, the expansion of political participation, and the decline of deference; in this one, he emphasizes continuity by analyzing the long-run consistency of political issues in Massachusetts and the basic stability of colonial social relations. So great indeed are the disparities between the Connecticut of *From Puritan to Yankee* and the Massachusetts of *King and People* that a reader is compelled to ask whether Bushman has gotten one or the other wrong; or, if he is right on both counts, how two colonies so very different could have existed side by side at the same time— much less have managed to take part in the same revolution. The answer, I think, is that Bushman has been largely right in both cases; but that unless his two books are taken together, neither will fully disclose the cultural character of pre-Revolutionary New England.

The basic argument in *King and People* holds that colonial Massachusetts

had a "monarchical culture" but lacked a "monarchical society" to support it: a situation that imparted a unique twist to provincial politics between 1691 and 1765, and which destabilized the relationship of the Bay Colony to the empire in the critical years 1765-1776, even as it made colonists reluctant to accept independence. As Bushman defines it, "monarchical culture" embodied the reciprocal relationship between king and people, in which popular affection and loyalty were tendered in return for royal protection. In England this cultural ideal was supported by a social and economic order characterized by the dependency of people of inferior rank upon patrons, who were in turn the clients of patrons superior to them; thus England's "monarchical society" was understood as a great multiple skein of dependencies that connected almost everyone to the ultimate patron, the king. Such a monarchical society made sense of the idealized reciprocity of the monarchical culture. But in Massachusetts the farmers who made up most of society were freeholders, who were in no way dependent on landlords or other socially superior patrons. The royal governor, as the king's representative in the province, was of course dependent on the crown; but he had no means of creating the kinds of ties of dependency within Massachusetts society that could bind colonists to him. In the usage of the day, the governor had a different "interest" than the people did: his welfare was bound up not with that of the colonists he governed, but with that of his patrons in England. Thus, while the ideal of a sovereign protecting his loyal subjects exercised a powerful hold on the political imagination of the Bay colonists, the colonists perceived the royal governor as generally being more interested in enriching himself at their expense than he was in protecting them, as he was supposed to do, on behalf of the monarch.

Throughout the period of the second Massachusetts charter (1691-1774) the province's country party (or "popular") politicians were preoccupied with limiting the ability of the governor and other royal officials to plunder the people. Accordingly, they sought to attach the imperial officers to the people's interest. In general the colony's merchants during the period succeeded in coopting imperial customs agents by such informal means as intermarriage and—occasionally—intimidation; but the General Court fought a long, inconclusive series of battles to limit the governor's formal powers. Such narrowly-construed constitutional issues as the Assembly's right to appoint its own Speaker, to adjourn itself for brief periods, to audit expenditures, and to control the governor's salary, dominated provincial politics in Massachusetts before the Revolutionary crisis. Heated as these disputes were, they neither raised the specter of disloyalty to the crown nor involved the people of the province themselves in the practice of politics. The province's politicians maneuvered within the limits of monarchical political culture, opposing the king's officers in the interest of the people

and in the name of the king, who (in the conventional formulation) could never willingly act in opposition to his subjects' welfare, but whose servants might well have become corrupt. The end result of these conflicts was compromise and accommodation: although it took a half-century or more for the colonists to define the limits of their rights under the charter of 1691, not even the most radical politicians questioned the justice or the benefits of their dependency on the crown.

In contrast, Connecticut politics grew steadily more rancorous—and more participatory—from the time of the Glorious Revolution to the 1760s. Unlike Massachusetts, which had lost its original charter in James II's attempts to rationalize the Empire, Connecticut had remained a corporate colony with the right to elect its own governor. And unlike Massachusetts, where the critical political issues had been defined around the scope of the governor's power, Connecticut politics involved the people much more directly in matters that directly affected their lives: land, money, and religion. Indeed, it was largely the experience of the Great Awakening that shaped pre-Revolutionary politics in Connecticut, for once "faith in the divinity of earthly law and authority had been weakened" it became possible for "a party to seek the downfall of its rulers." Even Old Lights were compelled to adopt the new style and resort to "unprecedented methods for marshaling public opinion. It became increasingly obvious after the Awakening that . . . men would try to regulate the government to suit their own purposes." (*From Puritan to Yankee*, p. 266.) "Whereas public good at the beginning of the [eighteenth] century had implied the denial of private interests for the sake of more transcendent values," by 1765 "it . . . contained the promise also that government would serve private interests. The civil authority was to act as the public's agent, not as its disciplinarian." (*Ibid.*, p. 280.)

In Massachusetts at the same time, there was no sense that the public could have more than a unitary interest, for monarchical political culture provided only the king and the people as conceptual categories. In the Bay Colony private interests did not openly compete for advantage in the public political arena, and would not do so until long after independence. Popular political participation remained at a very low level until the Stamp Act crisis consumed the province. Only when the people could no longer be kept from revolutionary agitation did political leaders finally commit themselves to organizing public opinion for political purposes. Furthermore, in the Bay Colony it was essentially very old political questions having to do with the power of royal administrators (e.g., Should the governor have a permanent salary? Should there be a colonial civil list?) that finally mobilized the province to resist the British ministry. The issues that initially inflamed Massachusetts, in other words, could have had no meaning in Connecticut,

which had had no consequential contact with royal officers during the colonial period; what was in Massachusetts the rather alarming novelty of popular politics could have had neither novelty nor shock value in Connecticut; and the realization that the public interest was divisible, which did not fully dawn in Massachusetts until the controversy over the state constitution in 1778-80, had at that point been the fundamental fact of Connecticut politics for more than a generation.

In some sense this is no more than to say that Connecticut and Massachusetts were very different colonies, but that in itself is not a fact that historians of the Revolution routinely take into account. The prevailing fashion in historiography today is to explain much (if not everything) that occurred in Revolutionary America by invoking republican ideology, without necessarily stopping to ask what it was that made republicanism sufficiently believable to colonial Americans that they were able to adopt it as their revolutionary ideology. Few historians, other than Bushman, have carefully investigated the contexts of republican thought. As a result, we still know comparatively little of what it was that made Americans willing to risk lives, fortunes, and honor for an independence that almost none of them had wanted as late as 1774 or even 1775. From Bushman's two books it is clear, however, that whatever circumstances *did* make republicanism believable to the Revolutionary generation, they were not the same even in colonies as nearly alike as Massachusetts and Connecticut have usually been presumed to be. Diversity, not uniformity, was the rule even in the that most homogeneous of colonial America's many regions, New England.

Bushman's two books, when read together, suggest that the origins of this intra-regional cultural diversity can be traced to the end of the seventeenth century, and the diverse effects of the Stuarts's attempts at imperial reform under the Dominion of New England. Connecticut never had to face the contradiction of a monarchical government being imposed on its non-monarchical society, as Massachusetts did, because Connecticut managed to retain its original charter and its corporate privileges until the end of the colonial period. The king never achieved the intense symbolic importance in Connecticut that he did in the Bay Colony because in the absence of a royal governor the king remained a relatively distant abstraction. In this sense, Connecticut politics and political culture can be regarded heuristically as a measure of what Massachusetts politics and political culture would have become without the revocation of the Charter of 1629.

The politicians of the Bay Colony spent more than a half-century after the Glorious Revolution trying to resolve the contradictions between the nature of their polity and the character of their society. During that time, two of the three great issues that fragmented Connecticut politics (land and religion) did not become politicized in Massachusetts; and the one common

issue (the question of paper money) that did enter the political realm in both colonies had entirely different implications for the Bay Colony than for Connecticut. By the time of the Revolution, Connecticut had evolved a form of participatory popular politics based on the pursuit of private interest that had not emerged in Massachusetts because the monarchical political culture would not permit the open expression of such concerns. The energies of Massachusetts politicians accordingly had been consumed with constitutional issues rather than with meeting the demands of a diverse public interest. Because the Bay Colony's political culture had shaped its political history so powerfully, the province reacted with a peculiar fervor to the ministry's persistent attempts after 1765 to bring it to heel in a reformed Empire. In the hothouse conditions of Revolutionary agitation and in the absence of royal authority after independence, popular politics flowered as never before, so that what had happened gradually in Connecticut was recapitulated in the space of a few years in Massachusetts. What the British perceived as Massachusetts' flamboyant stubbornness eventually evoked a royal response harsh enough to convince all the mainland colonies that they were in peril, too. But no other colony would have behaved as Massachusetts did, because no other colony—not even Connecticut—was positioned by its political culture and its political history to react as Massachusetts did to Whitehall's imperial challenge.

Thus, even in North America's most homogeneous region, the one most fully English in character, neighboring colonies demonstrate the exceptional diversity of eighteenth-century American political culture. New England's diversity came not from the influx of immigrants that elsewhere disordered colonial societies and politics, but rather from the divergent legacies of the Glorious Revolution. If Bushman's books revealed no more than this, they would offer a valuable contribution to our understanding of the period and the region, offering an argument for the significance of what is often dismissed as the glacial age of colonial politics and suggesting what rewards may attend closer attention to the political culture and political histories of other colonies in the same period. But *From Puritan to Yankee* and *King and People in Provincial Massachusetts* have a much greater significance as well, for when taken together they make the most eloquent case yet for the radical contingency of the American Revolution. Reading the one and re-reading the other inexorably presses the conclusion that the Revolution was in the last analysis possible only because the British after the Seven Years' War compelled Americans to achieve the unity they could never have attained voluntarily.

The Minutes of the Board of Proprietors of the Eastern Division of New Jersey from 1764 to 1794, Vol. IV. Edited by MAXINE N. LURIE and JOANNE R. WALROTH. (Newark: New Jersey Historical Society, 1985. xlii, 522p. Biographical directory, bibliographical note, index. \$30.00.)

Along with its West Jersey counterpart, the Board of Proprietors of the Eastern Division of New Jersey, founded in 1685, is an anomaly in modern America. Of the several proprietary colonies in British North America, the proprietors of East and West Jersey alone retained ownership of untitled land after surrendering governmental authority to the crown (1702) and even after the creation of a republican state and nation in 1776. To this day the two Jersey proprietary boards grant titles for unappropriated land, making those unique vestiges of the colonial past the oldest business corporations in the United States.

The East Jersey proprietors, aware of their historical legacy and the centrality of land claims in early New Jersey history, undertook the printing of the board's minute books. From 1949 to 1960 three volumes, covering the years 1685-1764, were privately published under the editorship of George J. Miller, then registrar of the board. After a hiatus of twenty-five years, the New Jersey Historical Society, aided by private financial support, undertook the publication of the final volume of colonial era minutes in commemoration of the tercentenary of the board. Important in its own right, the current volume brings to completion the series of skillfully edited transcriptions of records essential to an understanding of the intimate relationship between land claims and the political, economic, and even social life of colonial New Jersey.

This volume of board minutes demonstrates the complex and confusing problems inherent in proprietary ownership of land. Most of the material relates to individual titles and claims, but there is a wealth of information about the final determination of the northern boundary between New Jersey and New York, the renewed controversy over the dividing line between East and West Jersey, the long-standing conflict over land titles between the Eastern proprietors and the Elizabethtown Associates, the management of the vast Ramapo (Romopock) Tract in modern Bergen and Passaic counties, and the development of Jersey's burgeoning iron industry.

Readers hoping to discover new insights concerning the coming of the American Revolution, the War for Independence, or the creation of the republic will be disappointed. Although many proprietors and most of the board members played major roles in provincial politics, the business of the board was business. Ultimately a bastion of Loyalism, the board took no official notice of the events and issues leading to independence, and, more surprisingly, nary a hint of concern that the growing political turmoil might

jeopardize the place and property of the proprietors. Regular board meetings terminated without comment in April 1776 and, save for a few rump sessions in 1778 and 1782, did not resume until September 1784. The post-war material is fascinating. In addition to detailing the confiscation of several estates belonging to proprietors, the minutes record the efforts to recover the board's records, which had been taken to New York City by its Loyalist registrar and were not returned until 1785.

Lurie and Walroth have transcribed, edited, and annotated the minutes in superb fashion. Their work is marked by painstaking accuracy and laudatory restraint which lets their scholarship enhance rather than dominate the historical documents. Those familiar with the sources available for the study of New Jersey colonial history will immediately recognize the prodigious research that went into this volume. An extensive introduction both explains editorial policy and provides historical context for the board and the issues confronting it. The grouping of footnotes at the end of individual board meeting minutes instead of at the bottom of the page containing the reference is awkward but preferable to endnotes. Of special utility is the biographical directory containing succinct sketches of persons mentioned in the minutes. The index, an indispensable tool in any work of documentary editing, is exemplary in its comprehensiveness and extensive cross-referencing. And once again the New Jersey Historical Society staff has produced a finely crafted volume that is a substantive contribution to historical scholarship.

University of Utah

LARRY R. GERLACH

A Biographical Dictionary of the Maryland Legislature, 1635-1789. Edited by EDWARD C. PAPPENFUSE, ALAN F. DAY, DAVID W. JORDAN, and GREGORY STIVERSON. (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, for the Maryland Hall of Records Commission, 1979, 1985. Volume I, xvii, 477p; Volume II, xiii, 469p. Session lists, maps, addenda, corrigenda. \$29.50, \$35.00.)

This biographical dictionary of the Maryland legislature in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is the third of its kind in this country. Preceded only by a *Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1961* (1961) and by a *Biographical Directory of the South Carolina House of Representatives* (1974, 1977) it is more useful for both the layman and the scholar and it will set the standard for all that follow. The excellence of this work was made possible by several factors. First, the Maryland records are probably the fullest and best preserved of all of the thirteen colonies. Second, Mary-

land has been blessed by remarkably able state archivists (Morris Radoff, 1939-1975, and Edward Papenfuse, 1975—) who had/have a commitment to making these records readily available and the ability to see the potential for their use in a variety of innovative ways. And finally, partly as a result of the preceding factors and partly because of the work of the St. Mary's City Commission and its historian Lois Green Carr, an exceptional group of scholars have been working in early Maryland history who (e.g., Russell Menard) provided the encouragement and information essential for beginning such a project.

The volumes include four useful maps of all Maryland counties in 1686, 1730, 1773, and 1789; session lists providing a record of election or attendance in the Assembly; and 1,445 biographies. It is the biographies that require some additional comment.

What the editors and their staff have accomplished is truly remarkable. They have "isolated" all but one half of one percent of the legislators. And for these legislators they have provided invaluable information. In varying but substantial degree, the biographies tell us, among other things, the date and place of each legislator's birth, his family background (father, mother, aunts, uncles, cousins, etc.), his marriage partner(s), his children (and whom they married), his private career (religion, education, occupation, etc.), his public career, his stands on public/private issues, and his health during his lifetime and at his death.

Thus, we know, for example, that Thomas Dent was born in Yorkshire, England, in 1630 and that he came to Maryland in 1658 as a free person and settled in St. Marys' County. He married Rebecca Wilkinson, and they had three sons and two daughters. In every case but one we know who they married. Dent was literate; he was an Anglican and a gentleman. Both a merchant and a planter, he entered on his arrival rights for transporting seventy-five persons. He served in the lower house in 1669 and 1674-1674/75. At the local level he was a justice, sheriff, coroner, and alderman of St. Marys' City. At the time of his first election he owned 850 acres of land, and at his death in 1676 he had personal property valued at £596.8.0, including slaves, servants, and books. His landholdings had increased to 1,083 acres and an additional three plantations of unspecified size. Finally, from the session lists we know that during the 1671-1674/75 Proprietary Assembly he attended three sessions. And since full documented files are kept on each legislator at the Hall of Records, there may be additional information on Dent. These files will be open to the public once various other projects are completed.

The uses of this kind of information are many. Genealogists will be delighted at the vital statistics and kin connections. Historians will be able to do a wide variety of comparative work. It will, for example, be possible

to chart the family relationships of legislators, which will allow scholars to determine how important family ties were in gaining public office. Through an analysis of wealth of legislators, it will also be possible to determine accurately if political power became, over time, concentrated among the wealthiest persons in the colony. Knowing wealth, family relationships, social status, education, so many things, will also enable scholars better to explain voting behavior. And there is much more that can be done.

The Hall of Records Commission is to be congratulated on the publication of these extremely useful volumes.

University of Maryland, College Park

EMORY G. EVANS

The Papers of Henry Bouquet. Volume 5, September 1, 1760-October 31, 1761. Edited by LOUIS M. WADDELL, JOHN L. TOTTENHAM, and DONALD H. KENT. (Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1984. xxx, 875p. Illustrations, bibliography, chronology, index. \$55.00.)

Volume five of this distinguished edition of *The Papers of Henry Bouquet* finds the future hero of Bushy Run commanding the garrison at Presque Isle as they build a blockhouse. Having completed that chore, he departs to take command of the garrison at Pittsburgh. The rest of the volume details the problems of supply and logistics that Bouquet encounters, the petty problems he faces in trying to coordinate military affairs in western Pennsylvania, and his role as an intermediary for the British forces as far west as Detroit.

Once again, this volume reminds us of the many details that a commanding officer must deal with in organizing any military outpost. At the same time, however, there is also material buried in the correspondence dealing with Indian affairs and the relations among the Indians, the settlers, and traders of Pennsylvania. The correspondence sheds light on imperial relations as well. This volume, however, has less of the human interest vignettes and more of the military minutiae than previous volumes.

Editorially, volume five continues the tradition of the previous four. It is an example of distinguished editorial work and provides the expert, as well as the amateur, with all the information necessary for an understanding of the documents at hand. The footnotes are exhaustive; the bibliographic information extensive; and the editorial apparatus monumental. Geographical sites and persons mentioned in the text are identified in endnotes; letters in a foreign language are first printed in the original language and then in translation. There is an excellent index and a good chronology of

events for the fourteen months covered by the volume. Unfortunately, all this means added expense, and the price of this volume has escalated significantly.

The editors and the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission are to be commended for continuing this fine tradition of editorial excellence.

*Pennsylvania State University
Delaware County Campus*

GEORGE W. FRANZ

The Documentary History of the Supreme Court of the United States, 1789-1800. Volume I. Edited by MAEVA MARCUS and JAMES R. PERRY. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985. lxxii, 999p. Illustrations, glossary of legal terms, signs and abbreviations, index. \$95.00.)

Although most people have the impression that the Supreme Court of the United States began its work when John Marshall was appointed, or when *Marbury v. Madison* was decided, the Court had been operating for almost a decade before Marshall became Chief Justice. The first volume of the *Documentary History of the Supreme Court* for that decade, published in two separately bound parts, now provides us with a ready source of information on the Court's early years.

The first part contains documents relating to the first seventeen nominations to the Court, followed by several versions of the records of the Court's proceedings. The second part consists of letters, news reports, and diary entries regarding appointments and Court proceedings. The editors have aimed for the "literal reproduction" of the "greatest number of relevant documents" in the available space (pp. xlvi-xlix), and have described their editorial methods in a detailed introduction.

This volume does not contain information about the Court's decisions; that will be provided in later volumes in the series. But it does give us material that scholars will find useful in several ways. First, the editors have diligently tracked down information about the lawyers who were admitted to practice before the Supreme Court. This will allow scholars to develop a picture of a segment of the legal community in the 1790s.

Second, and more important, the documents will provide the basis for an understanding of the development of the Supreme Court as an institution. Here the Court's records, gradually taking on a more stylized and routinized format, are especially useful. But the materials on the appointment process are also informative here, revealing what the legal elite thought about the relative importance of the new Court. In addition to the well-known fact that John Jay resigned as Chief Justice to become governor of New York,

we can see William Cushing of Massachusetts placing the completion of some trials there ahead of taking his seat on the Supreme Court (p. 29). James Iredell writes his uncle that a position on the Supreme Court is attractive because of the pay and the healthy climate in New York (pp. 700-1), though one suspects he might have had second thoughts after the relocation of the seat of government.

Finally, the documents, especially the commentaries on the appointments, reveal the criteria that leading citizens in the early republic regarded as important for Justices of the Supreme Court. The letters and newspaper reports suggest that people regarded the Court in a vague sort of way as likely to be important, and one letter to Alexander Hamilton expressly mentions "the power of paralyzing the measures of the government by declaring a law unconstitutional" as a reason for thinking that the courts would be "immensely important" (p. 760). The controversy over the failed nomination of John Rutledge to be Chief Justice, traced in numerous articles and letters, shows the interplay of considerations of political as well as moral soundness in the appointment process.

The volume is well-produced. Its annotations, although "minimal" (p. li), are quite helpful. The editors have provided interesting portraits of the Justices and other prominent citizens; that of Robert Hanson Harrison, who declined an appointment in 1789 for reasons of ill health, dramatically illustrates the importance that service in the Revolutionary army had in the early republic.

Scholars will undoubtedly find the later volumes, dealing with the background of and responses to the Court's decisions during this period, of enduring value if the editors maintain the standards they have set in this one.

Georgetown University Law Center

MARK TUSHNET

Visionary Republic: Millennial Themes in American Thought, 1756-1800. By RUTH BLOCH. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985. xvi, 291p. Index. \$29.95.)

Twenty years ago Alan Heimert's *Religion and the American Mind from Great Awakening to Revolution* reshaped scholarship about religion and the American Revolution. Its argument was simple and eloquent: religion was a major cause of the American Revolution, and its primary agents were New England Calvinists committed to the millennium, not the vaunted Enlightenment. Despite startlingly negative, even abusive, reviews, Heimert's book brought forth a remarkable progeny. Ernest Lee Tuveson,

William McLoughlin, Sacvan Bercovitch, Cushing Strout, Nathan Hatch, and James West Davidson, among others, all recognized the force of Heimert's argument even if they scarcely followed his interpretation. Now, Ruth Bloch moves beyond New England and into the later eighteenth century to argue once more for the importance of millennial religion in making America revolutionary.

Bloch's book sweeps across early America's intellectual landscape with considerable power. Where Heimert, Hatch, and Davidson restricted their research and analysis to New England, Bloch has done an astonishing job in recovering the breadth of American millennialist thinking between 1750 and 1800. This may escape non-specialists, but colonialists and early national historians who have worked outside New England will realize just how exhaustively Bloch has surveyed her subject. Here, the millennialism of the middle and even southern colonies and states rivals that of New England. In Bloch's hands, millennialism and the political thought founded on it became national even before there was a nation.

Bloch also probes transatlantic connections. She links traditional pietistic colonial millennialism with radical British and French varieties to describe new complexities in early national political thinking. Her evidence—sometimes too modestly revealed—demonstrates how easily political thinkers of the 1780s and 1790s retained links to the transatlantic intellectual world. Some historians to the contrary, their intellectual horizons did not stop at land deeds, village boundaries, or a new provincialism stimulated by political independence.

Bloch does not pursue a monolithic interpretation. A rich American millennialism emerges as she explores complexities as well as vagaries and downright eccentricities. Her book also implicitly cautions us in overusing the "republican" synthesis to explain Revolutionary political thought and action. In Bloch's view, the religious-political thought of figures like David Austin, Herman Husband, and Simon Hough takes its place beside *Cato's Letters* and *Common Sense* in any sophisticated explication of Revolutionary politics and thought.

Bloch's book is not without difficulties. Ironically, a New England bias limits her opening discussion of the Great Awakening. She too exclusively credits the Awakening, which she identifies as a largely New England phenomenon, as the source for Revolutionary-era millennialism. But a check of colonial newspapers or even William Penn's writings would show more diverse sources for millennialist thought than Bloch credits. Bloch's descriptive emphasis also seems to inhibit causal analysis. Millennialism is common to so much Revolutionary thought yet also occasionally absent where one might expect it (Shays' Rebellion, for example) that its precise effects remain elusive. Finally, one wishes Bloch had more forcefully outlined her dis-

agreements with Heimert, Hatch, and Davidson rather than inter them in endnotes where their dialogue is too frequently obscured.

Still, *Visionary Republic* is an excellent book. By forcing us to confront the breadth and richness of millennialist thought in the Revolutionary age, Bloch challenges many comfortable generalizations about the sources and substance of early American political thought. This is a significant achievement, although one remains less than sanguine about prospects that historians will leave their interpretative easy chairs to take up her challenge.

Yale University

JON BUTLER

Rembrandt Peale 1778-1860: A Life in the Arts. An Exhibition at The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, February 22, 1985 to June 28, 1985. Organized by CAROL EATON HEVNER. (Philadelphia: The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1985. 121p. Illustrations, bibliography, index. \$9.95.)

Rembrandt Peale is perhaps the only major American artist of the early republic for whom we do not have a full biography. This is surprising, since his career comprised not only sixty-five years of artistic achievement, but also extended into other fields as well. An individual almost as versatile and as energetic as his remarkable father, Rembrandt was an artist, a writer, a poet, a museum founder and operator, a scientist, a teacher, a traveller and student, and a publicist of both art and of the new nation. Born in 1778, while his father was serving as a militia officer in the grim winter at Valley Forge, young Rembrandt was to do his own first major painting—a self-portrait—at the age of thirteen. In maturity, his techniques were so accomplished that his father (modestly disregarding his own work) pronounced him “superior to any artist in America.” Indeed, the older Peale was not too proud to adopt new coloring techniques which Rembrandt had brought back from his 1809 trip to Italy.

Rembrandt Peale’s style, best evidenced in his portraits, combined the classical with the newly emerging romanticism of his day. Certain touches reappear frequently: the light shining down from above; the faint blurring of the background; the deft brush strokes in details of dress, a lady’s lace, or the fine ruffles of a gentleman’s shirt front; and the unusually liquid quality of the subject’s eyes. For Rembrandt painted not only to record a likeness, but also as a pronouncement of the noble aspirations of the early republic. This is most stirringly exemplified in his many portraits of Washington, or that of General Samuel Smith, the defender of Baltimore.

The artist Rembrandt Peale was projected into national attention when his “Rubens Peale with a Geranium” was sold last year for \$4.07 million.

This, the highest price ever paid for an American painting, was very probably enhanced by the earlier exhibition of Peale's work at The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, which was accompanied by a symposium on the artist (published as the January 1986 number of the *PMHB*) and by a substantial catalogue.

The catalogue, the subject of the review, marks the first time that a scholarly publication has accompanied a Rembrandt Peale exhibit. Prepared by Carol Eaton Hevner over a nearly three-year period, the Peale catalogue actually comprises both a biography of the artist and a scholarly analysis of his contribution to American art.

The catalogue entries for each individual painting proceed in chronological order, and provide biographical detail as well as descriptive analysis, so that the artist's life gradually unfolds. In addition, these entries are preceded by two fine essays on Rembrandt Peale. The first, "Rembrandt Peale: The Career of an American Old Master," by Lillian B. Miller (historian of the National Portrait Gallery and editor of the Peale Family Papers), presents the artist's life in brief and puts his aspirations and accomplishments in the setting of his own times. The second essay, "The Portraiture of Rembrandt Peale: Artistic Aspirations and Stylistic Changes," by Hevner, provides a penetrating review of Peale's real contribution to American art.

Any catalogue must have certain inherent limitations. Foremost is that imposed by the selection of the pictures exhibited: this excluded such fine examples as his Nicholas Biddle, Judge Levy, or Samuel Fisher Bradford. Another factor was the cost of reproducing color, which allowed us only Peale's self-portrait on the cover. This is regrettable, since Rembrandt's glowing use of color is one of his most striking characteristics, as in his "Rubens Peale with a Geranium." A self-imposed limitation upon the exhibit itself was the exclusion of drawings, so that we do not have his superb sketch of John C. Calhoun, or others that would have been eminently suitable for a black-and-white catalogue. The catalogue would also have been enriched by a more generous inclusion of Peale's landscapes and still lifes. These more informal works reveal a softer and more intimate side of Peale's style, which his grandiose themes may lack. All these observations are minor matters which do not detract from the value of the whole.

This catalogue is highly recommended, not only as a must for libraries, but also as a feast for art historians, and as a pleasure for students and general readers of the early republic. It is to be hoped that Hevner's fine accomplishment here is the prelude to a full biography of the artist. Too long in the shadow of his father, Rembrandt Peale merits recognition on his own of his particular contribution to American art.

A Vigorous Spirit of Enterprise: Merchants and Economic Development in Revolutionary Philadelphia. By THOMAS M. DOERFLINGER. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1986. xvi, 413p. Appendix, bibliography, index. \$32.00.)

Thomas Doerflinger's *A Vigorous Spirit of Enterprise* examines the Philadelphia "merchant community" and its role in "economic development" from 1750 to 1791. Through a careful analysis of quantitative and impressionistic data, it discusses the changing social physiognomy of the "merchant community," mercantile activity during the Revolution, and the merchants' role in the diversification of the postwar economy and the establishment of the Constitution.

Philadelphia's famed "merchant aristocracy," Doerflinger asserts, simply did not exist. Wealth, ethnicity, and religion divided merchants; moreover, the occupation was remarkably easy to enter (or leave). These characteristics—combined with the structure of trade, Philadelphia's position in the British Empire, and a "fabric of adversity"—"strongly encouraged aggressive entrepreneurship" and produced "ambitious, competitive, and intensely acquisitive" merchants (p. 62).

Lower-rung merchants came to the fore when "upper-class" traders refused to enthusiastically oppose the British. While the Revolution totally disrupted normal trading patterns, it provided great opportunities for the "fortune builders," led by Robert Morris, who, in a search for new sources of wealth, began diversifying economic activity. In a series of case studies, Doerflinger discusses these new economic endeavors: the tobacco, China, and westward trades; banking; securities; land speculation; and manufacturing. From 1776 to 1788, merchants explored these innovative avenues with caution; after 1788, however, "a reckless, speculative environment" fueled their quest for wealth.

These "fortune builders," some of whom were staff officers and many of whom were connected to Morris, played a central role in the "emergence of the traders as an interest group" (p. 275). Comprising a coherent group within the republican society, they helped defeat the Philadelphia popular movement and consolidate the Pennsylvania Revolution from 1779 to 1781. They then participated in the early nationalist movement. Convinced on the eve of the Constitution that the nation stood "at a crossroads," where it could move either "to order and abundance" or to "weakness, chaos, and poverty," they provided key leadership and support for the Federalists (p. 275).

Doerflinger's work adds substantially to our understanding of Revolutionary Philadelphia. We have long needed a detailed study of merchants

to put alongside those of artisans and the "lower sort." Doerflinger's analysis of the merchants' wealth-holding and living conditions, his examination of the workings of the dry goods and provision trades, and his discussion of Philadelphia's "financial modernization" are excellent.

There is, however, much here to contest. Many will dispute, as I do, Doerflinger's conclusion that "Philadelphia's merchant community did not constitute a 'class,' an 'aristocracy,' or a cohesive social group of any other description" (p. 62). Some will disagree, as I do, with his reinterpretation of the origins of the Pennsylvania Revolution (which strongly criticizes recent Neo-Progressive work); still others will remain unconvinced by an "ethno-cultural" analysis of Revolutionary Philadelphia that focuses on Anglicans and the "radical Presbyterian faction."

The larger issues present more serious analytical problems. Doerflinger assumes the existence of capitalism without explicitly defining it; evidently he believes it to be a system in which people "[devote] themselves to making much more money than they need for survival" (p. 4). Given this definition, Philadelphia merchants did indeed aid "economic development" (also never explicitly defined) in finding new ways to make money. From the perspective of the classical economists (including Marx) or that presented in Elizabeth Fox-Genovese and Eugene Genovese, *The Fruits of Merchant Capital*, the issue is not money-making per se, but rather how the accumulation is invested. Doerflinger's perspective assumes away the transition-to-capitalism question and provides no means of comprehending the struggles to develop American manufacturing (which many Philadelphia merchant capitalists opposed or ignored).

In its wealth of data, this is a very useful book. Well-written and well-organized, it helps us get to a more rounded picture of Philadelphia in the last half of the eighteenth century.

Lake Forest College

STEVEN ROSSWURM

Samuel Slater and the Origins of the American Textile Industry, 1790-1860.

By BARBARA M. TUCKER. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984. 268p. Maps, illustrations, tables, index. \$29.95.)

Barbara Tucker offers a book made of two strands: on the one hand, an anecdotal history of the establishment and growth of the Slater Cotton Company; on the other, a corrective to recent treatments of the origins and development of industrial capitalism in the early national period. Choosing to follow two paths presents problems for a writer, and in this instance success does not lie equally in the separate directions.

The anecdotal reprise of Samuel Slater's rise to wealth in the cotton industry of Pawtucket, Rhode Island, and the Northeast presents an interesting description of events, peopled by the individuals selected from the voluminous business records from which it is drawn. Such a treatment offers a welcome relief from the numbers and tables of the cliometricians, but at the same time one may suspect it lacks the reliability associated with mathematical analysis of large numbers of events. Acceptance of the representativeness of the anecdotes and their interpretation rests on the author's ability to convince the reader of the correctness of the analysis. The argument must sustain the reader's faith in the citations chosen from the large body of material available to the writer.

As part of such an assessment, however, one must deal with the author's other, stated, intention to correct the record of recent historians who, she feels, see only conflict between labor and management, examine only the skilled worker, and create a distorted picture of class consciousness and class confrontation. "My purpose," she writes, "is to explore the persistence of traditional culture amid the rapid technological and economic changes of the early Industrial Revolution in New England, focusing on working-class culture in the context of the general social and economic trends of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries" (p. 15). The immediate problem with this lies in the fact that other writers have not ignored traditional working-class culture and its relationship to the coming of industrial capitalism. Community studies, political accounts, histories of the "inarticulate," and many others have struggled and succeeded in describing the complex interaction of old beliefs and new circumstances. To seek in this book for a corrective, therefore, is to seek in vain.

Tucker notes another aspect of her approach when she describes the culture of which she writes: "In the long run the benign, paternalistic structure of New England society was unable effectively to assimilate massive economic change" (p. 16). Unfortunately for her case, she does not convincingly demonstrate that anything benign was going on at any point in Slater's career, nor that there was a paternalistic culture which was part of workers' view of a well-ordered society.

Tucker freely assigns values and intention to the actors in the book but is not always convincing, or even consistent. She claims that as part of Slater's paternalism he did not treat employees as commodities, yet she shows how at every point in his career he hired the most vulnerable members of society, then dismissed them as soon as a cheaper source of labor became available. She asserts that "As long as both labor and management adhered to its side of the agreement, harmonious relations between the two parts prevailed" (p. 162). Yet it is clear from her description that no reciprocal agreement existed, nor could one exist, given the vast disparity in power

between the two sides. As the economic power of the Slaters grew, they had less and less need to employ the appearances of old values, the quaint villages, and support of religion which Tucker notes but to which she seldom assigns intention on the part of the owners.

The technology of Slater's operations plays a consistent role in these accounts. Tucker's use of it undermines her interpretations, however, and her willingness to call upon it to support her thesis despite her unfamiliarity with it offers a disturbing opportunity to check her assigned intentions or judgments to the actual behavior of the Slaters. Without cataloguing the misinterpretations, one cannot consider a continuing reliance on waterpower, as opposed to steampower, as slowness in innovation, nor compare production on hand and power looms, or types of mules, without considering the types of cloth and yarn produced. Discussions of speed-ups and stretch-outs are similarly flawed. When in a definable instance the author's assignment of motives or judgment of performance is measurably flawed, the less easily evaluated must also be called into question. Without reading the same records as the author, few can be checked.

But does the activity of one cotton company operating in a Rhode Island village deserve such careful scrutiny, should this account be so carefully evaluated? Yes, because of its importance to the country's history, and because of the relationship between these events and those on the moving frontier of industrial development. For example, Slater's influence was directly felt in Pennsylvania through his role in cotton operations there in which his style of management was copied. Furthermore, Philadelphia-area mills operated according to similar economic practices (small shops, partnerships, close oversight), though generally with a more skilled workforce, and the two experiences would reward comparison. Finally, and perhaps more important, many of the workers who expressed their dissatisfaction with Slater's mills by voting with their feet went off to mills in Pennsylvania where they could serve as expert operatives and assist in the training of other, resident operatives. One can only assume that they taught not only textile techniques, but also imbued the workers with some of their feelings and beliefs about the nature of labor-management interactions and their relationship to traditional culture. While early managers and skilled workers were being imported from England, the main body of workers in these and other mills came from local labor pools. They brought with them beliefs about mutual responsibility, fair wages, set prices, limited profits, and much more. In their work they developed a new code based on old and new values and expectations as they judged the new economic system. By denying the efforts, past and present, to comprehend this vibrant and complex period, and setting up her own account as a solitary effort, Tucker mistreats others who have labored both in the mills and in the field of history, and then

attempts to return Slater to a position as a great man, one who innovated, yet stood against the tide of change. Her account cannot bear such a weight.

Museum of American Textile History

LAURENCE GROSS

From the American System to Mass Production, 1800-1932: The Development of Manufacturing Technology in the United States. By DAVID A. HOUNSHELL. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984. xxi, 411p. Figures, tables, appendixes, bibliography, index. Cloth, \$38.50; paper, \$14.95.)

This is an important book and a brave book. It is important because, as the subtitle indicates, the author deals with nothing less than the development of manufacturing technology in the United States, a topic of considerable importance as the nation faces a serious erosion of its world leadership in manufacturing technology. It is brave because, as Hounshell recognizes, a work on this subject must criticize or take account of much of the most vital scholarship in the history of American technology.

In the main *From the American System to Mass Production* accepts and extends the evidence and concepts developed by previous historians. Hounshell, like his predecessors, finds the origins of a distinct American manufacturing technology in the federal armories established at Springfield (MA) and Harpers Ferry in the 1790s, and emphasizes the standardization and use of machine tools promoted by the War Department's ordnance department after 1815. He then moves into case studies of production technology at the Singer (sewing machine), McCormick (reaper), and Ford companies, and the cabinet- and bicycle-making industries. In each case he takes care to put technology into its social contexts: the goals and ideologies of the corporate and government bureaucracies, the economic constraints, and the individual personalities and aspirations. Carefully-selected and well-captioned illustrations aid his narrative at all points. This dedication to refining our understanding of the rise of manufacturing technology is Hounshell's main contribution to scholarship—a contribution accepted with relief when historians of this generation are more often particularists than generalists.

There are several areas in which the book confirms previous notions about the development of the American system of manufactures. It argues that beginning with the innovations at the armories, Americans learned to value precision manufacture, usually in the pursuit of standardization and interchangeability. Hounshell carefully points out that although these goals were not consistently obtainable, they fostered a state of mind in which Americans

adopted machine tools and other technologies readily. And with powered machines, vistas of mass production opened up which the clock-making and bicycle-making industries, in particular, reached for in the early and late nineteenth century, respectively.

To this understanding Hounshell adds several modifications. Most important is his insistence that company marketing strategies were crucial to the style and success of manufacturing technologies. He shows how Singer led its field by making a high-quality, high-priced, hand-fitted machine, and took little interest in adopting the panoply of "American system" techniques until its sales literally outran the capacity of its European-style manufacturing plants. The McCormick company did not abandon its simple, virtually handicraft production technology in favor of the American system until it reversed its strategy of low production (based on a fear of saturating the reaper market). Henry Ford's vision of a Model T in every garage created the drive for production technology innovation which allowed his engineers to come up with the assembly line.

From the American System to Mass Production demonstrates historiographic sophistication by depicting the rise of mass production as less than a logical progression of ideas and inventions. At each stage of development the manufacturers came to terms with the limits of their concepts and the available technology, and outside innovations or new concepts (often apparently alien to the existing system) were accepted. For example, although the ideal of absolute precision lay behind the adoption of jigs, fixtures, and gauges, it proved a will-'o-the-wisp: eventually American manufacturers had to recognize that mass production did not call for "good" but rather "good enough" (p. 212). And in the bicycle and automobile industries, Hounshell shows that sheet metal stamping technology provided the crucial flexibility and efficiency in manufacturing which the "armory practice" could not provide. When Ford needed to bring his Model T production into high gear, he purchased an entire pressed-steel plant and moved it to Detroit.

From the foregoing discussion readers of this journal may suppose that this book had little to do with Pennsylvania industry. The firms studied had their plants and headquarters in New England, the Midwest, and New Jersey. The industries for which Pennsylvania has become known, such as iron and steel, railroads, and mining, were not central to the history of mass production. Yet, in a larger sense, the rise of mass production affected urban-industrial Pennsylvania in virtually every category of life—by increasing the demand for its products and services, by providing its citizens with a cornucopia of goods to consume, and by altering its ways of life. Neither the shrieking mills of Pittsburgh nor the quiet ways of the Amish would hold such historical and cultural significance were it not for the mass production of automobiles, the culminating artifact of the mass production

story. I highly recommend this book for all who seek to understand one of the crucial factors in the United States's rise to industrial leadership.

Rockefeller Archive Center

DARWIN H. STAPLETON

Governing the Hearth: Law and the Family in Nineteenth-Century America.
By MICHAEL GROSSBERG. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985. xiv, 417p. Index. \$32.00.)

Governing the Hearth is an enormously ambitious book. Grossberg has attempted to explain the development of American family law from the American Revolution to the dawn of the Progressive Era. Grossberg argues that the colonial family was to a great extent an appendage of the larger society. Thus, the society exercised great control over the family from its formation—through marriage—to its eventual dissolution through death and inheritance. After the Revolution this began to change as “families became less and less willing to sacrifice domestic autonomy to the dictates of communal supervision” (p. 5). This led to what Grossberg calls the “republican family” (p. 6).

The “republican family” resists easy definition, but Grossberg argues that the family of post-Revolutionary America mirrored the society it was in. Thus, to the extent the society objected to “unaccountable authority and unchecked governmental activism,” so did the family. Similarly, like the emerging laissez-faire economy, the family accepted “the equation of property rights with independence,” and like other players in the market place, the family faced uncertainty (pp. 6-7). Grossberg's thesis is that the law changed in the nineteenth century to expand the rights of individuals at the expense of the state. By the end of the century, however, new forms of governmental interference with the family had developed and “the regulatory presence of the state in family law had significantly increased” (p. 290).

The new role of the family led to alterations of the law. Thus, in the nineteenth century courts upheld marriages that were secretly performed, performed against the will of the parents, or performed by those other than the clergy. Marriage banns—the public announcement of a forthcoming marriage—fell into disuse, and courts refused to resurrect them. These changes created greater individual autonomy in the decision to marry. By World War I the state sought to regulate marriage in new ways, through tests for venereal disease and other “hygienic invasions” of marriage. The law affected families in other ways as well. Mothers gradually gained some rights to the custody of their bastard children. The rights of bastards increased

during the century, but they never achieved equality with their legitimate siblings.

One area of the law that seems to run counter to Grossberg's thesis is birth control and abortion. The history of birth control and abortion can also shed light on present-day public policy debates about family planning, contraception, and pornography. Grossberg shows that birth control, including abortion, was widespread throughout the century, as urban, white, middle-class Americans reduced family size. This development was consistent with the expanding family autonomy that Grossberg finds in other areas of law. But the law did not follow social practice. The law became more restrictive, not less, during this period.

Grossberg demonstrates that in Revolutionary America the state allowed abortions, at least during the first four months of pregnancy. Only with the emergence of the American Medical Association did abortion become illegal, as the professionalization of medicine led physicians to try to eliminate midwives and others who competed with them for patients. Thus, instead of liberating people from state control, the changes in mid-century had the opposite effect. The same was true for birth control. The first American treatise on birth control, *Fruits of Philosophy* (1832), led to the prosecution of its author, Dr. Charles Knowlton, for obscenity. After the Civil War new obscenity laws prohibited sending birth control information through the mails.

The rhetoric of the era reminds one of current debates. In the 1870s opponents of birth control said that all those who advocated it were "abortionists." In the 1950s the phrase "murder of the unborn" would be applied to those who advocated birth control. Today, of course, many who oppose abortion also oppose sex education and other contraception. Similarly, in the 1870s and the early twentieth century judges upheld obscenity convictions for those who distributed birth control information because the judges argued that this form of pornography encouraged immoral and illegal behavior. Perhaps before we sit down to read the Meese Report, we should first read a chapter from Grossberg. It will help put things into perspective.

State University of New York at Binghamton

PAUL FINKELMAN

Childbearing in American Society: 1650-1850. By CATHERINE M. SCHOLTEN. (New York: New York University Press, 1985. viii, 143p. Index. \$22.50.)

"Hydropathic Highway to Health": Women and Water-Cure in Antebellum America. By JANE B. DONEGAN. (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1986. xx, 229p. Illustrations, selected bibliography, index. \$35.00.)

Throughout the colonial era and much of the nineteenth century, regular physicians competed for patients and professional recognition with midwives

and the practitioners of alternative theories of health, including mesmerists, homeopaths, and hydropaths. Regular physicians, themselves unaware of the causes of disease, commonly resorted to such heroic procedures as surgery, the ingestion of massive doses of opium and lead and other dangerous substances, and frequent purgings and bloodletting of as much as four-fifths of the body's blood supply. By comparison, the alternative practitioners' reliance on diet, exercise, cold baths, and psychological support often proved as beneficial and certainly less dangerous to the patient. Many such practitioners were women deeply concerned with alleviating the pain and risk of childbirth. Both Scholten and Donegan focus their attention on the choices of care available to women during their travail—Scholten concentrating on the traditions and decline of midwifery, and Donegan chronicling the short history of hydropathy in America.

In her book, Scholten persuasively disputes the classic argument that high fertility rates among colonial women were encouraged by the availability of land in a labor-scarce society. The impetus, she argues, was religious and social: "In a situation where there was little political or economic reason to restrain birth, the high rate of birth reflects the limits of social concern for women and is evidence of the pervasive assumption that frequent childbearing was woman's natural lot and her primary social contribution." Pregnancy, then, was a common state for most women, and childbirth a frequent ordeal in which a woman sought support from the female community. With the onset of labor female friends and relatives, as well as the midwife, gathered in the lying-in room to assist, recount their own experiences, and tell bawdy stories, all the while encouraging the woman in labor to rest or walk, sit or stand as she felt inclined.

Between 1760 and 1825 some middle-class women began to turn to male physicians, first for help during difficult labor, gradually even under normal conditions in the hope of a safer and faster delivery. Such hope was often illusory. Most physicians had little or no training in obstetrics or female anatomy, tended to resort too quickly to use of forceps, and were severely hampered by the modesty of the age that required the patient to remain covered in the presence of a man. For their part physicians denounced the use of midwives and banned the presence of female friends. Childbirth was transformed from an open affair shared and supported by a community of women to a very private event in which the woman in labor relinquished control to the attending physician.

Scholten fairly points out that the intentions of physicians were good, representing a new level of concern for women which gradually replaced the older fatalistic acceptance of pain as the natural lot of Eve's daughters. At the same time, American society began to emphasize childrearing rather than childbearing as woman's most important task. With the pressure of hard, physical work, frequent pregnancies, and numerous offspring, colonial

mothers had little opportunity or inclination to devote much time to their children, relying instead on older siblings, servants, or other relatives to handle child care. As children of the late eighteenth century came to be viewed as the future hope of the new republic, their mothers gained new respect as the most influential agent in their formative years. Consequently, for the first time, education for women achieved widespread support as necessary preparation for the extended role of motherhood.

Scholten's analysis of the history of childbearing is sound, thorough, and insightful. Her speculations on the cause behind the changing attitudes toward the importance of childrearing and the sanctity of motherhood are much less so. Scholten suggests that the new importance attached to motherhood was the result of modernization, but she is unable to identify the mechanisms involved. The assumption that Scholten falls back on—namely, that industrialization relieved women of much home manufacturing and thereby freed more time for child care—has been decisively disproven by scholars such as Ruth Cowan who have demonstrated that the gradual loss of help (servants, children, and men working at home) and the simultaneous increase in standards of housekeeping actually increased a woman's work load during the years 1770 to 1850.

While Scholten examines the century-long shift from midwives to male physicians, Donegan concentrates on the rise and fall of hydropathy in less than two decades. Hydropathy originated in Austria in 1829 and involved the belief in water as a healing agent. Patients were subjected to cold baths and showers and wet bandage wraps. The water-cure was introduced to America in the 1840s. Over the next decade several water-cure establishments were opened, a journal was founded, and converts were made. By the Civil War, however, hydropathy was a dead issue.

The advocates of hydropathy recommended a simple diet, plenty of exercise, cold baths, and a reliance on nature's own restorative powers. Such an approach appealed to many who had grown suspicious of orthodox physicians' penchant for radical interference. Regular physicians viewed childbirth as an illness requiring purging, bloodletting that sometimes left the woman blind for weeks, and ergot to induce violent uterine contractions. The postpartum mother was kept in bed for weeks in the hopes of avoiding the deadly puerperal fever which was actually transmitted from patient to patient on the unsterilized hands of their physicians. The results were often traumatic deliveries, unnecessary infections, and lengthy convalescences. By contrast, hydropaths encouraged women to establish a healthy regimen of exercise, baths, and diet throughout pregnancy to prepare themselves for an easier travail. After birth, women were urged to take exercise as soon as possible; many were ambulatory in just a few days.

Hydropathy welcomed both male and female practitioners and encour-

aged patients of both sexes to take charge of their own health. Not surprisingly, many female converts to hydropathy also advocated dress reform, better educational and occupational opportunities for women, and a general acceptance of equality between the sexes.

While Donegan presents a detailed and fascinating history of the movement, she fails to put hydropathy into historical context, thereby implicitly overstating its importance. Only on the second to last page of the book does she mention that only 10 percent of all physicians practiced alternate forms of medicine, and hydropaths made up just a fraction of that small number. She offers very little analysis of the movement, preferring to accept the often self-serving interpretations offered by the hydropaths themselves and their converts. Most disturbing, she remains silent on the reasons for hydropathy's sudden decline, suggesting only that the Civil War "impacted negatively on hydropathic medicine." By contrast, Scholten offers a more even-handed analysis of the skills and motivations of both midwives and physicians, being careful to judge them against the beliefs of their era, and not our own. The result is a more complete and complex picture of an era when all medicine was based on a mixture of empiricism and misinformation.

University of Pennsylvania

KARIN CALVERT

Emigrants and Exiles: Ireland and the Irish Exodus to North America. By KERBY A. MILLER. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985. xii, 684p. Appendix, bibliography of manuscript sources, index. \$35.00.)

Kerby Miller's weighty tome is a valuable addition to the story of Irish migration to North America. It provides a comprehensive history of the Celtic exodus from the seventeenth to the twentieth centuries and, most impressively, places the narrative within an intriguing interpretative framework. As the title suggests, the emphasis is on Ireland and the motives for leaving, but the book also offers fresh insight into the immigrants' status in America.

Although Miller does discuss the specific factors triggering each phase of emigration, he is primarily concerned with the clash between what he perceives to be the two prevailing influences on Irish history—one a pre-modern, indigenous way of life, the other a modern, Anglicized set of values associated with British "commercialization" of Ireland. The latter, whose impact gradually intensified in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, wrought significant changes in Irish mores and became the major catalyst for emigration. In this context the Famine emigration becomes essentially part of a larger process, the effects of which were evident both before and

after the late 1840s. Indeed, emigration remained "the central experience of post-Famine Irish life" (p. 455) until the early twentieth century, despite population decline and land reform, because of "Irish agriculture's integration into an international market system in which most Irish farmers suffered increasing competitive disadvantages" (p. 391). The Famine itself, in fact, by decimating the small landholders, promoted the English objective of "a market-oriented rural society dominated by commercial farmers and graziers" (p. 380).

This economic "modernization" challenged the native Irish "worldview," one "rooted deeply in Irish history and culture" (p. 7) and predicated on a communal, non-commercial way of life antithetical to individualism and mobility. This value system, strongest in rural Catholic areas, discouraged departure in the eighteenth century and allowed Irishmen to rationalize the inevitable exodus of the nineteenth century as involuntary "exile" attributable to British "oppression." The resiliency of the "exile motif" and of the concomitant "traditional Irish Catholic worldview" (p. 429) helps explain the sometimes surprisingly slow adjustment of Hibernian immigrants to the United States and the persistent strength of Irish-American support for Irish independence.

Miller's argument is much more complex than the above summary implies. He distinguishes carefully the impact of his themes on various denominations, classes, and regions of Ireland and candidly presents evidence that qualifies his interpretations. The path winds exceedingly as the story reaches the late nineteenth century. Irish nationalism and Roman Catholicism encourage both modernization and traditional mores. Even "commercialization" inadvertently contributes to the survival of traditional values by reinforcing the family farm.

Persuasive in most respects, Miller's interpretative schema is not always convincing. This reviewer wonders especially whether portraying the Catholic church primarily as a secular pawn caught between two contending cultures does justice to its role in Irish life. It also seems somewhat ungracious of the author to argue cogently through the first half of the book that British commercial hegemony fundamentally disrupted Irish life and then, in the latter part, to criticize post-Famine Irish spokesmen for blaming continuing dislocation on the English.

The author's footnotes reflect a truly prodigious amount of research. Although inevitably some relevant works are omitted, his notes provide valuable reference lists to recent secondary literature on both sides of the Atlantic. More importantly, he utilizes thousands of unpublished letters written by emigrants. Unfortunately, the notes, which are at the back of the book, are almost uniformly multiple by paragraph, thus making it difficult to attribute specific quotations or assertions.

Miller writes with great precision, but the carefully nuanced arguments and sophisticated vocabulary will limit somewhat the popular audience for this work. It is, however, essential for anyone seriously interested in Irish or Irish-American history.

University of Scranton

ROBERT F. HUESTON

★ ★ ★ ★

The editors of the **PMHB** congratulate Sheila Skemp (University of Mississippi), whose article, "William Franklin: His Father's Son," published in the April, 1985, issue of the **PMHB**, received the South-eastern American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies award for best article on an eighteenth-century subject published in a scholarly journal in 1985.

THE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Howard H. Lewis *President*

Vice-Presidents

Harvey Bartle, III
Margarett McKeel

William L. Grala
Harrison Wright

Secretary, David W. Maxey, Esq.

Treasurer, Wm. Richard Gordon

Councilors

Term Ending 1987

Ms. Carol S. Baldrige
Mrs. T. Wistar Brown
Mr. D. Hughes Cauffman
Mr. Edward D. Griffith
Mr. Bertram L. O'Neill
Mr. Frank Reed
Mr. F. Joseph Stokes, Jr.

Term Ending 1988

Mr. E. Digby Baltzell
Mr. John W. Eckman
Mrs. Philip Klein
Mr. Franklin Krum
Mr. Frank P. Louchheim
Mr. Howard Mitchell, Jr.

Term Ending 1989

Mr. George E. Bartol, III
Mr. George Connell
Mr. Ragan A. Henry
Ms. Carol Eaton Hevner
Mr. Charles Soltis
Mr. S. Robert Teitelman
Mr. Russell F. Weigley

Counsel, Henry N. Platt



Director, Peter J. Parker

☎ ☎ ☎ ☎

Founded in 1824, The Historical Society of Pennsylvania has long been a center of research in Pennsylvania and American history. It has accumulated an important historical collection, chiefly through contributions of family, political, and business manuscripts, as well as letters, diaries, newspapers, magazines, maps, prints, paintings, photographs, and rare books. Additional contributions of such a nature are urgently solicited for preservation by the Society where they may be consulted by scholars.

Membership. There are various classes of membership: individual, \$30.00; household, \$40.00; patron, \$100.00; benefactor, \$1,000. Membership benefits include invitations to lectures and exhibit openings, receipt of the newsletter, *The Pennsylvania Correspondent*, and a subscription to *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* (Individual membership without publications and student memberships are also available). For additional membership information please call the Society, (215) 732-6201.

Hours: The Society is open to the public Wednesday, 1 p.m. to 9 p.m.; Tuesday, Thursday, Friday, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. For exhibition hours please call the above number.

The Historical Society of Pennsylvania
and
The Library Company of Philadelphia
are pleased to announce a program of

**SUMMER RESEARCH FELLOWSHIPS
in AMERICAN HISTORY and CULTURE for 1987**

These two neighboring Independent Research Libraries boast comprehensive, complementary collections capable of supporting research in a variety of fields and disciplines relating to the history of North America, especially in the 18th and 19th centuries.

Proposals will be welcomed from applicants working in any field appropriate to the collections. Candidates are encouraged to inquire, prior to application, about the appropriateness of their proposed topics.

Fellowships are tenable for one or two months, June through September, 1987 and carry stipends of \$1,000 per month. Reasonably priced furnished apartments are available by the month in the immediate vicinity.

Although the program is designed for scholars possessing the Ph.D. or a significant record of professional experience and scholarly publication, several fellowships will be reserved for doctoral candidates doing dissertation research.

**CANDIDATES MUST APPLY BY FEBRUARY 1, 1987;
APPOINTMENTS WILL BE ANNOUNCED BY
MARCH 15, 1987.**

For further information and application forms please write to:

James Green, Curator
The Library Company of Philadelphia
1314 Locust Street
Philadelphia, PA 19107