
In the third quarter of the eighteenth century, the carpenter-builder Robert Smith along with a number of other extraordinary but largely forgotten craftsmen transformed the provincial capital of Pennsylvania into one of the architectural showpieces of the British Empire. When he died in 1777, the Pennsylvania Evening Post paid tribute to this valued member of the community by observing that many of Philadelphia's grandest public buildings and residences were "ornaments of his great abilities." Smith designed or supervised the construction of the steeple of Christ Church, St. Peter's Church, Third Presbyterian Church, Zion Lutheran Church, and Carpenters' Hall in Philadelphia, Nassau Hall at Princeton, Christ Church in Shrewsbury, New Jersey, and the Public Hospital in Williamsburg, Virginia, the best known of a remarkable collection of structures that ranks him among the most prolific of colonial builders. Ebenezer Hazard visited Philadelphia the year that Smith died and declared Zion Church to be the "largest and finest in North America." With so many prestigious commissions of the highest quality, Smith obviously had the architectural skills and organizational ability to guide major projects to successful conclusions in a period when the shortage of money, materials, or craftsmanship converged to undermine so many building schemes.

In a quest to understand how a relatively obscure Scottish immigrant rose to dominate the architectural profession in America's preeminent colonial city, Charles Peterson, the doyen of early American architectural history, has spent more than half a century piecing together the scattered evidence of Smith's career in Philadelphia and beyond. Since no Smith papers have survived and only three small sketch drawings can be firmly attributed to Smith himself, this volume is a monument to the tenacity of a historian who has pursued fragmentary shreds of evidence to reconstruct a building career that was so intimately connected with the rise of Philadelphia. In a brief introduction, Peterson sketches out what can be known of Smith's life and career, from his origins and early training in Scotland to his architectural practice and social status in Philadelphia in the period between 1749 and 1777. He asserts that Smith should be recognized as one of the outstanding architectural designers in colonial America. Not simply a carpenter
capable of translating standard Georgian design forms to meet regional expectations, Smith should be seen as an architect who could synthesize current fashion into a distinctive architectural style. In a chronologically arranged catalog of more than fifty works to which Smith has been associated in some manner, Peterson describes his precise role in each project and in so doing tries to define the Smith style. The author has done yeoman’s work in sifting through the evidence and calling out misattributions, such as the Williamsburg, Virginia, courthouse, or noting possible but unprovable connections, such as the design of the Northampton County, Pennsylvania, courthouse.

With so many of his known works destroyed or severely altered and no major drawings to measure his architectural imagination and competence, Robert Smith’s place in the history of American colonial architecture can never be fully assessed despite Peterson’s heroic efforts. The elite of Philadelphia in the 1750s and 1760s clearly thought of him as a master of his profession. But what was the nature of that profession in the late colonial period? What distinguishes Smith’s work from that of fellow craftsmen in the Carpenters’ Company? It is certainly not the architectural forms, which fit comfortably into a Delaware Valley interpretation of standard British Palladian design. Projecting, pedimented central blocks or gable ends with circular windows in the tympanum that appeared at Nassau Hall and St. Peter’s Church, for example, repeat forms that could be found in major American seaports and English provincial towns in the mid-eighteenth century. Peterson suggests that it is partly the technical ingenuity that Smith showed in framing broad spans with a raised tie-beam roof truss. Though not invented by Smith, the form became a signature solution for his churches. In pushing Smith as a daring engineer who tested the structural limits of uninterrupted roof spans, Peterson makes an unusual slip in reading documents that describe a building as being so many feet “in the clear” as meaning free of columns or other supports for the roof span. What this phrase meant in the colonial period was the internal dimension of a structure, excluding the width of the walls.

Smith practiced his craft with diligence, worked well with the elite, avoided major pitfalls, and died a respected member of his trade. However, as with so many British and American builders of the eighteenth century who worked in a fashion that allowed considerable freedom within a bound set of rules governing classical architecture, his singular achievement as a designer is extremely difficult to locate. He was no mere cipher of British pattern book design or the progenitor of an idiosyncratic style. His success lay in his fidelity to those intangible qualities of “good and workmanlike craftsmanship” that appeared in every contract he signed.

Colonial Williamsburg Foundation          CARL LOUNSBURY

From the eighteenth century, the architectural book has been the frequent companion of the American builder, designer, and householder. American-born joiners, several generations removed from their British origins, first used books to understand and execute the details of classical design in the mid-1700s. Fifty years later, a few American builders were compiling their own manuals to help their isolated colleagues make the transition to the Federal style in architecture. Around 1830, still other books introduced the Greek Revival.

The mid-nineteenth century saw the advent of a very different kind of architectural book. Addressed now to the homeowner rather than the builder, the architectural pattern book made the prospective owner of a new house a participant in its design. Under the influence of the persuasive imagery of architectural writer Andrew Jackson Downing and his successors, the planning of one’s house became the study of the man or woman who was to live in the dwelling.

Downing’s precepts have continued to influence home building and landscaping down to the present time. But as more and more Americans sought individuality and self-expression in their houses, the need for well-conceived and economical designs outstripped the capacity of the architectural profession. Thus was born the idea of the mail-order house plan—and, eventually, the pre-cut dwelling, chosen from a catalog and shipped to its destination for assembly by the owner or his local carpenter.

Building upon more than a quarter-century of his own research and on many articles and books that have appeared during the past two decades, Daniel D. Reiff has chronicled the slow progress from builder’s handbook to mail-order dwelling. Houses from Books is the most far-reaching of several recent studies that have addressed the long-overlooked influence of the published word and picture upon the American concept of home.


have focused on the histories and the publications of individual companies.

Like the latter books, Reiff's study focuses on the many publications that have influenced architecture. *Houses from Books* is far broader in its period of study and more detailed in its analysis than earlier surveys of its kind, but it makes no pretense of commenting on social or philosophical movements except when those movements are addressed in the architectural books themselves or in contemporary architectural journals.

*Houses from Books* begins with the advent of classicism and the beginnings of published architectural design in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England. Reiff then moves to a discussion of the influence of eighteenth-century British builder's guides in the American colonies, followed by an analysis of the comparable American books that first appeared with the publication of Asher Benjamin's *The Country Builder's Assistant* in 1797. Reiff offers a detailed discussion of the revolutionary architectural pattern books introduced by Downing in the 1840s and continued by Calvert Vaux, Gervase Wheeler, and Henry Hudson Holly. These "idea books" are contrasted with a parallel genre of nineteenth-century books filled with detailed plates of architectural details for the use of builders.

The latter two-thirds of *Houses from Books* is devoted to those authors and companies who used inexpensive catalogs to market full architectural services through the mail, beginning in the 1870s. By 1895, available catalogs offered prospective clients "more than 10,000 published house designs to choose from—and this does not even consider those in periodicals." Reiff juxtaposes this mass marketing of plans with the countervailing effort of journals like *The American Architect and Building News* to make the practice of architecture more professional.

The book concludes with a discussion of "pre-cut" houses in the early 1900s, starting with the now-famous Sears, Roebuck and Aladdin lines and detailing the designs of a number of lesser-known competitors who drew sustenance from the gigantic lumber industries of the upper Midwest and the Pacific Northwest. The book includes a section of examples of book-inspired houses from the author's home town of Fredonia, New York. Its appendices list selected house-plan books, early twentieth-century books that discuss small houses, technical books for craftsmen from the period before World War II, and period catalogs of interior and exterior architectural materials and details.

Publication of *Houses from Books* received a subvention from Furthermore, the publication program of the J. M. Kaplan Fund. Even with this assistance, the book is priced at $75, which, regrettably, will keep it from the hands of many home-owners, local preservationists, and other nonacademic users who traditionally have been among the most avid seekers of information on mail-order plans and buildings. The book's high price reflects its encyclopedic nature and the very qualities that will make it the standard reference on its subject for many years.
Despite its cost, *Houses from Books* belongs in every public and academic library and on the bookshelf of every preservationist and student of American material culture.
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For a number of years, the U. S. Capitol Historical Society has been sponsoring symposia related to Congress, the Capitol, and the American government, with many of the proceedings subsequently published. This volume contains the papers of two of them, the first six essays developed out of the 1995 symposium on Capitol architects, the last six out of the 1994 symposium on mid-nineteenth-century art in the Capitol. As a result, this volume really consists of two sets of papers, each with a different focus, though both related to the same building and both with a lot of information.

For the first group, on the architects of the Capitol and their predecessors, there are essays on the early planning and construction up to 1802; the three major architects for the design of the building as we know it; the development of the Architect of the Capitol's office, with focus on three long-term holders of that title; and the changes in our perception of the building and the work of the architect's office during the last half of the twentieth century.

All of these papers are interesting and well done, though again two different approaches are evident. With the exception of the paper on Latrobe and to a certain extent that on Bulfinch, the others are all succinct summaries. In the first one, "'Seat of Boils, Confusion, and Squandered Thousands': Building the Capitol, 1790–1802," William Allen, the architectural historian in the Architect of the Capitol's office, summarizes the various supervising officers, leading to the creation in 1867 of the present office, which merged the design, construction, and maintenance functions. Then he describes very effectively the trials and tribulations of the first twelve years of design and work on the building. Based on years of solid research, this is an excellent synthesis of that formative period which involved scores of individuals.

This pattern is generally followed in the last three papers in the first section. Thus, in the fourth essay, "Thomas U. Walter and the Search for Propriety," James Goode, who has written extensively on Washington architecture and whose dissertation dealt with Walter's role at the Capitol, summarizes that role and
Walter's efforts on behalf of the architectural profession, an important leitmotif of much of his career. As with the first essay, it is a valuable and straightforward account of a significant subject. In the fifth essay, "Right-Hand Men: The Development of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, 1865–1954," William Bushong, the historian of the White House Historical Association, summarizes the role of the office under Edward Clark, Elliott Woods, and David Lynn, who, between them, held the office for ninety years. Although their accomplishments are less well known, these three figures, all of whom rose to the position after years of service to their predecessors, played a very significant part in the history of the building as we know it today. In the last essay, "The Historicization of the U. S. Capitol and the Office of the Architect, 1954–1996," Richard Guy Wilson of the University of Virginia, who has written widely on American architecture of the last two hundred years, first produces a good and very interesting survey of changes in the reputation and perception of the building over the years and then summarizes the roles of the last two men to hold the position of architect, George Stewart and George M. White.

In the third essay, "Charles Bulfinch: Well-Connected, Refined Gentleman Architect," Pamela Scott, whose extensive work on the architecture of Washington, D.C., includes both co-authorship of the D.C. volume in the Buildings of the United States series and the organization of the 1995 Library of Congress exhibition on the Capitol as well as the authorship of its catalogue, examines the role of that figure in the story. Although Bulfinch's work in New England is well known, his role in completing the Capitol in the late 1810s and the 1820s is much less understood. Scott, therefore, on the basis of the relatively little real evidence we have, effectively examines what Bulfinch accomplished here and how he did it. Trying to fill in this missing episode in the story, she concludes that Bulfinch, a gentleman, behaved like one and was thus able to accommodate the various forces at work, from the presidents and the congressional committees to the legacy of Latrobe, Thornton, and the others involved.

Even more at variance from the format of most of the essays in this group is Jeffrey Cohen's "Forms into Architecture: Reform Ideals and the Gauntlets of the Real in Latrobe's Surveyorships at the U.S. Capitol." Rather than reiterate the early nineteenth-century history of the Capitol, Cohen, who teaches at Bryn Mawr and was co-author of the major 1994 study of Latrobe's architectural drawings, chose to concentrate on seven themes: (1) Latrobe vs. the Whig concept of government and a restrained Palladianism, (2) Latrobe as a proselytizer for the more severe, geometric neoclassicism of Soane, Dance, and himself, (3) the relationship between his kind of architecture and democracy, (4) communal, modern grandeur as the image of democracy, (5) the social and economic difficulties that Latrobe's education and training posed for him, (6) the advantages and disadvantages of a democratic government as an architectural client, and (7) Latrobe's translation of
form into reality by coming to terms late in life with the public's need for embellishment. The result is a stimulating essay, quite different in character from all the others.

In the second half of the volume, the first five essays deal with painting and design in the Capitol during the third quarter of the nineteenth century, with all but the first two concentrating on specific works of art. These two focus on Constantino Brumidi, who was responsible for a great deal of the decorative painting in the Senate and House extensions, as well as in the central dome; and he is also, in part, a subject of the third paper. In the first one, "The Artist of the Capitol," Barbara Wolanin, the curator in the Architect of the Capitol's office, summarizes her 1998 book on Brumidi, briefly discussing his background, his career, and his work on the Capitol, which is of enormous significance for the decoration of the building. This is followed by Catherine S. Myers, a professional conservator, who, in "A Study of Constantino Brumidi's Painting Technique in the Senate Corridors," combines a discussion of the results of technical analysis with a study of historical techniques to suggest how Brumidi worked. In the third essay, David Sellin, the former curator in the architect's office and the author of various studies of later-nineteenth-century American art, examines "Brumidi and the Case of the Mutant Mantel Clock: National Iconography in the Decorative Projects for the House of Representatives, 1855-1858." In a very interesting piece of art-historical detective work, he examines the interaction of Brumidi, the engineer Montgomery Meigs who was in charge of the Capitol extensions, the architect Walter, the sculptor W. H. Rinehart, French bronze casters in Philadelphia, and New York clockmakers during the completion of decorative touches for the House of Representatives' new chamber.

The next two essays focus on specific paintings in the new spaces. First, cultural historian Daniel C. Lewis examines "Emanuel Leutze's Westward the Course of Empire Takes Its Way: Imagining Manifest Destiny, the 'Stars and Stripes,' and the Civil War." Using Hawthorne, Whitman, and newspaper and literary accounts, as well as a comparison of the finished work with two oil sketches for it, he offers a very interesting interpretation of the Leutze painting. Then, Kimberly A. Jones, Assistant Curator of French Paintings at the National Gallery, in "Albert Bierstadt: History Painter for the U.S. Capitol," looks at two paintings by that artist originally intended for the House chamber. In this allegorical reading, she also relates these two works to the Leutze, though she does not see the Civil War connotations that Lewis finds there.

In the last essay in the volume, Teresa B. Lachin, another cultural historian, turns to sculpture in "Worthy of National Commemoration': National Statuary Hall and the Heroic Ideal, 1864-1997." Unlike the rest of the papers in the collection, this one not only has a different medium as its subject but also is broader than any of the others. In this account of the history of the sculpture
collection in Statuary Hall and in other parts of the Capitol, which by an 1864 act of Congress came to be composed of two statues selected by each state, the principal emphasis is on analyzing trends in the choice of subjects by section of the country and date. Like the two previous papers, it also reflects certain multicultural interests of the 1990s.

In total, this collection of essays represents research not only into various facets of the building and its decoration in the broadest sense but also various trends in contemporary scholarship. Although not definitive in any sense, it offers a number of interesting summaries and insights that revolve about the central building of the American republic; its designers, administrators, caretakers, and decorators; and the works of art it contains. In addition to 182 black-and-white photographs, the volume has seventeen color plates that help illuminate the four essays on painting.

University of Delaware  
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Although this collection of essays falls short of fulfilling the lofty ambitions of its title—the fault more, perhaps, of an overambitious title than of the work itself—it succeeds, in fifteen short essays, in mapping a number of important parts of “Philadelphia's cultural landscape” in the nineteenth century.

At the center of it all—with the clear implication that he was the center of it all—was the English-born engraver, John Sartain (1808–1897). Sartain will be at least vaguely familiar to anyone who has pored over reproductive engravings in antiquarian bookstores or, in recent years, bought them for their frames at flea markets.

Except among specialists, the reproductive engraving, the genre at which Sartain excelled, has lost not only its allure but its cultural meaning. Since the 1890s at least, these large engravings (as mostly they were) have gone the way of the antimacassar, discarded, undesirable reminders of the ponderous, claustrophobic Victorian interior. Until very recently, few, if any, scholars, let alone the general public, bothered to consider the educational and cultural role that these accessible works on paper played in the days before illustrated art books and periodicals brought art into the home of anyone interested in it.

Sartain arrived in Philadelphia, the center of American printing and book publishing at that time, in 1830, already trained in mezzotint engraving. By 1838, he had secured enough commissions to reproduce the work of such leading
Philadelphia painters as Thomas Sully and John Neagle and was able to settle himself, his wife, and family, which eventually included eight children, in a handsome row house on Sansom Street, where he continued to live until his death fifty-nine years later.

Ultimately, John Sartain's fame would rest upon such demonstrations of the engraver's art as his mixed-technique engraving after George Caleb Bingham, *County Election* (1854). That this composition acquired the status of national icon is owing to Sartain's print, which hung in many a law office, schoolroom, and cozy American parlor—rather than to the original painting, which, after all, was accessible only to the few.

It was Sartain's fortune, good and bad, to live a long life during which new techniques for reproducing images appeared in rapid succession. As Katharine Martinez, Sartain's biographer, states in her "Portrait of the Sartain Family and Their Home," "Mid-nineteenth-century Americans witnessed an explosion of visual images." As long as line-engraving and other intaglio techniques predominated, Sartain, the acknowledged "father of mezzotint engraving in this country," was on top of the reproductive print business. His energy and prosperity brought him into frequent contact with the likes of Philadelphia art collectors Joseph Harrison and James Claghorn, who purchased his works *en gros* and served with him on important committees at the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts and the Philadelphia School of Design for Women (now Moore College of Art and Design).

But with the entry of photography into the field of art reproduction in the early 1850s and, more especially, after Henri Rousselon of Goupil et Cie in Paris launched the inexpensive and stable photogravure process in 1872, the flow into the American marketplace of cheap but high quality imported reproductions in a multiplicity of formats and prices, overtook traditional engraving, relegating it to a high-end market of well-to-do connoisseurs. It may be said (but Martinez does not say) that at this point, when images were proliferating as never before, affording unprecedented access to Old Master and contemporary art, the venerable Sartain's influence diminished significantly. Unwilling or unable to venture into industrialized photo-mechanical production, he was forced to specialize in the illustration of the genre known as the gift book: handsomely bound, rather expensive compilations of light literature that were "considered appropriate fare for young ladies."

This is surprising for one as enterprising as Sartain. Practiced as he was in one traditional technique of reproduction, and one technique only, he was, moreover, ill equipped (and, perhaps, too old) to participate in the revival of print-making, especially etching, as a creative process, when this revival occurred—as early as the 1870s.

None of these shortcomings, however, diminish John Sartain's overlooked
importance to the history of art and art appreciation in America. The present volume plugs a yawning gap in information about the dissemination of images in America, but its usefulness does not end there. Subsequent chapters treat Sartain as a print collector—much of his collection remains intact at Moore College—as a collaborator with Philadelphia artists like Peter F. Rothermel and Christian Schussele, as a publisher of paintings belonging to Philadelphia’s leading collectors, as chief of the Bureau of Art for the Centennial Exhibition in Philadelphia in 1876, and, not least, as patriarch of a brood of eight children, of whom four followed him into the field of fine arts.

Of the second generation of Sartains, who seemed to be invariably attractive and enterprising, perhaps William and his older sister, Emily, demand our closest attention. In pursuit of a career as painter, William studied in Paris with Léon Bonnat, at the same time as his friend Thomas Eakins was enrolled in the studio of Jean-Léon Gérôme. That Sartain is by far the less esteemed artist (although perhaps the happier man) should surprise no one: his talent clearly was no match for that of Eakins, and the instruction he received chez Bonnat was less rigorous than that to which his friend submitted in Gérôme’s studio. The Orientalist subjects that Sartain made his specialty are no more than weak paraphrases of Bonnat’s. However, once back in America, he distinguished himself as a teacher: his star pupil was Cecilia Beaux. [Editor’s note: see PMHB 124 (2000) no. 3, devoted to Beaux.]

Of Emily Sartain, the present volume paints a charming portrait. Handsome, intelligent, and skilled as an engraver, she sojourned abroad in the company of her venturesome father, whose favorite she appears to have been, and, notably, became an influential artistic colleague of Mary Cassatt in Paris and Philadelphia. In Paris, through her friendship with Cassatt, she also exerted an important influence on the young, art-loving Louisine Elder, later Louise Havemeyer (although Philadelphia’s Cultural Landscape is silent on this point, perhaps in deference to Philadelphia’s age-old rivalry with New York).

Perhaps the most charming essay in the book treats the “Italianate romance” of Emily Sartain and Thomas Eakins, her brother’s friend, who was three years her junior. The fires of love burned brightly when the two were still in Philadelphia, but Eakins’s departure for Paris and the studio of Gérôme (to which he gained admission through John Sartain’s influence) opened an unbridgeable gap between them, especially when Emily surmised, upon visiting Paris, that Eakins had indulged in the common practice of hiring prostitutes as nude models. Not so much offended by the vice inherent in this practice, Emily, who held strong, progressive views on the place of women in society, was appalled that her young friend would acquiesce to a practice so degrading to her sex. She abruptly terminated the romance, although late in life the famous artist and his first love appear to have settled back into warm friendship.
Emily, meanwhile, became principal of the Philadelphia School of Design for Women in 1886, and served with distinction in that post until 1919. In 1890, she paid homage to her old inamorato Eakins by introducing studio classes in which women studied from undraped female models and draped male models: not quite all that Eakins had advocated years before, but a giant step in his direction.

The remainder of Philadelphia's Cultural Landscape deals with the history of the School of Design under Emily Sartain and her niece and successor, Harriet Sartain. These final essays are perhaps of less interest to the general reader of American art history than the earlier portion of the book, but given the central role of the Sartain family in the history of Moore College, they are not out of place. The editors of the volume, Katharine Martinez and Page Talbott, are to be congratulated for producing a volume that will be a useful reference not merely on Philadelphia's cultural history but on the long-neglected history of the reproductive print in America.

_Frick Art and Historical Center_  
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_William L. Price: Arts and Crafts to Modern Design._ By GEORGE E. THOMAS.  

The name of William L. or Will Price (1861–1916) is largely unfamiliar except to those individuals interested in the byways of Philadelphia's architecture around the turn of the century. The former Jacob Reed's Sons' Store (1903–04), 1426 Chestnut Street, is Price's most prominent surviving work in the city. An eclectic structure with a reinforced concrete frame, the facade of brick and limestone with carved details recalls Byzantine and Italian Renaissance sources; lush Henry Mercer Moravian tiles decorate the great Palladian ground floor entrance arch. Further afield one can journey out to the former Arts and Crafts community at Rose Valley (1901+) where a number of Price-designed houses and other buildings remain, or to West Conshohocken where lording over the Schuylkill River stands the extravagantly manorial Woodmont (1892–94), designed for Alan Wood in the François Ier style, and now owned by the Father and Mother Divine Mission. A few other houses survive, but unfortunately destroyed are the works for which Price received most of his fame, the Marlborough (1902), Blenheim (1905–06), and Traymore (1906, 1914–15), hotels in Atlantic City, and railroad stations and terminals in Chicago (1914–18), Indianapolis (1915–20), and other places along the Pennsylvania Railroad's east–west lines. These giant reinforced concrete structures with their powerfully molded forms, almost Baroque in their boldness with domes, towers, and great spanning spaces gave Price a presence on the
American architectural scene, but with their disappearance, and also the changes of
taste in the 1920s and beyond, Price receded from recorded memory.

The restoration of Will Price to center stage is George Thomas’s purpose with
this book. The contemporary architect Robert Venturi and the furniture dealer
Robert Edwards contribute respectively an introduction and a chapter on Price’s
furniture designs. Additionally two articles written by Price arguing for a modern
American architecture are included. They give something of the flavor of the man:
“Better, a thousand times better, the rock-ribbed Gothic of a Whitman than all the
curled darlings and simpering niceties of a borrowed culture” (p. 332). Lavishly
illustrated with color and black-and-white photographs and drawings, the book
contains, in addition to buildings and furniture (which Price or his office designed),
numerous photographs demonstrating Price’s interests in stagecraft and medieval
pageants, along with family photos. Price’s Quaker background and his political
interests, such as Henry George’s single tax theory which impacted the Rose Valley
settlement, are treated along with architectural life and alliances in Philadelphia.
Price’s brother Frank was also an architect and, for a time, a partner (1883–95). In
1903 another figure, M. Hawley McLanahan, became a partner. He played second
fiddle to Price as a designer but secured the larger hotel and railroad commissions
and put the firm on the national scene.

Price’s architecture went through an evolution. From 1883 to around 1900 his
designs were largely conventional, following the Queen Anne, English Tudor, and
other historical styles, though with a certain eccentric quality such as at Woodmont,
where the French Loire Valley chateau forms were distorted. About 1900 he
discovered the English Arts and Crafts movement and also the new possibilities of
reinforced concrete, at which point he becomes arguably “modern.” Thomas claims
that Price followed the line set down by Frank Furness—with whom he worked
briefly along with his brother circa 1880—of creating forms that represented
function instead of forms based upon history books. What is modern is of course
contentious, and while historical recall and ornament never disappear from Price’s
designs, he does not follow historical prototypes, as did more academic architects
such as McKim, Mead and White of New York City.

The issue of Price’s absence from the standard histories of American and modern
architecture occupies a good deal of Thomas’s treatment. His argument that one
villain among many is the Museum of Modern Art in New York City and the
importation of European modernism in the guise of the International Style in the
1930s has some ring of truth, along with other elements of historical amnesia. But
in the end part of the problem may reside with Philadelphia itself and its insular
quality. Frank Furness was totally forgotten until his resurrection by the
publications—some by Thomas—have placed Furness more at center stage in
American architecture. For a variety of reasons—some of which have been explored
by E. Digby Baltzell and Sam Bass Warner Jr., among many historians—Philadelphia's culture became a sideshow to what was identified as the important mainstreams of the later nineteenth and twentieth centuries in America. Philadelphia architects were frequently seen as outside that mainstream, and although one can argue that Louis Kahn and Robert Venturi received extensive coverage, still they are hardly the main current of American architecture. Maybe it is in the water Philadelphia's architects drink, or perhaps in the lingering Quaker culture, or the problem of an inferiority complex, or the lack of substantial architectural writers and publishing outlets, but Price is a typical Philadelphia figure with claims to genius who has been marginalized and who consequently vanished from the history books. If Thomas's book can help restore Will Price to center stage so much the better!

University of Virginia
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In the first part of his memoir of his life, Benjamin Franklin famously wrote of his father, Josiah, that "I was put to the Grammar School at Eight Years of Age, my Father intending to devote me as the Tithe of his Sons to the Service of the Church." He went on to explain that he was shortly taken out of school for want of sufficient family funds to advance the extended education such a "tithe" would require. The result of the change in schooling for Benjamin Franklin was that he grew to admire English rather than Latin as a learned and most practical tongue; he learned to prefer the mechanical arts to those metaphysical; and he learned to admire and emulate what he considered to be his father's "great Excellence," "a sound Understanding, and solid Judgment in prudential Matters, both in private and public Affairs." Franklin's admiration of his father is clear in the memoir, especially in the section early on, where Franklin speaks of his fine physique, lovely singing voice, and steadiness amid controversy. Yet Franklin's narrative also includes an almost imperceptible note of regret about the change in schooling and just a touch of personal chagrin that his father would not venture some capital to support his acquisition of printing materials on the first trip to London. With regard to the latter situation, Franklin revealed Sir William Keith's perfidy in taking advantage of the talented youth by pretending he would set him up in business—"But what shall we think of a Governor's playing such pitiful Tricks, and imposing so grossly on a poor ignorant Boy!"—and the whole story finally
serves as Franklin's best example of the remarkable probity of Josiah Franklin, a probity the son distinctly admired and by implication hoped he might be said to have inherited.

For most readers, what we have known of the father has come to us from the memoir written by the son. While most biographers of Benjamin Franklin have discussed his father by using information garnered from Franklin's memoir, few have taken up more thoroughly the very strong hints Franklin gives in his life story about the ways in which the father's strengths were also his son's. Arthur Bernon Tourtellot's biography of Benjamin Franklin (1977), as Nian-Sheng Huang remarks in this new cultural biography of Josiah Franklin, is one key study that usefully discusses Franklin's father. Tourtellot provided useful analysis of the relations between father and son and supportive context for understanding the father's life both in New England and in old England. Yet little more has been done with Josiah Franklin until now, although documents scattered here and there have borne his signature and a few entries in the diary of Samuel Sewall, Josiah Franklin's friend and church associate, have become known. Nian-Sheng Huang's too modest claim that his book "will not dramatically alter our previous perceptions of the father" (p. 1) belies the study's interesting richness of detail and cultural history related to Josiah's family life in England, his emigration, his willing change of occupations, his civic preoccupations, and his religious devotions. The study is a remarkably full account of the kinds of decision-making that ordinary people engaged in all the time, from decisions about labor to those about emigration, housing, religious practice, and family activity.

Josiah Franklin's life is a compelling story of determination and unrelenting labor. When it was clear that the town of Banbury, England, could not support the number of dyers who had come to town, Josiah left England with his wife, Anne Child, and three children, to settle in Boston. When he realized that Boston had a long-established and already successful dyeing trade dominated by Ambrose Vincent, he turned to tallow development and trade in the form of candle- and soap-making. The strengths of Huang's account of these years lies as much in the amount of detail he has gathered from examining buildings and working in archives as in his story's recovery of the lived experiences of everyday people. As Huang shows, Josiah made a prudent decision to change his trade from dyeing to chandling because candles were required by a range of people in and around the Boston area, from ministers, scholars, and magistrates, to tradespeople, inn-keepers, shipmasters, and traveling merchants (pp. 28–38). With careful detail, Huang illustrates the living and working conditions that Josiah faced, the efforts he put into changing tenements as the family grew and he remarried, and the esteem and respect he earned from those around him as the years increased.
Because of his interest in social history, Huang creates an account that importantly qualifies what might for some be unexamined assumptions about several aspects of Josiah Franklin's life and work. As Huang indicates, it might be easy to assume that sumptuary laws were the primary concern Franklin faced when he changed from silk dyeing to tallow chandling, yet other factors, such as reliable markets and an established clientele, were just as important to someone like Franklin (pp. 15-24). Because of the difficulty of the work, it might be easy to assume that Josiah Franklin's presumably low social and economic standing resulted from a lack of education and his unsteady participation in the secondary labor market. Huang ably shows that, to the contrary, Josiah Franklin had a good education, a sustained and always improving business in both manufacturing and marketing (with a special blue ball sign Franklin proudly displayed, even after his business moved from a smaller location to a more capacious one), and a distinctly important place in the community among churchgoer-friends who were of the merchant group, Samuel Sewall among them (pp. 39-56). Huang shows that the chandling trade, like the soap-making trade, was quite profitable compared with other labors, and although it took him until age eighty-two to pay off his property's mortgage, Josiah Franklin was quite successful indeed.

For Huang, the appearance that Franklin never got ahead as a tallow chandler and soap-maker is due to his encumbrances from having had so many children and his generosity to all of them—all it might seem, except Benjamin—as they reached their maturity. By making a comparison between the literate and accomplished Josiah Franklin, who had many children from two marriages to support, and an illiterate chandler, Thomas Clark, who had a very small family, Huang is able to show the differential in income as a partial result of Josiah Franklin's many family obligations (pp. 56-58). Franklin maintained a stable clientele, and he took part in important town and church events. His social standing was probably higher, Huang argues, than most would assume from a too-easy assumption linking social status to type of labor and relative financial status. Huang's correctives here are as interesting as they are convincing.

Huang's archival research to find Josiah Franklin's accounts and other documents and his substantial background in the social history of Boston in that day shed much light on what Josiah Franklin's life might have been like. The book's useful and delightful illustrations—maps, line drawings, and photographs—were nearly all created by the author. In a series of appendices, the volume offers a range of documents, from bills of sale for candles and property to estate inventories to letters written by Josiah Franklin to business associates and family members. The book is a noteworthy achievement in Franklin scholarship and a remarkable example of the important contribution that can result when one works under the assumption that, as Huang phrases it, "the real lives of ordinary people" (p. 2), no matter how uneventful these lives might appear to have been,
are worth recovering and examining. These are the stories of an unspoken inheritance awaiting articulation.

_Pennsylvania State University_  CARLA MULFORD


In the midst of David Swatzler's informative study of a late eighteenth-century Quaker mission to the Senecas, the reader discovers that someone in western New York once did what historians have long suggested: embraced the market economy by harvesting the natural resources of the local region and processing them for trade. "He negotiated contracts for the sale of boards to the U.S. Army at Franklin and Pittsburgh," Swatzler writes, "which took the mill's entire output for some time" (p. 48). It turns out that the Holland Land Company, one of those voracious enterprises run by men eager to acquire Native American lands and develop them for the non-Native American real estate market, built one of its storehouses out of planks that had come from the mill. But the story has a twist: the enterprising owner of the sawmill was Complanter, the Seneca leader, who struggled during the post-revolutionary period to preserve Seneca culture. In this instance Complanter recognized that cultural survival could only happen once his people had secured their economic base.

Complanter's sawmill is only one of the myriad events that Swatzler describes in _A Friend among the Senecas_. The book takes its title from Swatzler's central story: Henry Simmons's mission to these western Iroquois people in 1799. In essence, the book is based on Simmons's diary. But rather than recount Simmons's experiences only, Swatzler has constructed an argument that unfolds on three levels. On the first level, the book contains a narrative of the relations between Quakers and Senecas from the late eighteenth century to the early nineteenth century. On a second level, Swatzler moves back and forth in time to tell the long-term history of what happened to the Senecas and other indigenous peoples from the early seventeenth century to the mid-nineteenth century. On a third level, less developed than the other two, Swatzler provides an ethnography of the Senecas. Information from Simmons's diary is weaved into the writing throughout the book.

Parts of Swatzler's story will be familiar to scholars who have some knowledge of eighteenth-century Iroquois history. A series of maps at the front of the book shows dramatic changes in western Iroquoia, though the maps (like too many in scholarly works) lack mountains and thus inadvertently suggest that these native
peoples and the descendants of colonists who came after them inhabited a terrain as flat as the panhandle of Oklahoma. In the text Swatzler takes readers through important moments, such as the treaties at Fort Stanwix, New York, in 1768 and 1784; he recounts the experience of the Senecas and other Iroquois nations during the Revolution; and he provides information about Seneca cultural practices, such as their interest in certain sports which, he reveals, became avenues for working out relations either between peoples in this world or between humans and divine forces. Throughout he identifies major social problems confronting the Senecas, such as alcohol abuse, and the challenges that they faced from non-natives hungry for their land and souls. At the end of the volume Swatzler provides a copy of Simmons's 1799 journal and an adjacent edited version.

Swatzler's book will be of most interest to students and other general readers who possess little or no knowledge about the Seneca experience. For scholars, much of the argument will be familiar because Swatzler has reconstructed parts of the book from the secondary literature, ranging from the brilliant studies of Iroquois culture written by Anthony F. C. Wallace and Daniel Richter, to Barbara Graymont's dated but serviceable history of the Iroquois during the Revolution; his chapter on alcohol draws extensively from my 1995 book on the subject.

Still, Swatzler's contribution remains important. Too many historians casually believe that the decisive moments in Native American history took place when Europeans colonized the Atlantic coast and the spread of epidemic diseases devastated indigenous nations. Swatzler's book reminds us that the Senecas and other native peoples had a subsequent history. When the victors of the American Revolution were busy trying to secure their young republic, Complanter and the visionary Handsome Lake were working to preserve the culture of their people even if that meant, as Swatzler notes, engaging in theological disputes with visiting missionaries. *A Friend among the Senecas* helps to bring more of that vital story to light, and helps modern readers to grasp that a sawmill was often more than just a place to transform logs into boards.

*University of Southern California*  
PETER C. MANCALL

*From British Peasants to Colonial American Farmers* by ALLAN KULIKOFF.  

I suspect that graduate students and new teachers of early American history will offer great thanks to Allan Kulikoff for his yeoman work in compiling this wide-ranging synthesis about, well, yeomen. Kulikoff provides a much-needed overview of small farmers in colonial America, drawing together material from
thousands of secondary studies (all listed in a magnificent bibliography of over one hundred pages). The breadth and depth of Kulikoff's reading is what makes this volume so valuable: those trying to understand the state of the field on such matters as seventeenth- and eighteenth-century immigration, how farmers took control of the land and established homesteads, or the structure of farm households will be hard pressed to find a better source. Teachers looking for lecture material or specific answers to pesky student questions will be pleased with the book's detailed descriptions and numerous examples, numbers, and quotes. The volume is too dense for most undergraduates and is not likely to catch fire with a general readership. But as a resource for scholars of early America it is indispensable.

The book follows a rough chronology, beginning in late medieval Europe and ending with the Revolutionary War, mixing thematic chapters along the way. The emphasis here is on "demographic and economic structures" (Kulikoff is writing a second volume that will investigate "small farmer (yeomen) identity"). He begins in Europe, explaining the wrenching processes that displaced peasants from the land. The dispossession of English, Scots, Irish, and German farmers serves as the backdrop for one of his central points: European farmers crossed the ocean to obtain land they could not get at home and, once in America, most of these immigrants eventually secured their dream of ownership. Kulikoff charts the various migration streams that flowed across the Atlantic during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, cataloguing the reasons why migrants left, the places they settled in America, and offering an array of statistical portraits of typical migrants. He recounts the difficulties men and women from Europe faced in carving out homesteads and, in particular, the long and bloody conflicts with the land's native peoples. By drawing attention to these processes, Kulikoff reminds us of the costs of freedom and its many paradoxes. Landless Europeans gained the property that was so central to their notions of freedom by killing and dispossessing Indians. Male heads of households established their own freedom through patriarchal control of their children and wives. In the eighteenth century, at the very moment when white men had clearly established a strong foothold in America, the dream of land ownership began to become more tenuous for growing numbers of new immigrants (primarily Germans, Scots, and Irish), many of whom farmed the land as tenants, cottagers, or squatters rather than as independent owners.

The most original arguments come in the extended epilogue covering the American Revolution. Here Kulikoff complicates the image of farmers growing wealthy during the war with Britain and satisfying their own self-interested desires for luxuries rather than supporting the war effort. While acknowledging that some farmers profited from the war, he demonstrates that the war represented a time of enormous strain for most farmers, patriot and loyalist alike. The farm economy suffered as foreign trade and local markets stagnated. A labor scarcity developed as
many fathers and sons left the fields to fight along with farm laborers, slaves, and the many women who nursed, cooked, and sewed for the contending armies. When farmers provisioned the American army, they were paid in depreciated currency or in IOUs that held little or no value. British, French, and patriot armies impressed horses and wagons, looted crops and livestock, and burned fields and houses. In the backcountry, fighting between farmers and Indians devolved into total war, with each side trying to destroy as many people, homesteads, and villages as they could. In short, Kulikoff offers a long overdue analysis of the horrific burdens the war placed on civilians and provides a warning to those who neglect the extensive problems faced by the rural population when assessing the role farmers played during the Revolutionary War.

The most controversial sections of the book concern Kulikoff’s arguments about capitalism in the countryside. This will come as no surprise to those familiar with the longstanding debates over the nature of the early American rural economy and Kulikoff’s prominent role as a participant and mediator in these lively exchanges. No doubt some will disagree with his definition of capitalism—“a society dominated by two classes: capitalists who own the means of production (banks, factories, tools, and productive land) and workers who have only their labor to sell”—and his contention that “capitalism had not yet reached our shores as late as the American Revolution” (p. 2). Others will question his portrayal of colonial farmers as people who “aimed at . . . communal sufficiency in food [and] a comfortable subsistence” (p. 254). Thankfully, Kulikoff spends little time rehashing the debate and instead presents his case succinctly while pointing readers to places where he has developed his argument more extensively.

As with any work of synthesis, particularly one dealing with large demographic trends and economic structures, it is easy to second-guess some of the author’s choices. For example, the abundant statistics that make the book such a valuable reference tool tend to slow down the text by plunging readers into deep thickets of relational fractions. When reading some of the denser numeric paragraphs, the reader wishes Kulikoff had submerged some of his statistical examples in the endnotes and opted instead for a chart or a graph to dramatize larger trends. Kulikoff also eschews the kinds of comparisons with nonfarmers that would help us to understand better how small farmers differed from other European settlers. For instance, it is unclear whether the streams of migrants bound for rural America had different characteristics, backgrounds, and expectations than those who headed for cities and towns. Similarly, he provides only hints of the relationships and points of tension between farm communities and country towns and between the countryside and port cities. Kulikoff indicates that he will explore these relationships in his next volume that deals, among other things, with small farmers and their “repeated struggles with landlords, merchants, and rulers bent on depriving them of their farms” (p. 5). That volume, which promises to be just as comprehensive (and
probably more controversial), will undoubtedly join this one as the best starting place for the study of small farmers in early America.

University of Maryland, Baltimore County

TERRY BOUTON


They should have called it the “Companion” all along. This volume’s predecessor, Blackwell’s Encyclopedia of the American Revolution, appeared as if providentially in 1991, just before I moved from teaching a Revolution course in the cozy hills of the freshman seminar to the open terrain of the lecture hall, where the need for a comprehensive, coherent, and, well, encyclopedic account of the subject (and the corresponding inability to teach around awkward areas of relative ignorance) loomed dauntingly. Sequential enough in some places to crib whole lectures from, and much too big to disappear in the blur of the shelf if facts had to be checked on the way out the door to class, the volume also landed with an authoritative “thunk” on my desk in front of students during office hours, propelling some of them toward the library in pursuit of research topics from its judicious “Further Readings.” It even offered a starting point for my own archival forays. If only the colonial period had such a compact, reliable compendium, I used to think, both semesters might be comfortably productive. Can this trusty scout really be ready for the Chelsea Hospital of reference works after only nine years in the field, or even be in need of systematic scholarly overhaul? In an age of academic e-commerce—when historians storm the libraries and archives like Thomas Jefferson’s proverbial “swarms of Officers” as soon as our final grades are turned in—the answer to this question is arguably “yes.”

The technical continuities and changes between the two works can be summarized quickly. Seventy-five chapters in the Encyclopedia have become ninety in the Companion. The maps, mostly of military operations, are unchanged, as is the “Chronology.” The mother volume’s division into six thematic “Parts” remains in place. The thumbnail biographies of major figures of the revolutionary generation have been dropped to save space, however, as have the pictures. The chapters are now printed without internal pagination in double-column format, which puts more information in front of the reader at the same time than did the previous arrangement. The evocative jacket illustration, a painting of some New York patriots toppling a statue of their errant king in July 1776, better suits the contentious subjects of the book than did the bland Charles Willson Peale portrait of George Washington that it has effectively replaced.
But do the changes really make the Companion "in many ways a substantially new book" as the editors claim? They do not articulate in systematic detail what they see as the interpretive evolutions of the new work. The most apparent changes treat what John Murrin once called—in an earlier synthetic project by Greene and Pole—"a foul, three-letter word, 'war.'" Scholars have gradually embraced John Shy's 1976 characterization of the Revolution's war as "a process which entangled large numbers of people for a long period of time in experiences of remarkable intensity," and newer work has increasingly begun to enrich our appreciation of that process. Beginning with Thomas L. Purvis's incisive essay on "The Seven Years' War," almost half of the new chapters explore substantially military themes.

For Purvis, the Great War for Empire has three main lessons. It "disabused Anglo-Americans of their impulse to idealize the British military as invulnerable" (p. 111). It reinforced divergent views of imperial responsibility and reward on both sides of the Atlantic. And—as a model of creative British problem-solving following a fumbling start—it contrasted glaringly with persistent ministerial conceptual and strategic confusions in the 1770s and 1780s. Don Higginbotham's two magisterial essays on the progress of the War for Independence have been reinforced by chapters on the Continental army and on militia operations or irregular warfare. In recognition of the fact that any global imperial struggle has a maritime dimension, naval operations receive two essays. The tangled seam between the social and economic organization of colonial society and the successful—or at least the effective—application of force in, by, or to it is acknowledged by new essays on "the home front" and on "resistance" to the Revolution.

Holly A. Mayer focuses on the structural organization and administration of the army, and on its role of "representing" the very society whose political autonomy it was formed to secure. Sensibly declining to duplicate Higginbotham's assessment of its battlefield performance, she also considers the army's function as "America's marching band" (p. 311), noting how difficult it often was for soldiers to play simultaneously strategic and symbolic roles. Mark V. Kwasny shows persuasively that "partisan warfare" shaped the outcome of the contest in the Middle Atlantic core of the Revolution and on its frontiers, as well as in the better-known southern backcountry.

Clark G. Reynolds and James G. Bradford treat, respectively, "naval operations" and the "First United States Navy," but the conceptual distinctions between these topics blur. One better focused but less exhaustively detailed essay might have given the subject the attention that it needs for readers in our still-too-insular and too continental culture. While interpretive and even factual contradictions between contributors are inevitable in a project of this scale, it is jarring to read Higginbotham's judgment that "scholarly opinion no longer holds that [General William] Howe had orders to advance up the Hudson for a union with [General John] Burgoyne" in 1777 (p. 294), and Reynolds's assertion only twenty-six pages
later that Howe would “march north from New York along the Hudson River to meet up with [Burgoynel.” And Bradford’s mention twice in one paragraph that the Continental navy had “only 53 ships” (p. 238) suggests that the copy-editing of the new chapters could have been more rigorous. In general, the new military contributions, while interesting and valuable, fall a bit short of the scholarly standards set by Higginbotham.

Essays on “the home front” and on “resistance” acknowledge the truly revolutionary entanglement of the civil with the military, and of the social and economic with the political. Michael V. Kennedy’s treatment of labor shortages and material production is both ingenious and sure-footed, but it reads more like a truncated journal article than a true encyclopedia entry. Its complex statistical data are mostly unattributed to sources, and its limitation to the Middle Atlantic region seems idiosyncratic, if not arbitrary. But Michael A. McDonnell’s essay on “resistance” is a tour-de-force, showing the virtually countless ways in which the velocity of revolutionary mobilization could be retarded, and by what a wide range of standards even a “glorious cause” could fail to meet the mundane test of “satisfaction” (p. 349) among its diverse constituencies. Whereas in some essays the accumulation of detail seems only to dutifully fill the chronological “space” of the Revolution until “coverage” has been achieved, McDonnell patiently adds example after example to incubate whole new categories of “resistance.” When his work is done, the result surprisingly recalls our modern understanding of the complexity of resistance to slavery. The peculiar institution here looms as an even more cruel and ironic paradox in the hearts and minds of Washington’s and Jefferson’s generation than it has before.

The additions to the “Parts” outside of the Revolution’s war are varied and mostly useful. Richard R. Johnson’s essay on “Intra-imperial communications, 1689–1775” incorporates the current view of early modern Atlantic empires as intricately-networked constellations of nodes—and of pathways along which people, goods, and ideas moved between them—and as phenomena poorly understood in their own time and thus highly vulnerable to divergent kinds of disruption. Jack N. Rakove’s succinct essay on the Articles of Confederation shows that pragmatism rather than philosophy shaped that document, but that ironically in the end the Articles “proved largely irrelevant to the victory they were meant to secure” (p. 285). Horst Dippel’s analysis of the Revolution’s impact in “Germany” suggests that it met a society there that was at once deeply “divided” and indifferent to American affairs. While the path that brought mercenaries to America was a two-way street, the American Revolution found no “mirror” east of the Rhine as it clearly did in France. German intellectuals embraced the Revolution as a practical realization of Enlightenment ideals, but only in highly abstract ways. By 1800, the “wind from America” had largely dissipated in a society still almost a generation away from its own revolutions.
The important section on "Internal Developments after the Revolution" now opens with a long essay by Mary M. Schweitzer on "The Economic and Demographic Consequences" of the event that is in part a brilliant series of tightly written interpretive arguments, but somewhat detached from any clear overall framework. Sprinkled with meaningfully coded italic phrases, the piece will undoubtedly delight many specialist scholars and provoke as many others, while puzzling at least some members of "every class of reader and all age groups" (p. xiv) that the editors identify as being among their targeted audiences. The section also includes new chapters by James Sidbury and Christine Daniels on, respectively, the cultural construction of race and social status by the revolutionary generation. Both essays skillfully depict the ironies of a people making a revolution in which "all men are created equal" (except those who nature or environment have made different), and seeking to escape the particular consequences of some kinds of embedded hierarchy or inequality while simultaneously preserving and creating others.

Finally, the section on "Concepts" concludes with an essay by Cathy Matson on "Interests," representing a constellation of ideas and images that was central to English political thinking for generations and which was closely tied to economic possession of land. These concepts were under negotiation in British culture during the first half of the eighteenth century in response to the rise of Britain's Atlantic empire and to the convergence of war with "financial revolution." Thus, as a stable referent for a generation of Anglo-American activists who were prepared to put all else that was sacred in play, it inevitably became highly problematic. Matson's adroit guided tour through the many meanings that were attributed to the term between 1688 and 1788 shows that it remained coherent enough as a concept to promote American separation from empire, and almost enough to guide the ensuing military struggle for independence. But it became a political rugby ball in the collision between Federalists and anti-Federalists over fashioning a permanent constitution.

Like the modern navy's "Service Life Extension Program" for aircraft carriers, this project has given worthy employment, prestigious exposure, and skills-development opportunities to a generation of emerging scholars of the Revolution, working alongside a distinguished battery of long-familiar names. Presumably this reference department will remain afloat for at least another decade. It may become harder for projects like this to compete with interactive on-line compendiums of academic "content," or to persuade acquisitions bibliographers to make room for it in their tight budgets, but this reviewer will be happy to keep both volumes close at hand. As for the colonial period, newly-employed teachers can take heart in the welcome news—contained in the front matter to this volume—that a faithful "companion" to that no-less-dauntingly complex field is also now in preparation.

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

WAYNE BODLE


The first volume's documents show Washington making preparations for the 1777 campaign against the Howe brothers in the Philadelphia region. He is painstakingly cautious in asserting more control of the northern army, first under Philip Schuyler and then Horatio Gates in the battle with General John Burgoyne which ends at Saratoga. The presidential series volume covers the end of Washington's third year of his first term. Neither volume is totally complete but the missing documents are mentioned in footnotes or at the back. The editors give clear guidance where the best available copy of the unpublished documents is located. The second volume is aided by the completion of the papers of Alexander Hamilton, Thomas Jefferson, and James Madison for this period which are critical for understanding Washington's first term. When a printed document contains information not previously covered, the editors have done an admirable job of excerpting the relevant passages in the footnotes which give the document's context. The identifications for both volumes are clear and easy to follow, although it does seem that if a subject in question is from Virginia the reader is more likely to be informed of maiden names, or nephews and nieces, or cousins than is the case for someone from other parts of the country. Some identifications appear in the footnotes while others appear only in the index which is confusing. The indexes are perfunctory.

The George Washington in both volumes is a sound eighteenth-century political Whig. Government is limited in its duties and the people at large have rights that government must protect and not violate. In civilian-military relations in this period Washington is adamant about the limits of military authority. He reminds one officer who tried a civilian that the officer's actions were "irregular and illegal" and that the "temper of Americans and the principles on which the present contest turns will not countenance proceedings of this nature" (p. 495). Washington keeps the Continental Congress informed and closely follows their instructions. Reciprocal letters between Washington and John Hancock are cold and formal, but the power of civilian government over the military is undisputed. Believing that a crisis of the Revolution is at hand, Washington calls for greater efforts and sacrifices by all levels of government. For those who gave all their
efforts in the states such as Jonathan Trumbull, Senior, and George Clinton, Washington is outspoken in his admiration for their contributions. He discusses freely with these governors the problems facing the United States Army in 1777. The later cordial relationship between Clinton and Washington in the first years of his presidency becomes understandable, since Washington remains politically grounded as a revolutionary Whig more than as a leader of the Federalists.

Washington is careful in building up the army. He complains over his lack of control of the officers for the northern theater, but does not protest when members of Congress spearhead the effort to have Gates named as commander. Of the other generals Philip Schuyler seems the most dubious. Washington maintains a discreet silence on Schuyler's dismissal by Congress. John Sullivan appears to be mercurial and it is apparent that his military career will soon come to an end. Joseph Reed easily qualifies as the most fawning. William Heath's reputation rises in Washington's appraisal. Of his vast number of correspondents William Gordon, the Massachusetts clergyman, is well represented with his varied opinions of men and measures. Washington replies to Gordon in a noncommittal but serious way. Washington's letters to and from his relatives still center on the progress of the Revolution more than family news.

The performance of the British commanders, Richard and William Howe, in the early stages of the campaign certainly baffles Washington. Although he believes their ultimate aim is Philadelphia, their policy of leaving Burgoyne unaided in the north amazes him. Washington complains repeatedly that the lack of a navy cripples his intelligence efforts. Because of the lingering uncertainty over the purpose of the Howe brothers' intentions, Washington vacillates back and forth in positioning the army for either eventuality. By September 1777, the men in the United States forces start to become more optimistic about their chances of survival and a select few around Washington begin to believe there is an opportunity unfolding at Saratoga.

As president, Washington seems to be preoccupied in winning loyalty to the new government rather than excessively worried about the separation of powers. He seeks to mold a consensus to support the new Constitution, and the primary purpose of his efforts is aimed at consolidating the powers it designates to the government. Younger members from his staff during the Revolution who absorbed their commander's interest in the political or ideological aspects of the conflict are frequently given appointments. He spends a great deal of time over Arthur St. Clair's unsuccessful wars in the West. One other area that predominates in this volume is the struggle with Pierre L'Enfant and the planning of the city of Washington. After an almost infinite amount of patience, Washington and Jefferson finally conclude that L'Enfant is simply incapable of following any instructions from an appointed commission for the city. Washington accepts
L’Enfant’s resignation.

In private correspondence with Gouverneur Morris in Paris, Morris, of all people, comments that Talleyrand is castigated but not for his adultery which “was common enough among the Clergy of high Rank, but for the Variety and Publicity of his Amours.” More seriously, Morris informs Washington that the aristocrats seek to bolster their position by supporting the use of foreign armies against the revolutionary government to “reestablish that Species of Despotism most suited to their own Cupidity” (pp. 535, 537). Morris gives Washington an informed running commentary on the French Revolution.

In other areas, Washington displays a deep and abiding interest in all aspects of agriculture and he collects information for Sir John Sinclair in Great Britain. Washington’s comments on agricultural practices in the United States reveal the accuracy of Jefferson’s observation that Washington was a good farmer. The more important event for the long term was the first news of the August 1791 slave revolt in St. Domingue. The response by Washington is immediate. Aid is given to the white government without question. Previous discussion about the French alliance is simply shunted aside. Washington perceived it as a question of returning aid to France in a form that would be doubly advantageous to the United States by consolidating friendship and quickly paying off United States Revolutionary War debts.

Washington interprets the power given to the president in foreign affairs by the new Constitution to be broad and vast. He tries to invoke the “advise and consent” clause to the Senate before the onset of negotiations and quickly decides that the sharing of power in this area is unworkable. He cites the new Constitution to support his argument that he does not have to give background information about his decisions or nominations to the Senate. He politely refuses to grant the Senate’s request for more information. Long before the Jay Treaty fight, Washington expects the Senate to render their judgment independent of the executive. In another case involving foreign policy, he agrees with Jefferson who sought to expand the power of the federal government beyond the specifics of the Constitution. Jefferson argues that the powers not enunciated in the Constitution belonged to the new government because, “I consider the source of authority with us to be the Nation” (p. 529). He further argues that there was a connection between the events of 1776 and 1789. Washington did not disagree. He saw his participation as his effort in building a nation based on his and the people’s expressed principles. These two volumes, fourteen years apart, show this with increasing clarity.

Syracuse University

WILLIAM STINCHCOMBE

From the outset Matthew Gallman openly acknowledges that this work is not in the traditional genre of Irish famine migrant studies. Rather it is an analysis of two of the main receivers of, and host cities to, these migrants. The book starts with some personal stories of earlier Irish migrants proffering advice to those preparing to leave in the 1840s. This ranges from the expected, “There will be difficulties [sic] to meet with but then consider the object you have in view” (p. 2), to the trivial, “you need not get any new close [clothes] as it is not the fashions in america [sic] that thy hav [sic] at home” (p. 3). However, personal testimonies do not form the focus of this book. Instead, it is much more a study of how famine migration affected and at times challenged public policy in both Philadelphia and Liverpool.

Gallman convincingly draws numerous parallels between the two cities, outlining their burgeoning populations and their second-place ranking among the cityscapes of both Britain and America. The two cities also had similarly-sized, well-established Irish communities in the years preceding the famine influx that displayed many of the common characteristics of Irish migrants elsewhere—clustering into unskilled occupations and residing in cheap, often unsanitary and overcrowded dwellings close to the docks. These earlier migrants had established an array of Irish clubs and societies, but even with this support network the transition from migrant to settler was often difficult. However, the idea that these “two cities existed within the same intellectual universe” (p. 17) perhaps takes the notion of comparability too far. Although few would dispute the cross transatlantic flow of ideas, the local and national determinants that shaped public policy in both countries need to be addressed.

It is clear that both cities were close to being overwhelmed with the arrival of the famine Irish. Although many just passed through Liverpool en route elsewhere, this was cold comfort for the local authorities who by 1846 were assisting ten thousand Irish immigrants on a daily basis. Indeed such was the scale of the famine influx into this city that some contemporaries claimed Liverpool was “the unfair victim of its location” (p. 32). Although the rising tide of the Irish poor was smaller in the so-called “City of Brotherly Love,” the implications of the famine influx also aroused serious concerns. As Sidney George Fisher noted in his diary in 1847, “here they come not only to work and eat, or die, but to vote. That is the danger and the evil” (p. 34).

The already established reputation of famine migrants for exacerbating poverty, disease, and disorder is reinforced in this study as Gallman details both the
philanthropic and governmental responses that were often of a reforming nature. To Gallman’s credit he assesses not only the common ground, but also the disparities, such as Philadelphia’s more heightened reliance on private charity that, as the author correctly asserts, underlines “the differing assumptions about the respective roles of the individual and the state in society” (p. 111). The arrival of the famine migrants also worsened the sectarian conflicts that had already caused both verbal and physical clashes. Additionally, the famine migrants found themselves at the center of ongoing debates on the nature of crime and policing; Gallman’s work in this area confirms that of Roger Swift and others who have outlined the Irish tendency to become involved in petty crimes associated with poverty and vagrancy.

More than a decade in the making, Receiving Erin’s Children reveals the potential of comparative analysis for migration studies. A fuller discussion both of the pace and unprecedented nature of famine migration to Philadelphia and Liverpool and of the import of anti-Irish attitudes would have been welcome additions. Moreover, city maps would have helped guide readers through the myriad back streets and cellar dwellings that comprised the Irish quarters of these cities. These are minor criticisms, however, in what remains a valuable addition to the growing literature on Irish nineteenth-century migration.

Institute of Irish Studies, University of Liverpool

DIANE URQUHART


Fanny Kemble is a familiar figure to historians of women, the South, and antebellum America. In this new edited collection of Kemble’s journals, Catherine Clinton has provided tempting selections from the eleven volumes of memoirs Kemble published during her life. The bulk of the material, however, is from Kemble’s best-known work Journal of a Residence on a Georgian Plantation. But Clinton has included brief portions from earlier and later published journals to cover Kemble’s life from her teens to her seventies. Fanny Kemble lived a transatlantic life that spanned much of the nineteenth century. Given the range of Kemble’s experiences, there are a wide variety of topics covered in this work, from the theater to travel (both in the United States and Italy) to the working classes to the challenges of writing. But the majority of the selections focus on Kemble’s comments concerning the place of women in society and “her confrontation with slavery” on her husband’s Georgia plantations (p. 20).
Kemble was an exceptional writer and her accounts of her growing abhorrence to slavery and growing compassion for individual slaves remain powerful. "I stood in the midst of them, perfectly unable to speak, the tears pouring from my eyes at this sad spectacle of misery, myself and my emotion alike strange and incomprehensible to them" (p. 104). She chronicled the impact of bondage not only on the slaves, but also on her marriage. After ordering a group of pregnant slave women back to work, Pierce Butler, Kemble's husband, became "positively degraded in [her] eyes." She "feared[ed]" that her time on the plantation would "lessen [her] respect for him" (pp. 125–26). There is a wonderful immediacy and intimacy to these writings that Clinton has gathered. The heart-wrenching insights of this unique plantation mistress and her bluntly revealing look at plantation slavery remain interesting and invaluable.

Clinton dearly intended this collection to trace the development of Kemble's views on women and especially slavery, but there is a haphazard quality to the work. Indeed, Clinton never explains why she chose these selections and omitted others. For instance, there is almost no mention of Kemble's courtship with Pierce Butler or their infamous divorce. Only a handful of entries address her relationships with family members or her life in the theater. Furthermore, many of the excerpts have no real connection to each other. Clinton desired "to present a chronological narrative of [Kemble's] life in her own words," but the collection needed more editorial apparatus (p. 21). The selections cry out for more historical context—in terms of both the general historical events of the time and, even more importantly, the personal events in Kemble's life—than Clinton provides in the brief introduction. Without the chronology at the beginning, which I turned to repeatedly, it would have been impossible to relate the writings to Kemble's own history. The entries also needed more explicit linkages, as they sometimes spanned ten years in three pages with no editorial comment. To understand the significance of Kemble's views over the decades, the reader must have more knowledge about what was going on with Kemble and her family. The work would have been better served if there had been several editorial paragraphs before each chapter explaining the context within which Kemble wrote, instead of a meager sentence or two scattered throughout the collection. In the end, Clinton simply leaves the reader dissatisfied with this incomplete picture. To understand Fanny Kemble's views and life more fully, one should read either her complete journals, at least the Georgia plantation journal, or Clinton's recent biography of Kemble along with this edited collection.

Widener University

CHARLENE BOYER LEWIS

Hope and Glory is a belated product of a 1997 conference commemorating the one-hundredth anniversary of the dedication of Augustus Saint-Gaudens’s famous memorial to Col. Robert G. Shaw and the soldiers of the 54th Massachusetts Infantry. Although a bit long in coming this book is worth the wait. Readers looking for a new one-volume history of the 54th Massachusetts would be well advised to go elsewhere, but Hope and Glory’s essays represent the most wide-ranging exploration to date—methodologically speaking—of this famous Civil War regiment. The contributors apply the perspectives of social history, cultural history, art history, literary analysis, musicology, and popular culture to the all-black 54th. Although some essays are better than others (inevitable in any anthology), collectively they leave the impression that hardly a stone has been left unturned in the search for new insights into the regiment and its legacy.

The editors have adapted Gen. Colin Powell’s speech at the 1997 anniversary celebration into a serviceable foreword to the volume, which provides a helpful supplement to their own overly brief introduction. The fifteen essays that follow are divided into three sections.

Academic historians dominate the first section. James O. Horton uses his expertise on African Americans in the antebellum North, especially in Boston, to paint a portrait of the world that shaped most of the soldiers who joined the 54th Massachusetts. Edwin S. Redkey, who is working on a larger social history of the 54th, provides a brief but useful demographic portrait of the regiment. Donald Yacovone, a co-editor of this volume, revisits the equal pay controversy that was a defining moment for race relations in the Union Army. The first section concludes with a fascinating essay by Joan Waugh that explores how the family of Robert G. Shaw worked to keep alive his heroic image after the Civil War.

The second section features representations of memory related to the 54th, most particularly but not exclusively in monumental sculpture. David Blight begins this part of the book powerfully with a general essay exploring the 54th Massachusetts within the realm of Civil War memory, drawing from his own unparalleled knowledge in this field showcased most recently in Race and Reunion (2001). Other fine essays in this section include Thomas J. Brown’s exploration of Civil War monuments in postbellum Boston, which nicely puts the Shaw Memorial into its local historic context, and Kirk Savage’s piece adapted from Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves (1997). Indeed, one of the strengths of Hope and Glory derives from the ability of the editors to persuade leading scholars to contribute relevant insights from broader studies to this volume.
The second section includes three other essays that while not quite on par with the offerings of Blight, Brown, and Savage nonetheless make worthwhile contributions. Kathryn Greenhall provides the historical narrative outlining the long process to transform a memorial to Robert G. Shaw from merely an idea to its masterful embodiment in Saint Gaudens's bas-relief sculpture. Marilyn Richards looks at efforts before Saint-Gaudens to memorialize Shaw and the 54th by two African American artists, Edward Mitchell Bannister and Edmonia Lewis. This part of the book ends with a somewhat incongruous, but still interesting piece by James Smethurst that explores how poets over time commemorated the regiment.

The third section emphasizes the manifestations of the 54th Massachusetts in popular culture, especially in the film *Glory* (1989). The best essays in this part of the book are by Thomas Cripps, who argues the Hollywood movie is as much a monument to the 54th as the Shaw Memorial on the Boston Common, and a fascinating piece by Cathy Stanton and Stephen Belyea looking at the place of African Americans in the Civil War reenactment community and how *Glory* helped bring racial diversity into what had heretofore been an almost exclusively white male preserve. There is also a nice essay by co-editor Martin H. Blatt describing the making of *Glory* and how the film measures up in terms of historical authenticity. Two other essays on music and poetry, respectively, round out the third section.

In short, *Hope and Glory* collects a wealth of diverse scholarship on the 54th Massachusetts Infantry into one convenient package. While some of the contributions are not as original as might be wished, it is impossible to read this book in its entirety without seeing the regiment and its place in history in new ways. The editors of this volume should be applauded for bringing together such a disparate group of intellectual talent in Boston in 1997 and having the patience to put together a fine historical anthology out of that conference. *Hope and Glory* represents a worthy addition to the now voluminous literature on the 54th Massachusetts Infantry.

University of Northern Colorado

DONALD R. SHAFFER


This book of Civil War letters differs from all but a handful of others in that it is also partly a book of sketches, recording a soldier's experiences in both and words and drawings.
Charles W. Reed was not an entirely obscure individual, both as soldier and artist, before the publication of this book. As an artist, he is known for the illustrations he provided for John Billings's *Hardtack and Coffee, or the Unwritten Story of the Army* (1887), arguably the most entertaining attempt to capture the daily routine of the average Union soldier. As a soldier, Reed was present at one of the crucial junctures of the war and performed an act of bravery for which he was later awarded the Medal of Honor.

On the second day of the Battle of Gettysburg, Reed's artillery unit, the 9th Massachusetts Battery, was thrust forward to support General Sickles's corps which was on the left-center of the Union line. Sickles was driven back and Reed's battery, under the command of Captain John Bigelow, was asked to sacrifice itself to give time for a new line to be formed in the rear. Reed, as bugler, had little to do. But when Captain Bigelow was wounded as the Confederates finally overran their position, he ignored Bigelow's request to leave him behind, and escorted him to the new line. It should be noted that at the time Reed received the Medal of Honor, in 1895, it was commonly awarded for conspicuous—rarely as in later years for truly extraordinary—acts of bravery. Some recognition might also have been given to the Confederate officer who reportedly could not bear to see the two men shot down in cold blood and ordered his men not to fire at them.

Reed's experience at Gettysburg and his drawings for *Hardtack and Coffee*, however, are not at all representative of what is found in most of "A Grand Terrible Dramma." In *Hardtack and Coffee*, published some twenty years after the war, Reed fell in with Billings's purpose of recollecting the humorous and quirky moments of soldier life. During the war, Reed sketched whatever he could see, his tent or shanty, his camp, the surrounding landscape, and only occasionally a bellicose movement, with no interest in the comic. As a soldier, Reed, though a participant in Meade's campaigns after Gettysburg and Grant's campaigns of 1864–65, was rarely involved directly in battle.

Reed's battery, formed in the summer of 1862, did not reach Washington until early September, when it was assigned to the defenses of the city. This gave them a whole winter of training but also ample time for internal feuding, leading eventually to the resignation of their captain, one Achille De Vecchi, an Italian not up to the task of commanding a large number of cooped-up, near-school-age older boys and young men. One can only sympathize with the kindly, portly De Vecchi who, when their steamboat from Boston to New York passed the famous British ship the *Great Eastern*, popped his head in the window of Reed's cabin and awoke him with the words "Charle, Charl, de great Eastern, de great Eastern" (p. 19).

Reed's letters, mostly to his mother and two sisters, are unexceptional but they survive over the entire span of his military service and, in combination with the many sketches, provide an unusually vivid and complete look at the one soldier's experiences. Add to this that some of the sketches are unique views of important
BOOK REVIEWS

events—his view of the explosion of the mine at Petersburg and sketch of General Sickles and staff under a tree during the Battle of Gettysburg, for example—and the decision to publish is more than justified.

As for criticisms, one is that a number of sketches could have been reproduced on a larger scale, the drawing of Sickles and staff, for instance, and the sketch of the battery's first position at Gettysburg, as well as other landscapes. Another minor irritant is that the editor, in an attempt to reproduce Reed's misspellings, in some places kept too closely to what Reed's writing looked like and lost sight of what he was saying, which would have helped in the deciphering. This results in misreadings: "Danelock" (p. 15) is most likely Havelock; "denced strong dose of salts" (p. 136), deuced; "right with money" (p. 139), tight with money; "it's all bash" (p. 174), it's all bosh. I would also argue that there are instances in which an editor must judge what is a misspelling to be transcribed and what is a slip of the pen not worth inflicting on the future reader. Reed, I suspect, meant to write fumigations not "funnigations" (p. 134) and port[e]monnaie not "portmomaie" (p. 184).

On the whole, however, this book is the product of an enormous amount of energetic and conscientious work and Eric Campbell and Fordham University Press should be congratulated for taking on and completing such a difficult and rare project.

Historical Society of Pennsylvania

JAMES E. WHEATLEY


When most people think of the American Civil War, their minds fill with visions of combat—hordes in blue and gray blazing away at each other on dozens of bloody fields across Dixie. The war not only brought hardship, wounds, and death to the roughly three million male citizens and immigrants who put on uniforms, it also effected radical changes in the lives of those who remained at home. For instance, the destruction of slavery sparked a social revolution whose repercussions are still felt across the United States.

A growing number of historians now focus on how the Civil War impacted on civilians. For the most part, however, their studies deal with Southern communities. That is only natural. Almost all the war's large military campaigns crisscrossed Confederate soil, and there is no doubt that Southern society endured a series of dramatic crises, culminating in emancipation, defeat, occupation, and reconstruction. Nevertheless, the North faced its share of stress and adaptation. Analyzing
the Northern home front experience will prove useful in understanding not only why the Union prevailed, but also the kind of nation that emerged from the war.

*Making and Remaking Pennsylvania's Civil War* does not purport to present a comprehensive overview of the Keystone State's involvement in the Civil War. In the words of its editors, William Blair and William Pencak, this collection of essays serves as a model pointing "to new questions and approaches for understanding the broader war and its consequences." In addition to the mandatory pieces on race and gender, this interesting potpourri contains forays into art and film history, consumer theory, sectionalism, and cultural memory.

As is usually the case with collections of this sort, the essays comprising *Making and Remaking Pennsylvania's Civil War* vary in scope and quality. Only three of the ten contributors are professional historians, and two of them are relatively junior scholars. Three of the remaining contributors are graduate students in history, two are librarians, one is an art historian, and one is a professor of art. The editors can be faulted for not obtaining essays dealing with such important issues as immigration and wartime economic developments.

One of the book's strongest selections comes from Barbara A. Gannon, a doctoral student at Pennsylvania State University. In "Sites of Memory, Sites of Glory: African-American Grand Army of the Republic Posts in Pennsylvania," Gannon examines the surprisingly prominent role that blacks played in that famous organization for Union veterans. African Americans created their own GAR posts or joined integrated ones. They worked within the GAR to remind white comrades that blacks had fought for their own freedom and that the destruction of slavery represented the Civil War's central drama.

Co-editor William Blair explores the mass media's tendency to sanitize the Civil War with "The Brothers' War: Gettysburg the Movie and American Memory." Blair, an associate professor at Penn State and editor of *Civil War History,* exposes Gettysburg as an expression of white romanticism. Rather than address the issues that inspired the Civil War, the film dances around them, depicting soldiers on both sides simply as noble men and friends forced to kill each other over abstract principles.

*Making and Remaking Pennsylvania's Civil War* may fall short in places, but it does demonstrate the need for greater balance in Civil War studies. Military historians cannot understand the conflict without studying the societies from which the soldiers came, the societies to which they returned, and why they fought. At the same time, social and cultural historians cannot afford to ignore how thoroughly military affairs permeated American society from 1861 to 1865. Military illiteracy will place blinders on their scholarship and leave Civil War studies a house divided.

*Temple University*  

GREGORY J. W. URWIN

This beautifully produced, thoroughly researched volume details the intersection of science, technology, and entrepreneurship in the nineteenth-century United States. In the 1840s, looking for ways to fund their operations, and possessing extremely accurate timekeeping instruments, antebellum astronomers began selling time signals to local businesses and communities. Attempted first by William Cranch Bond of the Cambridge Observatory, and more or less perfected by Samuel Langley at the Allegheny Observatory, this system allowed astronomers in a dozen greater and lesser observatories to sell time signals. Such sales helped to raise both income and prestige in their local communities. Observatory time services served to elevate the authority of science and its control patent on "accuracy."

But Langley’s ability to make money by selling time signals to the Pennsylvania Railroad depended as much on cozy personal relationships with the Pennsylvania’s management and with local industrialists as it did on accuracy: it presents an interesting example of how science has never stood very far from commerce and has depended on its own versions of entrepreneurship. In this it follows the emphasis on science’s relation to business described in Robert V. Bruce, The Launching of Modern American Science, 1846–1876 (1987), in offering a sharply detailed account of individual astronomers melding technological innovation with an eye for business.

Following the establishment of standard time zones in 1883, observatories lost out to Western Union and the Naval Observatory. The Naval Observatory provided free time signals which were then distributed and sold by Western Union at far lower rates than individual observatories were charging. By 1900 commercial observatory time services had vanished. This too presents an interesting example of how public services may be turned to private profit.

While parts of this story have been told elsewhere, by Bartky in several excellent articles, by Carlene Stephens, and by myself, Bartky’s book provides a closely researched, sharp-eyed and straightforward narrative of the technological breakthroughs and political maneuverings required to make electronic time distribution possible. In doing so the book makes an original contribution to the literature on the technology of timekeeping and its intersection with the public.

It is, however, almost completely uninvolved in larger questions about time, timekeeping, and society. The book makes little attempt to explain, for example, why there should have been widespread interest in highly accurate time signals. Astronomers tended to warn darkly of railroad disasters that would follow in the wake of unstandardized time, though no clear connection between varied local times
and train wrecks has ever been established. And although Bartky describes the energy and determination of pioneering scientists, it is also clear that the scientific community lacked the clout necessary to bring standard time to the public. As Michel Foucault and Benedict Anderson have both suggested, standardized time served an important role in the process of imagining the modern nation. It was driven by commercial forces and markets, but also by a need for connectedness and an anxiety about place and surveillance. Bartky pays no attention to what might be termed the cultural history of time, or to questions about standardization and its impact on American life. But these are large questions and by ignoring them, Bartky has still produced a readable, accurate, precise, and useful account of a history few know much about.

George Mason University

MICHAEL O’MALLEY

Petrolia: The Landscape of America’s First Oil Boom. By BRIAN BLACK. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000. xii, 235p. Illustrations, tables, notes, bibliography, index. $42.50.)

“I attempt,” Brian Black writes in his preface, “to tell a story that goes beyond the commodity that defined the meaning of this place and to return to it its meaning” (p. xi). The commodity is, of course, petroleum. The place is the Venango County, Pennsylvania, oil field concentrated along a portion of the upper Allegheny River and its Oil Creek and Pithole Creek tributaries. Dubbed “Petrolia” by the author, this region in 1870 produced some 72 percent of the nation’s petroleum, or some 94 percent of the world’s total (p. 112). The meaning that Black explores is that of exploitative mineral extraction with its speculative boom and bust implications. Here were concentrated some of America’s first thoroughly industrialized landscapes, places created, and subsequently largely abandoned, through the single-mindedness of unfettered, short-term profit-taking.

“Rock oil,” or petroleum, came to be prized as an illuminant, a cheap alternative to whale oil. It was valued early as a lubricant and for its presumed medicinal properties in curing a wide array of ailments. Only in the automobile age did gasoline and other fuels emerge as important energy sources. Described in some detail are the roles played by various people in creating Petrolia: Edwin L. Drake (who in 1859, acting on behalf of a distant investor syndicate, sank the nation’s first successful oil well at Titusville using techniques perfected for obtaining salt brine), Jonathon Watson (who became the first speculator to assemble large leaseholds as a means of controlling the new underground wealth), and John D. Rockefeller (who through railroad freight-rate fixing came to dominate the transportation, refining, and marketing of the region’s petroleum.
and eventually the oil industry nationwide). Petrolia was characterized by over-drilling with very negative environmental, if not social, consequences. Under the “rule of capture” operators sought to extract from oil beds as much petroleum as possible as quickly as possible. This encouraged the “tragedy of the commons” whereby each player extracted oil wastefullly from underground so that others would not reap benefit.

Petrolia’s built environment was purely functional and, for the most part, only of temporary expedience, there being no guarantee that well-drilling would be successful or, if successful, that wells would prove productive over the long term. Indeed, impermanence proved the norm. For example, Pithole City, which rose to a population of some 10,000 people in 1865, had virtually ceased to exist by 1877 (p. 146). Even when thriving, oil field towns were largely unplanned, flimsily-built of wood, and wasteful of land. These were “sacrificial landscapes” where nature and potentially sustainable urban infrastructure was sacrificed to an “ethic of transiency.” The entrepreneurs created a built environment that was dangerous: flood and fire as well as disease brought constant grief to Petrolia. And yet the popular image of the region at the time, created largely through newspaper reporting, was very positive. Degraded environment was made to symbolize progress through technical prowess. Danger lurked, but in its reporting it was made a journalistic tool to stimulate reader interest, heroic tales of disaster complementing stories of economic success.

Brian Black’s accomplishment is not a mere retelling of an old story: one of technological and economic triumph perhaps. Rather, he poses a number of important questions. Why was Petrolia’s seemingly unlimited dominance by oil seen by nineteenth-century Americans as so inevitable? How could landscape of overt expediency, and thus of substantial degradation, have been so readily accepted and, indeed, celebrated? Was it the property system with its implications for unchecked individualism? Was it belief in a nation’s unlimited resources, especially land? How could such exaggerated “wasting places” go so unchallenged? None of these questions are thoroughly answered. Nor would the reader expect them to be. But their posing in the context of a detailed historical case study serves a useful purpose. The reader is reminded of how wasteful past economic development in America tended to be and also of the arrogance implicit in the belief that, with technology, humankind can somehow ignore long-run consequences. Although museums have been created to celebrate Petrolia’s history, and a few parks created on reclaimed land, the scars of its past still linger as contemporary place. It is Petrolia’s meaning that the author would not have us forget.

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
JOHN A. JAKLE

The tiny Spanish-American War-era cruiser Olympia lies on the Philadelphia riverfront nearly invisible against the city’s new waterfront construction and development. Nearby, the huge rusting relics of the super ocean liner United States and the mighty Iowa-class battleship New Jersey draw the attention of those who rush daily across the two Delaware River bridges between Camden and Philadelphia. Few notice the small, white-hulled warship berthed there as a floating museum.

The history of Olympia, as B. F. Cooling demonstrates in this book, has been equally obscure as well. After its initial heroic naval duty as Admiral Dewey’s flagship in Pacific operations during the Spanish American War, the cruiser performed largely routine tasks as it was quickly rendered obsolete by rapidly evolving naval technology. Olympia’s major contribution to U.S. naval history was to carry the body of the unknown soldier from Europe to Washington in 1921 for reburial in Arlington National Cemetery. Retired in 1925, Olympia was laid up in the freshwater Reserve Basin at the Philadelphia Navy Yard until the Navy decided in the 1950s to scrap it. At that time, historic preservationists saved the cruiser and brought it to its present-day berthing near Independence Seaport Museum, which manages the historic site.

Cooling participated in the early years of the ship’s restoration, and now writes this history to honor those “who have worked tirelessly through the years to save, preserve, and interpret the USS Olympia as part of the national heritage.” He frames that historical heritage around the notion that Olympia was a herald of the New Empire, a path-breaking steel and steam warship design that projected American sea power to the Pacific during the Spanish American War and made the U.S. a world power. Cooling argues that Olympia’s history should be studied as a metaphor for the rise of American naval power and imperialist adventures during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, culminating with its duty as flagship for the Great White Fleet in 1907.

Efforts to place Olympia at the center of other developments are less successful, however. Cooling admits throughout that the ship was merely an observer as the United States built its navy second to none, straddling the eras of commerce raiding and battleships. Technologically, Olympia’s ordnance, machinery, and design were obsolete before it saw service in war. Its role and mission was never defined after the war, and it drifted through naval history. Olympia always seemed to be in the way at the Philadelphia Navy Yard. For nearly a quarter century, captains of the yard tried to find a place to berth the old cruiser to make space for larger, more modern warships mothballed in the overcrowded Reserve Basin.

Nevertheless, Cooling’s assumption that this ship’s history is one way of looking
at larger naval and historical developments provides a worthwhile approach, and certainly the book successfully resurrects Olympia's historical reputation. It is too much to suggest, however, that the long-neglected cruiser should take a position at the head of the battle line of floating museums of America's historic naval fighting ships. That designation more appropriately must go to Constitution, Missouri, New Jersey, Nautilus, Intrepid, or even the submerged Monitor.

Rutgers University, Camden

JEFFERY M. DORWART


In September 1946, Time magazine noted the centenary of St. Vincent's Archabbey in Latrobe, Pennsylvania, with an article entitled "The Black Monks." In a fashion all too typical even today of secular reporting about Roman Catholic religious orders, it portrayed the monks and monasteries as quaint remnants of a bygone era—a kind of theme park of medieval nostalgia. The monks were understandably displeased with this simple-minded trivialization of their life and work, ironically arranged by their own ambitious publicity director.

It's too bad Jerome Oetgen's book on the abbey was not available then. Through these pages one does not enter some strange medieval time warp, but rather into the experience of a hard-working community of men who shaped their physical and human environment to suit their needs and the demands of a growing Catholic populace. If they had been set in colonial New England, they would be picking rocks out of the soil, catching and salting fish, and creating prosperous local industries. Their hard work contributed in no small measure to the economic and social development of western Pennsylvania, at one time America's frontier. At the same time they contributed yet another fascinating layer to the richly complex religious geography of Pennsylvania.

Oetgen is no stranger to the history of the abbey, having authored a very fine biography of its founder, Boniface Wimmer. Appropriately, then, Oetgen begins with Wimmer, the Projektenmacher of the Abbey of Metten in Germany who successfully transplanted a revived Benedictine monasticism to American soil. On a highly disputed piece of ecclesiastical turf in Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania, Wimmer and his cadre of junior monks created a monastic village that became the epicenter of a Benedictine empire. Key to the success that Wimmer enjoyed was his willingness to be pragmatic about the keeping of the Benedictine rule. These monks stressed the "labora" part of the Benedictine maxim of "ora et labora" (prayer and
work) and devoted themselves tirelessly to the American apostolate, at times at the expense of the more contemplative dimensions of their lives. In those formative years all caught the spirit of the Projecketenmacher. Like a form of spiritual DNA it was passed down from one generation to the next. These monks took parishes in the Diocese of Pittsburgh and its successor, the Diocese of Greensburg. They tilled the soil, brewed beer, studied abroad, founded missions, and thoroughly devoted themselves to building a visible Catholic presence in the United States and abroad. Their particular interpretation of the Rule of St. Benedict brought periodic bouts of angst over the quality of their monastic life. At times they elected abbots who promised to restore a pristine Benedictinism. However, the parish work in particular brought them more benefits than liabilities: a steady flow of money, candidates for their religious life, and a convenient dumping ground for troublesome community members who simply could not live at such close quarters for too long. By the time Wimmer died in 1887, St. Vincent's was an established and respected institution. The jewels in its crown were its new foundations in the United States and abroad, most of which evolved into Benedictine communities.

Oetgen's account is fulsome. He touches on every important aspect of monastic life from liturgy to the particulars of farming. He does not shrink from covering painful and embarrassing moments in the life of the community. For example, he relates for many pages the shenanigans of an actively homosexual monk who claimed to have special revelations from the Almighty. Likewise, he recounts the story of a failed mission to China and the gross (and perhaps felonious) financial misconduct of Abbot Aurelius Stehle who borrowed $250,000 from a New York bank without the consent of his monastic community. The inability of the community to pay off the debt led to a bitter scolding from Pope Pius XI and a period of conflict between the monasteries as the monks of St. Vincent's tried to get the other monasteries to help shoulder the loan.

As he chronicles the rich history of the abbey, Oetgen also weaves the development of the academy and the major seminary into his narrative and does this exceptionally well until the last chapter which relates the period from 1940 to 1963. Here the story bogs down completely when he describes the disastrous fire that ruined the monastery in early 1963 by giving a "where they were" account of various monks who witnessed the conflagration. In this section, as one might expect, Oetgen is too close to the subject to give it the same quality of historical perspective found in his treatments of previous epochs of St. Vincent's history.

Oetgen's primary audience appears to be the monks of the various abbeys that trace their origins to St. Vincent's, for he lists in painstaking detail the names of virtually all of the founding fathers and brothers of each new foundation. Likewise, his careful attention to the details of monastic elections and the distinctive nomenclature of monastic practices (e.g. "chapters") indicates that he expects his readers to understand these terms. For the nonmonastic reader the detail at times
...is excessive and gets in the way of this essentially solid account. In addition, Oetgen's appropriate respect for his monastic subjects sometimes borders on the hagiographical style that once characterized Catholic history.

Overall, however, Oetgen has done the abbey a considerable service by providing this nearly encyclopedic account of its origins and impact. Oetgen's story validates the perennial wisdom of St. Benedict's Rule which has always tried to strike a balance between being in the world but not of it.

Marquette University  
STEVEN M. AVELLA


Historians, even those not especially interested in Du Bois or African American history, should read Lewis's biography because it will teach them much about biography, narrative, "voice," exhaustive research, perceptive analysis, and graceful writing. Lewis gets about as close to Du Bois as any biographer could—but never so close as to lose objectivity. It's almost as if Lewis was lurking in the corners of Jim Crow and later Cold War America, shadowing the great and frustrated man, listening to his mutterings, measuring his ego, identifying with his frustrations, and feeling his pain.

there’s Lewis observing Du Bois moving to Africa, renouncing his American citizenship, and becoming a citizen of Ghana. The great black leader died there in 1963.

While clearly sympathetic to Du Bois and convinced of his brilliance and signal importance, Lewis nonetheless underscores Du Bois’s complexities, presents his inconsistencies, and admits his failings. “To know Du Bois,” Lewis writes, “was to become acquainted with the problem of the twentieth century—the problem of the color line—in one of its most intensely complex embodiments, and the experience of knowing Du Bois was frequently a searing one” (p. 2). Contemplative and combative, mercurial and militant, passionate and persuasive, Du Bois was enveloped by the veil of American racism that he so brilliantly described in The Souls of Black Folk (1903). The miasma of racism simultaneously suffocated and energized Du Bois. During the Depression, for example, Du Bois conceived a “race-centered political economy,” Lewis explains, one that joined “cultural nationalism, Scandinavian cooperativism, Booker Washington, and Marx in about equal parts. No other alternative had been left to him and his people” (p. 265).

Whereas many blacks balked at Du Bois’s new advocacy of segregation without discrimination, they overwhelmingly welcomed his Black Reconstruction, a work that Lewis rightly praises as “one of the superlative achievements in the writing of American history” (p. 360). Unlike previous students, Du Bois placed slaves and the freedpeople at the heart of the Civil War era. “By far,” Lewis writes, “Black Reconstruction’s greatest achievement was to weave a credible historical narrative in which black people, suddenly admitted to citizenship in an environment of feral hostility, displayed admirable volition and intelligence as well as the indolence and ignorance inherent in three centuries of bondage. It invested these former slaves... with what a later generation of historians would gravely call agency” (p. 368). “Analytical yet intuitive, densely researched but impressionistic, judicious and sweeping, Black Reconstruction pushed the figurative beyond the bounds of the historically permissible in its determination to integrate black labor into a Marxist schematic of proletarian overcoming” (p. 373). Lewis’s insightful interpretation of Du Bois’s classic text is a model of historiographical analysis.

Lewis also provides the best available assessment of the last quarter-century of Du Bois’s life. In 1936, for example, Du Bois traveled to Europe and Asia to compare industrial education worldwide with its counterpart in America. The trip included an extended stay in Hitler’s Germany. “Whenever he traveled outside the United States,” Lewis explains, “Du Bois was invariably seized by an almost giddy feeling of liberation, an exhilaration that often billowed into magniloquent opinionatedness and archly inflected prose” (p. 115). When abroad, Lewis notes, Du Bois was always “on the alert for telling acts of racial civility, often investing them with a significance motivated as much by genuine gratitude as by the
satisfaction of reproaching his own country” (p. 395).

Though feted as a distinguished scholar by the Nazis, and impressed by many features of the Third Reich, Du Bois found “no tragedy in modern times equal in its awful effects to the fight on the Jews in Germany.” Years before the world learned of the horrors of the Holocaust, Du Bois blasted German anti-Semitism as “an attack on civilization, comparable only to such horrors as the Spanish Inquisition and the African slave trade. It has set civilization back a hundred years” (p. 400). Though sympathetic to Jews, Du Bois nonetheless stated publicly that in Germany their persecution “occurs in a legal way, and in the open, even if it is cruel and unjust.” In contrast, he wrote, American blacks were oppressed “in flagrant violation of the law” (p. 420). “That he spoke of the German situation with an occasional inflection typical of the WASP of the day,” Lewis concludes, “was because Du Bois was essentially a brown-skinned New England gentile and, less admirably, because he was willing to score points against his own country for the discrimination against Negroes by recourse to legalistic sophistries about the sufferings of another religious or racial group—sophistries of which he, of all observers, should have been ashamed” (p. 421).

Similar poignant, fair-minded observations appear throughout Lewis’s distinguished work. In Du Bois, Lewis found a daunting, towering research subject. In Lewis, Du Bois found his definitive biographer.

North Carolina State University

JOHN DAVID SMITH