or Anglican, had seen their faiths fall from prominence and the mercantile elite of their parents’ generation give way to a new elite of manufacturers and professional politicians. Is it their houses or their status that these women sought to preserve? And do these houses truly speak to us or is it the poems and journals of their former residents that bring these houses to life?

The book is a provocative, complex, and fascinating investigation of women and remembrance. It is filled with important insights on life and literature in early national America and makes the reader wish for more on women as writers, as educators of rising generations of women, as shapers of familial and national memories. Whether the many parts add up to the whole will be decided differently by each reader.

Temple University

SUSAN E. KLEPP


Peter Kafar’s study is a valuable addition to Charles Brockden Brown scholarship insofar as it brings to light a wealth of new biographical and historical information concerning Brown’s family, the family’s relations with the Philadelphia Quaker community, and Brown’s relations with his closest cultural and intellectual fellow travelers. Some of Kafar’s work was published in articles, but the more complete presentation in book form makes this necessary reading for anyone working on Brown. Kafar’s accounts of Brown’s family history, his father’s banishment and vicissitudes as a businessman, and the identification of possible background for the “Henrietta” letters and aspects of Brown's novels all supplement and extend previous biographical scholarship in valuable ways that will undoubtedly inform future Brown scholarship.

The book’s strength lies in this wealth of indispensable contextual information. Despite many insights (e.g., chapter 3’s discussion of the dynamics behind the Brown-Smith-Bringhurst correspondence), however, the study is not as successful when it comes to combining this rich biographical-historical material with persuasive theses and commentary about Brown’s novels and larger career. The study is uncomfortable with contemporary (post-1985) Brown scholarship and with adequately theorized scholarship in general and consequently relies primarily on dated literary-critical work and undertheorized approaches to the period’s literary and cultural transformations. There is much valuable work on Brown before 1985, of course, but relying on it in this manner leads the study to reproduce critical commonplaces and assumptions that have been largely abandoned or whose significance has changed dramatically in the last twenty years.
The study aims to combine newfound biographical and historical insights with a reading of Brown's novelistic corpus in order to explore Brown as the initiator of an “American Gothic” mode. Yet the study never engages with the rich, ever-expanding body of recent scholarship on the gothic and its cultural twin, sentiment. Consequently the discussion of the gothic, and of Brown's novels, is extremely limited and based on aestheticized and psychologistic assumptions concerning the period's literary modes and their functions. This reliance on older scholarship also leads the study to provide a somewhat lopsided perspective on Brown's corpus as a whole, maximizing the role of the first four (“gothic”-“Godwinian”) novels while minimizing or even negating the significance and complexity of the later novels and nonnovelistic writings. Further, it leads the study to repeat dated commonplaces regarding Brown's supposed Federalist and conservative leanings in the post-novelistic years, without noting reviews in anti-Jacobin and Federalist periodicals or other evidence that suggests that contemporary Federalists saw Brown as an opponent rather than an ally. Overall, the version of Brown that appears here leans toward present-day, founding father revaluations, presenting Brown (and the gothic mode) as nationalistic, backward looking, and dependent on previous generations, an antimodern reading that obscures Brown's radical-democratic, cosmopolitan, progressive lineage and the gothic's role in the Atlantic revolutionary age.

Most dramatically, the study relies on exaggerated and often tendentious psychobiographical speculation that construes Brown's writings as expressions of an inner psychological reality. The inner Brown, on this reading, is a creature of atavistic neuroses and obsessions related to the “tribal drama” of the Quaker community (p. 79; a notion of Brown's “tribal” consciousness is developed and emphasized throughout). Such psychologistic speculation provides a particularly unpersuasive view of Brown's development and writings, even though it figures occasionally in Brown criticism since the 1815 Paul Allen-William Dunlap biography and has recently been emphasized by Steven Watts (1994) and Caleb Crain (2001).

University of Kansas

PHILIP BARNARD


Manufacturing Revolution is an exceptional study of the actors, events, and especially the ideas that laid the groundwork for industrialization in the early American republic. For Peskin, people and circumstances matter far more than the “broad impersonal forces” offered by Marx's angst-ridden stage theory,