Clio’s Cornucopia: The Last Quarter Century of Historical Scholarship on Philadelphia

Fifteen years in the making, Philadelphia: A 300-Year History was the first comprehensive history of Penn’s “greene country towne” since 1912 and certainly the most scholarly and interpretive history ever published. With 751 pages of text divided into sixteen chapters and sprinkled with carefully chosen lithographs, paintings, and photographs, the book drew upon senior historians, most of whom were educated in the decades bracketing World War II. Appropriate to their training and interests, the fluidly written essays focused mostly on the city’s political, institutional, and cultural history with due attention to religion, economic development, and the built environment. Chief officers of The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, the Library Company of Philadelphia, and the Winterthur Museum contributed essays, while other chapters came from the hands of faculty members at Bryn Mawr, Haverford, the University of Pennsylvania, Temple University, and a few outlying colleges. It was an insiders’ history,

A quarter century later, the book still reads well because its authors were skillful wordsmiths and because the authors, mindful that they were trying to reach a broad public audience, happily abandoned stiff academic prose. The essays had whiffs of humor, plenty of bite, and even excursions here and there into the sensational (such as the lurid tales of the Lanzetti brothers, the racket kings who controlled South Philadelphia in the 1930s). The editor (Russell F. Weigley) and the associate editors (Nicholas B. Wainwright and Edwin Wolf 2nd) gave the chapter writers, including themselves, plenty of leash to write forcefully. In his chapter on “The Border City in Civil War,” for example, Weigley did not conceal his disgust that it took “the outrageous exclusion of black men who were
serving in the armed forces of the Union, and of their families” finally to begin, late in the war, to “crack the resistance of the streetcar companies and the indifference of white Philadelphia” (p. 415). Nor did he shrink from averring that “the first families of Philadelphia did not accept revolution gladly in 1776, and again they did not now,” as the nation verged on Civil War (p. 403). Elizabeth Geffen's frank, peppery prose on pre–Civil War racism, antiabolitionism, anti-Catholicism, and antilaborism leaves the reader no doubts about her progressive outlook.

That the 300-Year History is slightly irreverent and steadfastly reformist in its political stance should not have evoked surprise because historians in general, with a few exceptions, are liberal in politics and progressive on social issues. It bears remembering, as well, that the essays were written in the midst of the civil rights movement, the Vietnam War, and the women's movement—in other words, in one of the most tumultuous and contested eras of American history. Also, at the time the book was commissioned in 1967, women's history was emerging from its infancy and African American history, building from a thin line of pioneers, was entering a period of rapid expansion that has continued to the present. Thus, the book's authors (or so it seems) were attuned to, if not quite part of, challenges to the consensus school of American history that had come to the fore in the post–World War II years. Considering that what is called “the new social history” was still aborning, most of the authors were ahead of their time in giving some notice to the roles, struggles, and accomplishments of African Americans, women, immigrants, labor organizers, radicals, street life and street gangs, popular culture, sports, and other such topics.

The coverage of these topics, to be sure, was uneven. The book slighted the full panoply of the city’s peoples in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The treatment of the American Revolution, as experienced and shaped in Philadelphia, was seen as a mostly top-down affair with street leaders, lower-class strategists, and broadside pamphleteers such as James Cannon and Timothy Matlack unmentioned and the yeasty work of the Committee of Privates entirely ignored. More surprising, some well-known top-echelon figures eluded notice, such as Tadeusz Kosciuszko, designer of some of the Delaware River fortifications that kept the British navy at a distance and later a confidant and friend of Thomas Jefferson in 1797–98 after the Polish hero returned to the city. Though they numbered several thousand in the city, African Americans, to judge by the silence on
them, had no role in the American Revolution. Even the Gradual Abolition Act of 1780, the first in the western world, was left unmentioned. In chronicling the city’s history after the Revolution, the chapter author paid no attention to the Saint Dominguan black refugees, pouring off ships in the 1790s in the grasp of fleeing white planter and merchant slavemasters. Nor did nineteenth- and twentieth-century African American leaders and activists such as William Douglass, Steven Gloucester, Robert Douglass, Jarena Lee, Sarah and Margaretta Forten, Sarah Mapps Douglass, Cyrus Bustill, Crystal Bird Fauset, and Father Divine merit attention. Silence on black life in Philadelphia in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries was complete, though coverage of black Philadelphians just before and after the Civil War took up many paragraphs.

Women and Native Americans fared little better. Only two sentences of the Lenape people before European arrival detained the authors of the chapter on Philadelphia’s founding. Important revolutionary era and early national era women such as Elizabeth Willing Powel, Elizabeth Graeme Ferguson, Elizabeth Drinker, Esther de Berdt Reed, Rebecca Jackson, Sarah Franklin Bache, and even Deborah Franklin escaped notice. Nor did the book treat women’s arrival on the public scene in the early nineteenth century through organizations such as the Magdalen Society, the Female Bible Society, the Female Society for the Relief of the Distressed, and the Female Anti-Slavery Society. Left unnoticed were Harriet Probasco, 1840s editor and publisher of American Women, the first newspaper of its kind, or E. D. E. N. Southworth, whose books, admittedly pulpish, outsold every Transcendentalist author of the antebellum era. Native Americans all but disappear after the late seventeenth century, making only a cameo appearance in connection with the Paxton Boys massacre of 1764. None of the Indian delegations to Philadelphia when the city was the nation’s capital in the last decade of the eighteenth century appear in the book, and even the founding of the Indian Rights Association in 1882 in Philadelphia went unnoticed.

In the quarter century since the 300-Year History appeared, scholarship on Philadelphia and its hinterlands has grown rapidly, gathering momentum and reaching nowadays the equivalent of a category five, full-force storm. Without precise quantitative analysis, it is safe to say that more books have been published on Philadelphia in the last twenty-five years than in the three previous centuries. What is more, the Philadelphia history factory has turned out far more durable goods than historians of any other
seaboard city with early colonial roots such as Boston, New York, and Charleston (though New York City may come close).

Including biographies of its famed sons and daughters, more than two hundred books on Philadelphia’s history have rolled off the presses since 1982—about ten a year on average! If we count mayoral campaign biographies, art museum exhibit catalogues (these days boasting deeply researched and often sparkling historical essays), volumes of edited historical documents, beautifully edited papers of such worthies as William Penn, Benjamin Franklin, Robert Morris, Charles Willson Peale, and John Bartram, and shorter monographs in the *Transactions* and *Proceedings* of the American Philosophical Society, the number easily exceeds four hundred. I leave to others the counting of journal articles on Philadelphia and its environs, published most numerously in the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* and *Pennsylvania History* but also in the *William and Mary Quarterly*, the *Journal of the Early Republic*, and many other journals. Whatever the number, the trend is unmistakable: a veritable meteor shower of scholarly works illuminating the city’s history in all its dimensions and at all levels of society.

This outburst of historical work might be explained by the sheer number of aspiring young historians entering the field, but the fact is that the production of PhDs in American history has remained fairly level over the last quarter century. The explanation must be found elsewhere. To some degree, not easily measured, the answer in part comes from a change of attitude among Philadelphia-area graduate advisers that to study Philadelphia and its hinterland is not provincial at all. For years, it was almost scripture at the University of Pennsylvania that early American history aspirants should look outside the Philadelphia area for dissertation topics. But that has changed. Equally if not more important is the rise of several well-funded centers devoted to mid-Atlantic studies, where a special focus on Philadelphia was a natural consequence. The McNeil Center for Early American Studies at the University of Pennsylvania, founded by Richard S. Dunn in 1978 as the Philadelphia Center for Early American Studies and nourished through the generosity of Robert L. McNeil Jr., its principal benefactor, has flourished with a growing number of predoctoral dissertation fellowships that have attracted some of the most promising young scholars from around the nation. With its energetic seminars meeting biweekly throughout most of the academic year, a summer seminar series, and brown bag luncheons, the McNeil
Center has spurred interest in the Quaker city and its spacious catch basin. Strengthening the Philadelphia area as the go-to place for young scholars was the Regional Economic History Research Center (later renamed the Center for the History of Business, Technology, and Society) at the Hagley Museum and Library in Wilmington, Delaware. Founded in 1976 and directed for many years by Glenn Porter, the Museum and Library created a parallel center of mid-Atlantic studies. With mounting collections ranging from prerevolutionary Philadelphia-area merchant account books and correspondence to massive troves of records from modern banks and corporations such as the Philadelphia Savings Funds Society and Strawbridge & Clothier, and with dissertation and post-doctoral fellowships and a vibrant seminar series, the center further spread the word of scholarly opportunities awaiting fledgling historians. The triad was complete with the recent founding in 2002 of the Program in Early American Economy and Society at the Library Company of Philadelphia, where dissertation and postdoctoral fellowships, seminars, and conferences now attract junior and senior historians, especially those working on the history of commerce, business, banking, transportation, household economies, and technology.

Apart from following the money, young social scientists have descended on Philadelphia, the southernmost of the northern cities, because the city has fascinated scholars as one of the most religiously and ethnically diverse metropolitan areas in the nation; as a center of literary, cultural, medical, photographic, and technological innovation; and, owing much to its Quaker legacy, as a springboard for reform movements. In short, as Sam Bass Warner argued four decades ago, Philadelphia has been a laboratory of the American experience.1

Nor can it be discounted that the vagaries of flood and fire damage and inadvertent or purposeful record disposal have treated Philadelphia more gently than any other Atlantic seaboard city of the colonial, revolutionary, early national, and antebellum eras. Adding to the appeal of Philadelphia’s research opportunities are the rich and deep manuscript and rare book collections of the American Philosophical Society, the Library Company of Philadelphia, The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, the Athenaeum, the Atwater Kent Museum, the Pennsylvania Hospital, the Rosenbach Museum and Library, the

Presbyterian Historical Society, the City Archives (with arguably the most extensive municipal records of any Atlantic seaboard city), a regional branch of the National Archives, the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts, the Independence Seaport Museum, the Civil War Library and Museum, the Franklin Institute, the Masonic Library and Museum, the National Museum of American Jewish History, and archives at a host of colleges and universities such as Haverford, Swarthmore, Temple, and the University of Pennsylvania. No wonder scholars now flock to Philadelphia in a kind of East Coast scholarly Gold Rush.  

It was only natural that as the trajectory of scholarly production spiraled upward, the University of Pennsylvania Press and Temple University Press should muscle up their previously slender offerings in American history, and especially the history of Philadelphia and the mid-Atlantic region. With Philadelphia attracting young historians from around the country trying to make their mark, the two main scholarly presses in Philadelphia picked low-hanging fruit off the trees as they had never before had an opportunity to do. In 1998, as if following the venerable tradition of trying out Broadway plays in New Haven, the McNeil Center for Early American Studies began publishing the best of its seminar papers in annual volumes. All matters considered, scholarly publication in the quarter century since the publication of the 300-Year History has been little short of spectacular.

How has this torrent of scholarship reconfigured our understanding of the city’s 325-year past? To begin with, the publication of multivolume series of the letters, essays, and diaries of great and nearly great Philadelphians, supported by generous funding from corporations, foundations, and especially the National Historical Publications and Records Commission and the National Endowment for the Humanities, has systematically stored up a trove of once-hidden gold: encyclopedic knowledge of the city’s family, church, neighborhood, economic, political, and cultural networks. Historical editing has come of age with special programs at several universities producing editors for this kind of invaluable contextualizing of the documents and the painstaking identification of names, places, relationships, literary allusions, and back stories. Library shelves are now lined with scores of meticulously edited volumes of

---


3 At first titled Explorations in Early American Culture, the series became Early American Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal in 2003.
Philadelphia's famous that provide a bonanza of information.

Near cousins of these multivolume documentary projects have been biographies, always a staple of a city's history but now issuing forth with attention to less-than-famous Philadelphians. New biographies will always be added, and the past quarter century has seen plenty of them—lesser mortals such as printers Christopher Sauer and his son; eighteenth-century politicians George Clymer, John Dickinson, Charles Thomson, and George Bryan; naturalists John and William Bartram; antebellum political activists William McMullan, Lucretia Mott, Robert Purvis, and George Lippard; orator Anna Dickinson; spiritualist Mother Rebecca Jackson; the Houston and Woodward families of Chestnut Hill; architects and builders Robert Smith, Frank Furness, and John Notman; sailmaker-activist James Forten; naval officer and diplomat James Biddle; salonistes Elizabeth Graeme Fergusson, Elizabeth Willing Powel, and Rebecca Gratz; and business titans, including the soap-producing Fels family, financier Anthony Drexel, media moguls Moses and Walter Annenberg, and department store innovator John Wanamaker.4

And then there are the iconic figures of the founding era. A clutch of biographies have kept the endlessly fascinating Thomas Paine before the public, though he is still too radical to qualify in the minds of many as a true founding father. Not so with Franklin, nearly everyone’s favorite. An armful of biographies, some of them spurred by the approach of his three hundredth birthday in 2006, along with thirty-seven volumes of his papers published since 1958 (now accessible online), have made Philadelphia’s polymath the city’s most heralded son. Though born and raised in Boston, the descendants of the City on the Hill have lost him irretrievably to his adopted city. This was abundantly clear in 2006, the tricentennial year of his birth. Hardly noticed in Boston, he was commemorated, evaluated, appreciated, and occasionally sneered at as an opportunistic flip-flopper all over the city, most spectacularly at the new National Constitution Center where lead curator Page Talbott and Tercentenary executive director Rosalind Remer filled up eight thousand square feet with a dazzling array of exhibits, many of them interactive, that made Ben accessible to a wide variety of people of all ages. Those not surfeited with viewing thousands of objects, paintings, manuscripts, maps, prints, puzzles, and inventions assembled from fifty-two institutions and nineteen individuals could take home the exhibit catalogue sprinkled with hundreds of color images of the exhibit materials amidst ten illuminating essays by notable historians.

So much Franklin but so little Penn has appeared over the last quarter century. Philadelphia’s founder, strange to say, still awaits his biographer, all the more remarkable given how closely Philadelphia is still associated with its visionary, enigmatic progenitor and given the handsomely constructed five-volume series of Penn’s correspondence and writings edited by Richard Dunn and Mary Maples Dunn. While a new biography by J. William Frost is in the making, historians must content themselves with a group of cutting-edge essays on Penn and his Anglo-American world authored by conferees commemorating in 1982 the tercentennial of Pennsylvania’s founding, which carry our understanding of him well beyond the older, somewhat antiquated biographies. The Society of

---

5 At least ten biographies of Paine have been published since 1982 and fourteen of Franklin. In addition are many studies of particular aspects of Paine and Franklin’s work.


7 Richard S. Dunn and Mary Maples Dunn, eds., *The World of William Penn* (Philadelphia, 1986). Nor has James Logan, Penn’s trusted associate, bibliophile, and cultural paragon, found a dedicated biographer or editor of his voluminous papers. Such important financial, political, and
Friends, however, has not lacked attention. Unlike the trailblazers of Pennsylvania Quaker history who were Quakers themselves—Rufus Jones, Henry Cadbury, Frederick Tolles, and Edwin Bronner—most studies in recent years have been done by non-Quakers and thus have been less reverential and more coolly analytic.⁸

No topic is more conventional and, arguably, more important than political history. None of the authors of the 300-Year History stinted political institutions, political parties, and political behavior, although plebeian politics in the colonial and revolutionary eras, treated extensively by young historians only as the book was reaching completion, received little attention. Ward-heeling politics and race-and religion-based political dynamics from the Jacksonian period forward fared much better. Since 1982, political history has continued to attract attention and has merged with social history to the point that it is useless to speak of these categories as anything but interrelated, since all politics have a social base and all social questions must be mediated in the arena of politics. Hardly any era of Philadelphia's history has escaped the eye of political historians. As in so many other areas of history, race, ethnicity, and gender have informed many of the studies, and much of the new scholarship has paid attention to the people "out of doors," as it was phrased in the eighteenth century—the populace that had remained largely faceless and voiceless in early political accounts.⁹

---


Like political history, military history was a staple of the *300-Year History*. Though well plowed, this field has continued to attract attention, though mostly for the American Revolution. Steven Rosswurm’s breakthrough study of the Philadelphia militia, which, like Oliver Cromwell’s army, became a hotbed of political radicalism, added greatly to our understanding of Philadelphia’s “inner revolution”—the effort to remake social, economic, and political structures while fighting for independence. Other studies have further pursued the common soldiers’ revolutionary experiences and aspirations at Valley Forge and during the Philadelphia campaign of 1777–78. Matthew Gallman’s study of the Philadelphia home front during the Civil War has filled a major gap and provides a model for parallel studies of Philadelphia’s role in subsequent twentieth-century wars—an open field of inquiry made all the more feasible through recent acquisitions of source material by The Historical Society of Pennsylvania and the Library Company.10

Philadelphia studies have broken ground most notably so far as its varied peoples are concerned as historians have moved beyond individual biographies to fix their gaze on group experiences. This has led to important studies of immigrants at water’s edge as they arrived from transatlantic journeys and on land as they took up life in their adopted country. Pennsylvania historians had already plowed a deep furrow treating English, German, Irish, and Scots-Irish immigrants of the colonial era. However, it was not entirely clear that Philadelphia, with its satellite ports of New Castle and Wilmington, Delaware, was for the entire eighteenth

century the preeminent port of entry for overseas migrants to North America. This has been established through fine-tuned studies by Aaron Fogleman, Marianne Wokeck, and Alison Games, who have traced immigrants back to their homelands; constructed statistically sophisticated analyses of the volume, composition, and timing of this human tide; and plumbed archives on both sides of the Atlantic as never before in order to give a fuller picture of cultural transfers and assimilation patterns. Tying together the mingling of these groups—the “mixed multitude”—is a recent study of the not-easy struggle to forge a broadly tolerant society and make religious freedom an official policy.11 No studies have yet emerged on the African origins of Philadelphia’s first waves of coerced immigrants, a topic that has been explored for southern colonies but, given the faint documentary record, will be difficult to pursue.

For the arrival in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries of southern and eastern European immigrants, as well as the Germans, Irish, and English, only tentative and often fileopietistic attempts had been made to fill out the Philadelphia mosaic. An early trial voyage had been launched with a series of essays on different immigrant groups in a volume edited by Allen F. Davis and Mark H. Haller in 1973.12 Then, in the year of the bicentennial of the American Revolution, the Balch Institute for Ethnic Studies began collecting manuscript materials on a rainbow of ethnic groups, including Armenians, Cambodians, Croatians, Hispanics, Icelandics, Latvians, Lebanese, Puerto Ricans, Slovenes, and many others. Merged with The Historical Society of Pennsylvania in 2002, the Balch materials (along with financial support) have encouraged investigation of the storm of strangers washing up on Philadelphia’s shores. Many of the smaller immigrant groups still await the attention of historians. But much has been learned about the Italians, who have been so much a part of the city’s history; the nineteenth-century Irish immigrants; Jews from Germany and the Pale; and Puerto Ricans.13 All of these studies are as
rich on immigrant backgrounds as on the process of assimilation on the banks of the Delaware. Fitting together the many strands of this incoming human material into a tapestry portraying the entire city’s changing population required demographic skills and the manipulation of huge amounts of data that lay beyond the skills or orientation of historians until the late 1960s. However, almost concurrent with the launching of the 300-Year History, the work of graying historians, an upstart group of decidedly young social science historians launched the Philadelphia Social History Project (PSHP). (Work on the 300-Year History began in 1967; the PSHP began in 1969.) Funded initially by the Center for Studies of Metropolitan Problems at the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) at a level that swamped the Barra Foundation’s modest funding for the 300-Year History of Philadelphia, the PSHP, directed by Theodore Hershberg, yoked seventeen high-spirited scholars from ten institutions working in five disciplines. By collecting and machine coding all the data from the manuscript federal population and manufacturing censuses from 1850 to 1880, the scholars hoped to crisscross disciplinary boundaries to trace the comparative experiences of African Americans, Irish immigrants, and German immigrants “in order to determine whether the burdens and disabilities faced by black Americans were peculiar to their historical experience or simply obstacles which every immigrant group entering society had to overcome.” In time, the project ventured far beyond this initial agenda, morphing into a “systematic analysis of the city’s basic demographical processes, spatial arrangements, and economic activities.”¹⁴ From the battery of data gatherers and number crunchers came thirteen technically sophisticated essays on such matters as “Industrial Location and Ethnic Residential Patterns,” “Intragroup Color Differences and Social Stratification” among “mulattoes and


blacks,” and “Family Strategies and the Family Economy” among secondary workers. By this time, the project had used up millions of dollars with four grants from NIMH along with additional grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities, the National Science Foundation, and the National Institute for Child Health and Human Development.

Virtually none of the PSHP findings found their way into the 300-Year History, whose chapters were written by historians trained in an earlier era, of different intellectual orientations, and largely indifferent to new-fangled, quantitative, interdisciplinary analysis. It is unlikely that any such massive project will ever be attempted again for any American city because the resulting essays, while valuable in providing mountains of technically useful data about a burgeoning nineteenth-century industrial city, were indigestible for general readers and largely inapplicable to solving late twentieth-century urban problems.

Even while the PSHP was swimming in data, two historians—working with small grants that would not have paid the electricity bills at PSHP—began to provide the much-needed demographic analysis of Philadelphia’s history. Working with disparate, incomplete, and difficult sources such as the Christ Church mortality bills and church death registers, Billy G. Smith established the broad contours of population growth, migration, and birth and death rates to 1800. Through a number of essays, constructed with technical aplomb, he also established the difficulties of life at the bottom and, contrary to myth, the difficulties of clawing one’s way up the social ladder to achieve “a decent competency.” Susan Klepp continued these investigations forward to the 1830s and, through a family study of the city’s population, was able to correlate birth and death rates by race, class, and gender. Among her key findings were the increasing difficulties of Philadelphia families at the bottom (including rising child mortality) during the commercial expansion of the late eighteenth century and the early industrialization in the antebellum era; Philadelphians’ changing definitions of pregnancy; and how they used

contraception and abortive technology to limit childbearing. Preliminary work has begun to fill in the demographic history of Philadelphia after the Civil War, but much remains to be done on this vital topic.

The entry of women into graduate programs in large numbers has resulted in a tectonic plate shift in the historical profession and has been a cardinal factor in the invigoration and reinterpretation of Philadelphia's history. Tied to the diversification of Clio's once predominantly male guild in the last few decades is the unearthing and reorganizing of sources relating to women's history. Here, one is reminded of the dicta of philosopher-historian Michel-Rolph Trouillot: “Inequalities experienced by the actors lead to uneven historical power in the inscription of traces,” and historical silences “enter the process of historical production” at the creation of archival material and the archival assembling of it. Thus, “lived inequalities yield unequal historical power.” Hence, it has been of no small importance that the Library Company of Philadelphia, The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, and the special collections departments at Temple, Penn, and other institutions have made the collection of materials relevant to women's history a designated priority. This began even as the book under review was being written, but it gained momentum thereafter to the point that by the late 1990s, about half of all the Library Company’s purchased materials bore directly or indirectly on women's history. Now it is time to update the 1983 guide to resources for women's history in the Delaware River Valley region, which stimulated interest among young scholars.

---


When graduate programs opened their doors to women and resources mounted up, women’s history blossomed. There were of course pioneering books such as Frances Manges’s study of women tavern keepers, artisans, and shopkeepers and biographies of important women such as Sarah J. Hale, Anne Shippen Willing, and Deborah Logan. But scholarly volumes such as Joan Jensen’s study of Philadelphia hinterland rural farm women from the mid-eighteenth to mid-nineteenth century; Merrill D. Smith’s study of divorce in early Pennsylvania; Karin Wulf’s investigation of unmarried women (spinsters by choice, widows, and abandoned women) in the urban economy; Lisa Wilson’s study of widows from the mid-eighteenth to mid-nineteenth century; and Sherry Broder’s analysis of family life at the bottom in the Quaker City at the end of the nineteenth century were unimaginable a quarter century ago.20 Built on a wide variety of sources—from court records, diaries, ledger and account books to sources long gathering dust in the Philadelphia City Archives, the records of the Pennsylvania Hospital for the Sick Poor, and other repositories—these studies have brought the distaff half of the city into clear view. In the process, the picture of male history has changed as well. Other important studies have examined women indentured servants in the colonial era, the politicized “Fiery Frenchified Dames” in the early republic, women reformers in the antebellum era, and women in industry and reform after the Civil War.21 In an era when the history of sexuality has entered the college curriculum, Clare A. Lyons has contributed an exploration of sexuality and power for the century after Penn’s death in the City of Brotherly Love that was anything but chaste, while Marc Stein has studied lesbian and gay Philadelphia in the twentieth-century City of Sisterly and Brotherly Love.22 Her history and his history are on their


way toward meeting at the middle.

Also swept up in the quest for a more inclusive and balanced history has been the attention given to African American and Native American history. The sparse treatment of Native Americans in the *300-Year History* has been partially repaired and greatly refined, especially for the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Francis Jennings’s two volumes on the Iroquois and their Lenape/Delaware subsidiary group, not yet published at the time the *300-Year History* went to press, has now provided a broad picture of how Indian relations involved Philadelphians in trade, war, diplomacy, and missionary work.23 Further work by Daniel Richter, Herbert C. Kraft, Amy C. Schutt, and Steven C. Harper will figure in future histories of the city.24 Still to be fully assayed is the Lenape history in the Delaware River Valley region before European contact. What has been discovered about how these people moved from a semimigratory mode to a sedentary, politically decentralized existence dependent on a hunting and fishing economy was synthesized in 1993 by John L. Cotter, Daniel G. Roberts, and Michael Parrington—the dons of Philadelphia-area archaeology. The Lenape “prehistory” may be further rescued from the mists of time as a result of the massive archaeological digging that preceded the construction of the National Constitution Center. Fully evaluating and piecing together the Indian artifacts remains to be done for lack of funding, but archaeologists at the National Park Service’s Northeast Region Archeology Program, whose day-by-day work can be observed by the public at the Independence Living History Center, note that the Indian artifacts recovered are among the very few archaeologically excavated within Philadelphia city limits.25

African American history, another area where the *300-Year History* fell short of adequate coverage, has been one of the cottage industries of

23 Francis Jennings, *The Ambiguous Iroquois Empire: The Covenant Chain Confederation of Indian Tribes with English Colonies from Its Beginnings to the Lancaster Treaty of 1744* (New York, 1984); *Empire of Fortune: Crowns, Colonies, and Tribes in the Seven Years War in America* (New York, 1988).


Philadelphia studies in recent years. The field in general has flourished over the last quarter century, as evidenced in the astounding compilation of books and published essays compiled in the *Harvard Guide to African American History* (2001). Philadelphia, as the nation’s preeminent free black urban center from the Revolution to the 1820s and in the late twentieth century the home of the fifth-largest black population, has virtually led the way in recapturing its African American past.

With the exception of biographies of a few notables such as Richard Allen, James Forten, and Robert Purvis, historians have studied black group experience—the only feasible strategy given the paucity of sources on individual lives before the twentieth century.\(^26\) For the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, this author’s own work on slavery in colonial Philadelphia, its gradual decline, and the growth of the North’s most important free black community in the post-Revolution decades has been followed by studies examining the tension-filled Quaker struggle to cleanse the Society of Friends of slavery, Benjamin Franklin’s connections with slavery and antislavery, the Pennsylvania Abolition Society and black abolitionists, Philadelphia’s nineteenth-century black bourgeoisie, and the famous case of Passmore Williamson’s rescue of a slave woman and her children.\(^27\)

For the mid and late nineteenth century, Roger Lane’s three notable books have set the standard for all subsequent work. In *Violent Death in the City: Suicide, Accident, and Murder in Nineteenth-Century Philadelphia* (1979) and *Roots of Violence in Black Philadelphia, 1860–1900* (1986) he combined quantitative data with “softer” archival materials to show how black social pathology was deeply marked by the limited work opportunities. In this work, Lane’s methodology resembled that of W. E. B. DuBois, whose classic *The Philadelphia Negro* (1899) showed how slavery and racial oppression of an earlier era still held late


nineteenth-century African Americans in thrall. In his third book, *William Dorsey’s Philadelphia and Ours: On the Past and Future of the Black City in America* (1991), about black Philadelphia in the post-emancipation era, Lane drew from oral testimony and scrapbook newspaper clippings assembled by black self-appointed keepers of the past to break through the historical amnesia about black Philadelphians that had long characterized most of the city’s history. Here, he was following in the footsteps of Jesse Torrey, an early nineteenth-century physician, and William Still, the black businessman and community leader, both of whom harvested oral testimonies from African Americans, mostly runaway slaves, to portray and preserve their stories in support of the abolitionist reform agenda. But the richness of black life in late nineteenth-century Philadelphia that he recovers, along with the stunted opportunities for advancement, is placed in the service of evaluating public policies addressing contemporary black urban life.  

For the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, new books have treated many aspects of life among black Philadelphians: how a minority group remembers its own history through festive gatherings meant to construct a usable past; African American health care; the education of the city’s black Americans; the southern black migration to Philadelphia that transformed the city in the twentieth century; Father Divine and his end-of-life Philadelphia sojourn; the tragic police attack on MOVE; and the city’s “Black Mafia.”


Poverty—not a popular subject because the thought of blighted lives is obnoxious to the idea of “a people of plenty,” a contradiction to the ruling myth of the bounteous natural resources of North America, and an embarrassment to those who trumpet American classlessness and exceptionalism—was little noticed in the 300-Year History, where neither “poverty” nor “poor relief” appear in the index. Only in Elizabeth M. Geffen’s chapter on “Industrial Development and Social Crisis, 1841–1854” can the reader find a sustained treatment of immiseration. Not until the mid-1970s, partly inspired by Michael Harrington’s The Other America: Poverty in the United States (1962), did the topic begin to attract historians’ attention. David Rothman’s seminal The Discovery of the Asylum: Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic (1971) and my own studies of poverty and poor relief a few years later may have had something to do with a quickening interest in the topic. Studies by John K. Alexander, Priscilla F. Clement, several essays in Billy G. Smith’s edited Down and Out in Early America (2004), and Simon P. Newman’s reading of the bodies of the poor in various institutional settings have shattered the myth of Philadelphia as the center of a peaceable and prosperous kingdom. As historians chronicled the depth of poverty—the period from about 1840 to 1920 largely remains to be plumbed—institutional studies of asylums that housed, treated, sometimes rehabilitated, and often crushed the poor, distressed, and criminal have added to our knowledge of the underclasses and their upper-class would-be rescuers. Such linkages are on view in admirable detail in probing essays on the 1793 yellow fever biological holocaust; studies on almshouses in the Philadelphia region; reforms to treat the mentally ill; Philadelphia’s history of punishment, incarceration, and criminal discipline; a study of the Walnut Street prison and race-based criminal justice; another on Eastern State Penitentiary; a treatise on orphanage reform; and a study of fictional images of prison reform.


Establishing the links between poverty, violence, and crime, and tracing the changing administration of criminal justice constitute another dimension of exploring the underbelly of Philadelphia’s history. At the intersections of social, institutional, legal, and political history are a number of new studies that range from the early Quaker settlements, where hope reigned for a gentler and more sympathetic mediation of human darkness, to the gun-filled spilling of blood in the late twentieth-century neighborhoods of the city.32

As new studies emerged, historians expanded their definition of poverty, seeing it both as a condition requiring public relief and private charity and a condition of living impoverished without such relief—in other words, living poor as against requiring poor relief. With this broader framework in place, studies of poverty shaded into labor history, for most laboring people were poor at some time in their life and large numbers in the preindustrial era stumbled from “a decent competency” to destitution. The authors of the 300-Year History were no strangers to the importance of labor in the city’s history, but the new labor studies emerging in the 1970s were not within their field of vision. Important studies of the labor-market experiences (which define the structure and character of every community) by Anthony F. C. Wallace and Bruce Laurie had begun to till new ground as the 300-Year History neared completion.33 Thereafter, a quantitatively grounded study by Billy G. Smith on tailors, shoemakers, sailors, and laborers; a theoretically sophisticated analysis of artisanal political engagement by Ronald Schultz; engaging studies of

---


Philadelphia-area textile mill capitalists and workers during and after their heyday by Cynthia Shelton and Jean Seder; a penetrating consideration of law and labor by Christopher L. Tomlins; an incisive work by Walter Licht on Philadelphia’s job structure; and an important study of Philadelphia’s multiethnic, interracial waterfront Wobblies in the early twentieth century by Peter Cole have greatly expanded our knowledge of survival strategies, political engagement, work rhythms, labor organizing, religious commitments, and family networks among the army of working-class Philadelphians who made their city “the world’s workshop.”

One of the strengths of the 300-Year History was its attention to business history and the economic development of the city and outlying region for which it served as entrepôt. Not a single chapter neglected this topic, and some authors lavished attention on industry, banking, entrepreneurship, and technology. In the quarter century since, disproving charges that social history has crowded out older, less fashionable topics, economic and business history has been one of the most productive areas of scholarship. Promoting this important field have been the Center for the History of Business, Technology, and Society at the Hagley Museum and Library and the Library Company of Philadelphia’s Program in Early American Economy and Society. A shelf full of books in this area include studies of revolutionary-era merchants; deepening market involvement and the drive toward a capitalist ethos after the Revolution; the rise of textile industrialists’ and their strike-prone workers’ ties to slave-produced cotton after the advent of Whitney’s cotton gin; arms making and shipbuilding; highly intensive capitalist coal and railroad development; builders, small manufacturers, and printers; and modern banking financiers.


This somewhat fragmented body of economic and business history is not easily characterized, but it is clear that the trend has been toward “business-in-society,” where the kind of internal study of management structures in large corporations—the work inspired by the late Alfred Chandler—has given way to the connections between business and politics, law, labor, education, and social changes. Large corporations have continued to attract attention, as is evident in some of the books cited above, but more attention has been given to small businesses. This by itself has drawn attention to female entrepreneurs who elbowed their way onto gendered economic ground as small-scale retailers and service providers.36 It was female enterprisers of this kind who were celebrated at the Centennial Exposition of 1876—the subject of enduring interest as shown in a recent book.37 From the Library Company’s Program in Early American Economy and Society, further studies of women entrepreneurs can be expected.38

Other avenues explored in social and cultural studies deal with categories familiar to economic, business, and labor historians—work, family, neighborhood, and class and ethnic structure. But social and cultural historians, a numerous and diverse group, have largely eschewed quantifi-

36 I am indebted to Glenn Porter, director emeritus of the Hagley Museum and Library, for insight into the historiographical changes in business history.
38 The online list of fellows and their research topics for each of the last six years suggests that a deluge of books on economy and society in Philadelphia and its environs will be published before long. Whetting the appetites of doctoral aspirants in this area is Cathy Matson and Wendy Woslon, Economic History in the Philadelphia Region: A Guide to Manuscripts and Print Resources for Research (Philadelphia, 2005), http://www.librarycompany.org/Economics/PEAESGuide/history.htm.
able data in favor of producing a more human story, where the reader learns of individual and group life experiences and is asked to comprehend the lives of urban dwellers from bottom to top of Philadelphia society. Thus, in many of these studies, historians of this generation have emphasized narrative, storytelling, pointillist character sketches, even “walks” through Philadelphia neighborhoods. Such are a number of recent works on Philadelphia taverns, churches, particular buildings and public places, neighborhoods, associational life, and mass demonstrations and celebrations. In these studies, the reader can see the pulsating city in intimate settings and trace its change from commercial seaport to industrial giant to the deindustrialized Quaker City of today. Many of these books show the futility of trying to pigeon-hole scholars as political, social, cultural, religious, or economic historians as if these categories are mutually exclusive. In fact, most of the books referenced above stand at multiple intersections of these classifications of history.

There can be no top and bottom without a middle. In between the Philadelphia entrepreneur-capitalists and the working classes resided the sprawling, ever-changing, and, until after World War II, the mostly white middle class. This was not a group attracting the attention of the authors of the 300-Year History, for as an analytic category it is hardly more than a quarter century old. For historians, the middle had a dishwater quality, neither as glamorous as stories of amassing wealth and fame at the top nor

as lurid as neighborhood gangs, mobsters, and violence-prone figures at
the bottom. Nor do charts of upward mobility, rates of home ownership,
and changes in wealth distribution make for armchair reading.

Now, however, the middle class has come of age. Stuart Blumin’s *The
Emergence of the Middle Class: Social Experience in the American City,
1760–1900* (1989) led the way. Blumin showed that while defined by
occupation and income, the middle class was equally defined by values,
style, and taste. Tracing the rise of white-collar workers, who flocked from
the “walking city” to the leafy suburbs where they created their own social
life separated from the city in which they made their living, recent books
have deepened our knowledge of the consumer-oriented middle classes.
Mostly they have left behind census data and other forms of quantitative
evidence to focus instead on the middle-class’s newspaper- and magazine-
reading habits; their delight with baseball, expositions, and amusement
parks; their fascination with (and work in) department stores; and their
migration to the “crabgrass frontier” where they depended on urban
transit networks. In much of this work, historians have dwelt on how
gender conventions shaped the leisure and work experiences of middle-
class Philadelphians.

Another strength of the *300-Year History* was attention to associ-
tional and institutional life in Philadelphia. This was appropriate since the
city boasted so many “firsts”—the first hospital for the sick poor, first fire
insurance company, first circulating library—a dizzying list of “firsts.”
Predictably then, new books on Philadelphia’s institutions have rolled off
the presses, often on the occasion of the centenary or bicentenary of the
organization’s founding. Included are histories of The Historical Society
of Pennsylvania and the Academy of Music; celebrations of the Library
Company of Philadelphia, the Philadelphia Society for Promoting

---

40 Jerome P. Bjelopera, *City of Clerks: Office and Sales Workers in Philadelphia, 1870–1920*
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Centennial*; William C. Kashatus, *Connie Mack’s ’29 Triumph: The Rise and Fall of the
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Agriculture, and the Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania.41 Other books have treated an array of institutions dedicated to the preserving, presenting, and promoting—as well as the politics thereof—of Philadelphia’s history and culture.42

In an era when the visual is overrunning the verbal, books on the iconographic history of Philadelphia, conspicuously displayed in local bookstore windows, have been around for a long time, but in the last quarter century they have changed in focus and character. After World War II, Nicholas Wainwright and Martin P. Snyder lovingly gathered engravings and lithographs of pre–twentieth-century Philadelphia for publication. But Snyder was interested primarily in maps and buildings, not people, and Wainwright tried for an exhaustive catalogue of lithographs, many of which were created to promote commercial enterprises (which included bowling pavilions and billiard parlors). Both avoided later photographic images and the rich social history they could reveal.43

As new media studies evolved in the 1980s, iconographic studies have pushed forward in time and thematically in new directions. Two of them, created from the photographic collections of the Library Company of Philadelphia, present the work of William H. Rau, who was engaged by the Pennsylvania Railroad to promote its rising empire, and other photographs collected to promote the achievements of the clean and sedate Center City.44 The editors of four other published collections, however, like a metro newspaper stringer in search of a good story, sought out the low, the common, and the lurid in the dirty, disheveled city. Interested more in social history than architectural or business history, they knew

42 Gary B. Nash, First City: Philadelphia and the Forging of Historical Memory (Philadelphia, 2002); Steven Conn, Metropolitan Philadelphia: Living with the Presence of the Past (Philadelphia, 2006); Vogel, Cultural Connections.
that pictures could tell stories; and one of the photographic centers of the nation had many pictures scattered in more than two dozen archives. The first of this quartet published in the 1980s was Kenneth Finkel’s *Nineteenth-Century Photography in Philadelphia: 250 Historical Prints from the Library Company of Philadelphia* (1980). Three others were published by Temple University Press, two of which brought back to life the alleys, markets, soup kitchens, work sites, clubs, parades, and shops from 1890 to 1960, and the other displaying Philadelphians at work in the industrial city.45

All of these books became a kind of prelude to the 150th anniversary of photography in 1989, celebrated at the Philadelphia Museum of Art with an exhibition, *Legacy in Light*, built from thirty regional photographic collections and imaginatively curated by Kenneth Finkel. Today, access to photographic images is available with online finding aids such as those created at the Athenaeum, the Free Library of Philadelphia, the Library Company of Philadelphia, and the Philadelphia City Archives.46

Material culture, which was of only casual interest to the authors of the *300-Year History* (except for a preoccupation with the city’s architecture and built environment), has attracted considerable attention in the last few decades. The Winterthur Program in American Material Culture at the University of Delaware has been the engine driving this enterprise, and in the *Winterthur Portfolio* much of the work has appeared in handsomely illustrated essay form. Especially notable is the effort of historians of material culture to transcend traditional connoisseurship of objects handcrafted from silver, pewter, wood, fibers, glass, and ceramics to see objects in multiple contexts. Thus, in historically oriented decorative arts, a pewter cup or stove backplate is seen as a crafted piece, as a consumer commodity, and as a symbol. Likewise, the craftperson’s skill is seen as a kind of intellectual property; an artisan is seen to operate in a political and social network of clients and patrons; and the skilled artisan is studied as a political, social, and cultural actor in the community. Such are the recent


works of Adrienne Hood, Susan Stabile, and Laura Rigal.47

Emblematic of reaching beyond traditional connoisseurship, the Philadelphia Museum of Art and other Philadelphia-area museums have brought together historians and museum curators to produce glittering, voluptuously illustrated catalogues produced to accompany crowd-fetching exhibits on such topics (to name only a few) as the arts and crafts of Pennsylvania Germans; the China trade and the high-end consumer items brought across the Pacific and around the Cape of Tierra Fuego to reach Philadelphia; class and style among black Philadelphians; and the artisan-produced trappings of the consumer-minded middle and upper classes before the American Revolution.48 In the latter book, in what has now become almost an obligatory symbiosis, two of Philadelphia’s notable early American historians (Richard S. Dunn and Edward C. Carter 2nd) teamed up with two museum curators (Richard Saunders and Jack Lindsey). The historians provided the broad-brush historical milieu in which artisans and painters produced their work while the curators supplied the close-grained analysis of aesthetic and technical workmanship.

If a new edition of the 300-Year History were to be published, or if the city and its cultural institutions were to decide to follow New York City and Chicago in creating an Encyclopedia of Philadelphia—not a bad idea since both have been rousing successes—the editors and authors will have a mother lode of precious metal to draw upon in fusing old and new approaches to urban history.

With so much accomplished, what is left to do? Plenty, of course, for the historians’ work is never done. I have already noted above some of the areas, including the life of the Lenape people before Europeans arrived; biographies of notable Philadelphians; and Philadelphia’s involvement in the wars of the twentieth century. Other topics where dissertation research is already underway or books from dissertations are in the offing include a study of the Philadelphia theater’s treatment of race, slavery, and abolition; the rise of voluntary associations after the American

Revolution; the place of popular literature and popular music among the city’s commonality; the study of early Philadelphia advertising; explorations of Philadelphia’s involvement in the Haitian Revolution and the experience of St. Domingue’s refugees, both black and white; alcoholism; female crime; and the study of public markets that were so much a part of pre–Civil War city life.

Diverse as these topics are, several fields of force are emerging. Naturally, the Program in Early American Economy and Society at the Library Company of Philadelphia has gathered economic and business historians like so many filings attracted by a magnet. The economic networks and transportation systems radiating out from Philadelphia are under scrutiny. More particular studies of the sprawling mercantile community include specialized explorations of coal, flour, coffee, mahogany, alcohol, tea, linen, finished clothing, and beeswax with other vendible commodities still to be isolated. Apart from particular mercantile specialties, young scholars are zeroing in on aspects of economic activity such as credit, counterfeiting, life insurance, and the always popular patterns and meanings of consumption.

In what seems to reflect the current transformation of American society into one of the world’s most religiously observant people, religious belief and experience have begun to attract serious attention. A number of studies are underway, including ones of Philadelphia Catholics in the nineteenth century, the phenomenon of religious dreaming, and studies of religious groups in Philadelphia’s hinterland. These works will by no means exhaust the possibilities, for the study of religion from the pew rather than from the pulpit is still a young and exciting field.

Another field awaiting sharp-eyed, tireless, and numbers-loving historians concerns the demographic changes over the past century and a half. This vast territory will have to be reconnoitered in pieces because the task is immense. Studying the successive reconfiguring of the city’s population may not have the visceral appeal of exploring patterns of religious belief or changing tastes and patterns of consumption, but we cannot understand Philadelphia’s people as a whole until the kind of studies by Smith, Klepp, and others mentioned above are conducted for the fifteen decades since the end of the Civil War.

Philadelphia’s history, as with the United States at large, is the history of repeated immigrations, and two of the mightiest have yet to be fully studied. The first of these post–Civil War influxes began in the 1870s and
continued until the eve of World War I. Jews from the Pale and southern Italians are the foremost among the waves of eastern and southern Europeans who arrived, and they have received their due as immigrant groups. But the overall ethnic, religious, and occupational transformation of the city, along with the disease and poverty it engendered (as well as remarkable examples of endurance and success), is yet to be assayed. The second post–Civil War immigrant wave, which began with the Immigration Act of 1965, has led to huge increases in the city’s foreign-born residents while the city was losing nearly one-quarter of its 1950 population to the flight of native-born citizens to the suburbs and the loss of industrial jobs. The Historical Society of Pennsylvania has begun the work of documenting and preserving the histories of these new Philadelphians with its New Immigrants Initiative (a legacy of the Balch Institute) and with its new PhilaPlace project, a collaborative effort illuminating the history of Philadelphia’s changing neighborhoods. Latino, Asian, African, and Arab immigrants—each group is highly diverse and ought to be considered as mélanges of people from vast continents—may have to await second- and third-generation Mexicans, Koreans, Palestinians, Sierra Leoneans, Cambodians, and Salvadorians to become historians of their own group. But this will be part of the remarkable remaking of Philadelphia in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries.
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