

headway in the first, and he is hardly unique in occasionally stumbling in pursuit of the second. It is a dense read, as one simultaneously tries to keep track of three intricate and detailed cases. That in the end he manages to pull out a common thread comes largely from his rather late introduction of a "third way" between the cosmopolitan and the local, which he sees emerging in the region in the early nineteenth century. The division of communities into what he calls cosmopolitan evangelicals and those who were advocates of national politics can be equated in rough form with moral reformers and those who promoted their goals through an increasingly democratic political system.

The categorization is an interesting one. Its greatest strength is that it elides the usual problems inherent in contrasting cosmopolitans and locals by recognizing that by the middle years of the nineteenth century, advocates of both positions were thinking beyond the local arena even as they acted within their local communities. The problem of pluralism both within and among communities—the manner in which individuals and groups would interact with others of different backgrounds or orientations—was an essential question for all Americans.

The categorization nonetheless presents its own difficulties, in part because both terms remain imprecise and are far more general than the finely textured portrayals of community that Riordan presented earlier in the study. Certainly, many leading moral reformers actively pursued a national political agenda, while, conversely, cosmopolitan evangelicalism represents only a part of the alternative. Where does Riordan place those evangelicals who did not adhere to the cosmopolitan agenda of the reform society? Many were "Jacksonian" in their politics and presumably adhered to a version of the national political agenda. But what of those cosmopolitans who were not evangelical? That I raise such questions is only because the analysis, building upon a very nuanced research base, is both highly suggestive and reflective of the fact that historians have at least as much difficulty in getting a clear fix on the problem of diversity as participants did. Nevertheless, this book does an excellent job of portraying the very diverse reactions to diversity experienced by the diverse peoples of the Delaware Valley.

State University of New York at Stony Brook

NED C. LANDSMAN

"Let a Common Interest Bind Us Together": Associations, Partisanship, and Culture in Philadelphia, 1775–1840. By ALBRECHT KOSCHNIK. (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2007. xvi, 351 pp. Illustrations, tables, notes, bibliography, index. Cloth, \$75; paper, \$45.)

This meticulously researched analytical study of voluntary associations in Philadelphia argues that Federalists, notwithstanding their failure to control major elected offices after 1800, "put the principle of voluntary action to more

diverse, long-lived, and influential uses" (p. 2) than we have previously recognized. The first of five thematic chapters examines partisan groups that disagreed about the 1776 state constitution and looks at the controversies over the democratic societies of the 1790s; it also details the widespread hostility to partisan groups that prevented their long-term viability. Chapter 2 considers several post-1800 partisan fraternities, especially the Republican Tammany Society and the Federalist Washington Benevolent Society, while chapter 3 provides a rich examination of volunteer militia companies. The final two chapters focus on younger "third generation" (p. 153) Federalists and present the book's central argument—that this cohort's professional and cultural groups "formed the organizational basis for the transformation of Federalist partisanship into cultural Federalism" (p. 185). Albrecht Koschnik maintains that this broad view of political action reveals a continuity within Federalism as "it moved from the almost exclusive concern with political power to the almost equally exclusive creation of culture" (p. 9). Although Federalists left partisan politics behind, they created "the institutional backbone of a new civic culture . . . that provided the context for their assertion of cultural authority and stewardship" (p. 227).

The sustained attention here to multiple voluntary associations as key forces in shaping political culture in a period when modern political parties only gradually (and never entirely) became legitimate organizations draws insight from Alexis de Tocqueville, Jurgen Habermas's conceptualization of the "public sphere," and recent scholarship assessing festive culture's construction of popular politics (e.g., monographs by Simon P. Newman, Len Travers, and David Waldstreicher). Koschnik distinguishes his study from these earlier works by emphasizing the quotidian qualities of partisan socialization that occurred outside strictly ideological and specifically electioneering concerns. He makes this case effectively by drawing on the diary of Thomas Franklin Pleasants (a young Philadelphia lawyer, member of The Philological Society whose speeches were published in the *Port Folio*, member of the Washington Association and the Athenaeum, and an officer in the voluntary militia), who exemplified the professionally and socially grounded nature of associational life. The study builds a detailed prosopographical portrait of the individuals involved in later Federalist organizations, which are summarized in eight tables that emphasize occupational and partisan affiliations of group members as well as in three appendices that explain the character of partisan associations and their members.

The book's brief conclusion compares elite leadership in Philadelphia with that in other nineteenth-century U.S. cities. Although the three major ports from the colonial northeast may seem similar to one another, Koschnik is most struck by the divergent qualities of Philadelphia when compared to New York and, especially, Boston. Whereas elites in the latter two places "preserved their power much more successfully by embracing partisan politics and incorporating middling concerns" (p. 233), those in Philadelphia opted for an "eventual retreat from

partisan politics" (p. 230). Rejecting the classic argument of E. Digby Baltzell—that religious traditions explain the major differences between Puritan Boston and Quaker Philadelphia—Koschnik places "the origins of the division between partisan politics and organized culture in Philadelphia in the Federalist withdrawal from politics" (p. 235).

This sharp distinction between politics and religion seems somewhat overdrawn, for surely the distinctive Quaker engagement with postwar public life was directly related to the anti-Quaker tenor of the broad revolutionary era. Some more attention to the continuities and disruptions that the Revolution brought to the colonial order might have led us to see this book's subjects as aspirers to older colonial norms rather than as the innovative reformers that Koschnik describes. Conceptualizing the pioneers of cultural institutions as "conservatives" rather than as "Federalists" might have underscored some of this continuity and would have conveyed a less fixed sense of partisan affiliation. An abstract quality informs some of the assessment here; for example, the local details of Philadelphia politics, especially municipal government, where conservatives often had more success than at the statewide or national levels, receive almost no attention. Our understanding of associational development might also have benefited from noting the period's rancorous struggles over organized labor (such as the Philadelphia Mayor's Court decision in *Commonwealth v. Pullis* [1806] that labor unions were illegal groups), especially in a book that probes the close relationship between law and associations.

"*Let a Common Interest Bind Us Together*" makes an important and original contribution to a new kind of political history that looks beyond election results and officeholders' accounts. This deeply researched and expansive view of the expression of power adds to our understanding of how society became more recognizably modern in the wake of the American Revolution, and it situates the quasi-private world of masculine voluntary associations as a major force within this transformation.

University of Maine

LIAM RIORDAN

Founding Friends: Families, Staff, and Patients at the Friends Asylum in Early Nineteenth-Century Philadelphia. By PATRICIA D'ANTONIO. (Bethlehem, PA: Lehigh University Press, 2006. 253 pp. Appendices, notes, bibliography, index. \$46.50.)

Patricia D'Antonio has written a scholarly work that successfully negotiates the many threads required to understand fully the history of any institution. By carefully placing the Friends Asylum within its layered contexts of nineteenth-century Quakerism, early middle-class formation, nascent medical professionalism,