to escape the state's proslavery government. There they created the Indiana Yearly Meeting of Anti-Slavery Friends, which lasted about ten years.

Ryan P. Jordan is the first scholar to tackle this important, but complicated, chapter in the history of Quakerism. Unfortunately, he is handicapped by the fact that he is not a Quaker and is unfamiliar with many aspects of Quakerism. He suggests that abolition played a larger role than it did in the Hicksite-Orthodox separation of 1827 and that the same factors were at work in the Gurneyite-Wilburite separation of 1845; in reality, the 1845 event had nothing to do with abolition. He also erroneously equates some of the meetings created by the “come-outer” Quakers with the communitarian experiments of the day.

In addition, Jordan appears to have relied largely on the Friend, the newspaper of the Orthodox Quakers, but not on the Friends Intelligencer, published by the Hicksites. He states that Isaac Hopper was disowned for publishing articles in the National Anti-Slavery Standard that were critical of the Society of Friends, whereas his disownment was based on his being connected with the NASS, which published an article critical of George White, a Hicksite minister and abolitionist who opposed working with non-Quaker abolitionists. In identifying the women who organized the Seneca Falls Convention of 1848, Jordan neglects to mention Jane Hunt, the hostess of the tea party.

There are numerous other small errors. Nevertheless, the author is to be commended for investigating this important, but neglected, phase of Quaker history. It is to be hoped that others will be encouraged to take up the challenge.

Kennett Square, PA

MARGARET HOPE BACON


Although equipped with outdated, antiquated weapons for nearly half of its term of service, the Sixth Pennsylvania Cavalry repeatedly proved itself on the battlefield and garnered the respect and admiration of its commanders and fellow horse soldiers by the close of the Civil War. In Rush’s Lancers: The Sixth Pennsylvania Cavalry in the Civil War, Eric J. Wittenberg presents an impressive retelling of the unit’s unique history and crafts a vivid image of its experiences within the army.

Employing a familiar pattern for regimental histories, Rush’s Lancers follows the regiment from its inception and organization in Philadelphia in the summer of 1861 to its disbanding in August 1865. Wittenberg unsurprisingly pays close attention to the unit’s field deployments and major engagements, especially at Brandy Station in 1863, where the unit finally came of age—ironically only after
having abandoned its trademark lances. The regiment’s experiences under fire there and elsewhere, Wittenberg maintains, helped forge its heterogeneous mixture of aristocratic young gentlemen, Quakers, and rough-hewn immigrants into a single fighting unit.

In addition to detailing an impressive combat record, Wittenberg rightly breaks from the older historical models by examining and describing the Sixth Pennsylvania’s long periods of inactivity and monotonous drudgery, which were inherent to nineteenth-century military service. Like many Civil War soldiers, the Lancers encountered harsh winter conditions, rampant disease, and numerous supply problems while in camp, and Wittenberg draws from an extensive collection of letters, newspapers, memoirs, and other primary sources to capture such experiences.

Indeed, the book derives its greatest strength from Wittenberg’s reliance on first-person accounts and recollections, which allow him to give voice to the common cavalryman. As such, he offers a personal and ground-level view into the victories and hardships of Rush’s Lancers. Wittenberg must also be commended for his concluding chapter that examines the Lancer’s postwar experiences. Again, by utilizing a host of primary sources, he tracks over a dozen veterans through their mostly successful postwar lives and details the creation of a specific veteran Lancer organization, which met annually until 1931.

Overall, Wittenberg presents a fascinating description of one of the Civil War’s most unusual regiments. Yet, he rarely attempts to engage in the greater historical debates, such as those regarding the commitment and ideology of ordinary soldiers, that have raged over the last decade. Several occurrences, including at least one instance of desertion and, even more troubling, the failure of the majority of the regiment to reenlist in 1863, remain unexplained and unexplored. Instead, Wittenberg depicts nearly all the Lancers—save the apparently intractable Colonel Richard Rush—as heroes to the Union who were completely dedicated to their cause. But, seemingly in contrast, the author also suggests that class differences between the officers and enlisted men appeared at the beginning and continued throughout the duration of the regiment’s service. Unfortunately, he fails to describe them adequately or link them to problems of regimental discipline or retention.

Despite these limitations, Wittenberg has provided an engaging and eminently readable history of one of the Civil War’s more underappreciated and understudied regiments.
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