story of individuals who lived in the past and fills in details with anecdotal information from those who experience outbuildings today as owners, interpreters, or students of architecture. The book is packed with evidence provided by archaeological investigations, painted and printed images, and traditional written sources like diaries. Olmert effectively uses all this material to tie together topics as distinct as baptismal rituals, practices for dry cleaning wool clothing, and folk beliefs about pigeon feathers to tell a fundamentally human history.

As Olmert notes, “It’s fine to recognize the good taste of the past, but that must never blind us to the inequities that flourished there” (69). Olmert points out that many of the outbuildings that survive today served as showpieces for their owners and represent the upper end of the spectrum in terms of size, materials, and modish design elements. Where possible, he uses other types of sources to discuss the broader range of outbuildings that once existed. His text makes clear the divisions that existed in eighteenth-century tidewater society based on class, gender, and race. Laundries and dairies, for example, were spaces used predominantly by women; offices, on the other hand, were part of the male domain. Perhaps most importantly, Olmert emphasizes the effect that slave labor had on the built environment. Detached kitchens, he explains, “had little to do with the threat of fire, and everything to do with slavery” (47). In telling the story of the small working buildings that surrounded eighteenth-century houses, Olmert adds to our understanding of not only architectural history but the everyday experience of masters and slaves, husbands and wives, and the rich and powerful and the disenfranchised. Given the broad scope of his work, two minor disappointments are that the index does not capture all the subject matter and some period images are discussed in the text but not pictured.
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The slow, tragic decline of William Penn’s vision for Pennsylvania as a place where European settlers and native peoples could live in peaceful coexistence has long provided historians with an overarching narrative within which to situate their studies of cultural interaction and racial antagonism on the colonial mid-Atlantic frontier. This narrative framework, for example, recently resulted in an impressive collection of essays edited by William Pencak and Daniel Richter entitled Friends and Enemies in Penn’s Woods: Indians, Colonists, and the
Racial Construction of Pennsylvania (2004). It is also the organizing theme in the work here under review, Kevin Kenny’s Peaceable Kingdom Lost: The Paxton Boys and the Destruction of William Penn’s Holy Experiment. Like Pencak and Richter, Kenny asserts that the gradual breakdown of respectful relations between Native Americans and European settlers in western Pennsylvania accelerated the emergence of racial paradigms that, in turn, led to a Euro-American consensus that accepted the violent dispossession and extermination of Indians. What sets Kenny’s work apart is the impressive degree of detail with which he investigates and contextualizes “Pennsylvania’s most aggressive colonials” (3): the notorious Paxton Boys.

Kenny claims that the provincial authorities’ inability to persecute and punish the Paxton Boys for the brutal murder of twenty innocent Conestoga Indians in Lancaster in the winter of 1763 was a lesson “not lost on other western settlers” (205); they learned that they too could seize Indian land by violent means without fear of reprisal. In short, the example of the Paxton Boys led to the final revulsion of Penn’s “holy experiment.” This argument is not new and many scholars—not least Peter Silver in Our Savage Neighbors (2007)—working on the legacy of the Paxton Boys have reached similar conclusions. But unlike other recent studies on the topic, Peaceable Kingdom Lost focuses on the continued participation of the Paxton Boys’ leaders in the development of racist justifications for western expansion in the decade after the Conestoga massacres. Kenny shows, perhaps better than any scholar since Alden T. Vaughan wrote on the subject twenty-five years ago, that many men involved in the murders of 1763, such as Lazurus Stuart and Matthew Smith, later endorsed and committed similar atrocities in defiance of eastern officials they deemed corrupt. This fact does more than sustain the narrative in the final chapters of the book; it concretely illustrates the durability of the link between the hatred of Indians and “patriotism” on the eve of the American Revolution. Kenny further demonstrates that Thomas Penn and other provincial leaders, frustrated by their inability to rein in unruly settlers after 1764, were aware of the symbolic importance of the Conestoga massacres. Throughout the late 1760s, they continually asserted that the government’s authority in the West could be reestablished if prominent Paxton Boys were successfully prosecuted.

Kevin Kenny has laid out a smooth and engaging narrative alongside an impressively researched analysis of the secondary historical debates surrounding the Paxton Boys. Peaceable Kingdom Lost is also the most detailed treatment of the subject to emerge in a generation, and it is an indispensable introduction to one of the most troubling and transformative episodes in the history of colonial Pennsylvania.