lifelong friend of Louisine Havemeyer. Years later, traveling with Mr. and Mrs. Havemeyer through Europe on picture-buying expeditions, she expanded their collecting beyond the Impressionists. She had a faultless eye for quality in paintings and advised buying the work of Veronese, Goya, and El Greco. At this time these artists — especially El Greco — were not widely known and respected.

It seems clear that many an American museum would be a masterpiece or two poorer today if it had not been for Mary Cassatt’s activities in the collecting field. To cite only two instances, the great El Greco “Assumption” was purchased by the Art Institute of Chicago because Mary Cassatt would not accept as final its rejection by another American museum. And in Pittsburgh, instance number two, Simon Vouet’s “Toilet of Venus,” once owned by Miss Cassatt herself, came in 1952 into the collection of Carnegie Institute as a gift from Mrs. Horace Binney Hare, Miss Cassatt’s niece. The Carnegie Institute collection also includes examples of Mary Cassatt’s most famous prints and her 1891 painting “Young Women Picking Fruit.” So it seems that one hundred and twenty-two years after her birth a part of Mary Cassatt, the part of her life she valued most, her art work, keeps her memory bright in the place where she was born.

Registrar, Museum of Art, Carnegie Institute

Fred Myers


Once in a while a book comes from the press to people who care so much about it that they wish to proclaim its values from the proverbial housetops. The present reprint of the Pennsylvania volume of the First Census of the United States of America is a case in point. It possesses as much fascination as a great novel. Opened at random, it may be read with the same high degree of interest. It is, indeed, a rich example of the worth and charm of documentation of human and humane statistics.

This reviewer, when a small boy, was told that Christianity and the United States both began with a counting of noses. Of course, that
observation was a simplification which was open to challenge. But the basic fact of it is justified. There is an undeniable resemblance between Augustus Caesar’s mandate that all the world should be taxed, as reported in Luke 2, and the decision of the First Congress that government in the new American republic should be dependent upon the expressed will of all the citizens thereof.

Joseph and Mary went to Bethlehem; and 3,231,533 registered persons, domiciled in the erstwhile thirteen British colonies, were visited in their homes by approximately 650 assistant marshals on or soon after the first Monday in August 1790, and officially enumerated, not primarily to be obliged to contribute financially to the support of the nascent nation but rather particularly that they might be privileged to vote for the members of the House of Representatives. This, in brief, was democracy in formal — and notably historic — action.

President George Washington had signed the First Census Act, passed at the second session of the First Congress, thus accepting the proposition that “the task of making the first enumeration of inhabitants” was his responsibility. The Constitution was his authority, Article I providing that Representatives should “be apportioned among the several States . . . according to their respective numbers” with a decennial census to furnish the necessary basis for such apportionment. It is worth mentioning in this connection that: “It was only as an incident to the establishment of its democratic political machinery that the United States in 1789 became the first nation in the world to provide by law for a periodic enumeration of its people.”

Doubtless a precedent for the whole idea of a national count was available in the state census of Virginia, recorded annually from 1782 through 1785. In any case, the application of the elementary principle of registration to the population of the entire nation was an example of organized freedom in practice. It established participation in sovereignty as a rule of life in the United States.

Unfortunately, the 1790 returns from Delaware, Georgia, Kentucky, New Jersey, Tennessee and Virginia were destroyed in the burning of the Capitol at Washington during the War of 1812. The schedules for Pennsylvania, however, were saved to be “originally published” by the Government Printing Office in 1908. It is a facsimile of that edition that is made ready to the hands of scholars by private industry in 1966.

Of course, the 1790 significance of Pennsylvania was conspicuously “special.” The Keystone State then was incontroversibly the
crown of the arch, “the bond stone” uniting all the others. Philadelphia was the Capital. It is for that reason that the name of Thomas Jefferson appears on page 227 as a resident of Philadelphia County, “Secy. of State to U. S.”

But, naturally, not only “the statesmen and leaders of thought” were enumerated. “Those whose names appear upon the schedules . . . were in general the plain citizens” — the people “who by their conduct in war and peace made the Constitution possible and by their intelligence and self-restraint put it into successful operation.”

The data collected and published could not be considered unduly intrusive. All that was recorded was valid to the prime purpose of the Census: “Name of county, name of township, name of head of family, number of free white males of 16 years and upward, including heads of families; number of free white males under 16 years; number of free white females, including heads of families; number of all other free persons; number of slaves.” The total population of Allegheny County in 1790 was 10,322, of which aggregate 159 were chattels.

An example of the rich historicity of the Pennsylvania book in its present reissued form is to be seen on pages 13-14 where the inhabitants of Pittsburgh Town are cataloged, beginning with Alexander Fowler and ending with Benjamin Bennett, Sen. The census of Allegheny County as a whole begins with Chas. Conrad on page 12 and concludes with Absalom Hanks on page 18.

No attempt has been made by the 1966 publishers to “correct” the original records. Thus Colonel Stephen Byard is not edited to read “Stephen Bayard” and the pronunciation changed to “Baird.” Even admittedly wrong spellings have been left untampered with.

What is so exciting about the First Pennsylvania Census is that it is an authentic representation of the era by which it was produced. It obeys Shakespeare in that it is a mirror of a sort, held up to Nature. Certainly, there is no other chronicle of the time or the place more important to historians. Specifically it is a practical aid to students of genealogy. Under the heading “Pitt Township,” for instance, are listed “heads of families” including: “Willson, Sample, Pedien. Irish, Brackenridg, tanahill, Winebiddle, Walles, Cohoon, dunken. Amberson, Parker, tillpatrick, Ohara, Harden, Adams, Watson, Graham, Arawine, Williams, Greer, Trimble, Rusel, Linhart, Gilleland, Lovjoy, Kenedy, Burchfeld, Castlman, McCertney. Kelley, Sampson, Perchment, McClalnd, Nigley, Henderson, Sevron. Caldwell, Buckhanen, Ferrey, Mcleland, Grant, Bedford, Freser” and many
other names, each of which may be a puzzle at least as interesting as the average modern television mystery.

This, we believe, is our Western Pennsylvania equivalent of England's *Domesday Book*, compiled in 1086, "published" in 1783.

*The Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania*


These books present short but detailed accounts of two of the more important battles of the Revolutionary War. Although they are clumsy to handle and lack indexes, their illustrations are good and the maps are excellent. The method of referencing is poor. Footnotes, even if located at the end of the volumes, would have been preferable to the present scheme.

Smith's book on the battle of Trenton incorporates his research in Hessian manuscripts with the available secondary material and is generally an excellent account of that engagement. The reviewer's only major criticism is that the author does not give enough attention to the problems faced by the various American columns in their night march and in co-ordinating their attacks on the town. The use of the Hessian materials gives the reader a good view of the "other side of the hill" and enables the author to clarify several confused incidents during the battle. On the whole he produced an excellent account of the battle.

The Monmouth volume does not show as much original research as the Trenton book but gives an outstanding account of a highly confused and disconnected battle. The author's account is aided by excellent maps and by a personal knowledge of the field which clarifies many of the incidents that have troubled preceding historians. Smith also shows good judgment in refusing to plunge into the thicket of the Lee-Washington controversy. His account shows that Washington's