

century natives of the South. Except for these minor complaints, De Vorsey's study must be considered an important contribution to colonial historiography and historical geography.

Southern Illinois University

ROBERT L. GOLD

*The Battle of Pensacola. March 9 to May 8, 1781. Spain's Final Triumph over Great Britain in the Gulf of Mexico.* By N. ORWIN RUSH. Tallahassee, 1966. Florida State University. Illustrations. Maps. Bibliography. Index. Pp. ix, 158. \$7.00.

This slender volume (108 pages of actual text and quotations) is a very difficult work to review. It is difficult because the story related is so well known; because, aside from General John Campbell's transcript accounts of the Battle of Pensacola, its work contains only a modicum of new archival documentation, particularly Spanish; and, lastly, because it consists of chapters composed either of almost complete quotations (IV and V) or of quotations interlaced by transitional paragraphs (I, II, and III). That the volume was published is a tribute to the editor's drive, the tolerant attitude of Florida State University's editorial committee, and ultimately, perhaps, the affluence of the Floridians.

*The Battle of Pensacola* is simply a padded volume, couching a new translation (not by Rush) of Bernardo de Gálvez' *Diario* of the battle. Thus it consists of a rather revealing preface, a bibliography, an index, maps and drawings, and five very unbalanced chapters. Chapter I (Background), where the editor sees the "significance of the Battle of Pensacola as a decisive factor in the outcome of the Revolution" and as "one of the most brilliantly executed battles of the war," is made up almost equally of text and quotations from very limited sources. Chapter II (The Generals: Gálvez and Campbell) contains seventeen pages, of which approximately eleven are quotations, and is based on even more limited sources, only one of which is in Spanish—*Sociedad económica de la Habana* (1845). (Chapter III (The Battle of Pensacola) gives a good, concise synthesis of the battle which is worthy of publication in a local historical journal. Chapter IV (The *Diario*) contains a six and one-half-page introduction to the fifty-one-page translation of the first printing of Gálvez' battle account—a work previously translated into English and republished in Spanish several times. Finally, Chapter V (Campbell's Account of the Battle), a fifteen and one-half-page chapter, consists of four brief paragraphs by Rush and three interesting letters by General Camp-

bell—all of them from the same source, the Carleton collection in the Public Records Office.

This volume will vex North American Revolutionary historians, because it lacks historical perspective, contains some involved translations, and is extremely favorable to the Spaniards. It will also irritate Hispanic American colonial historians. Why did the author—or perhaps better, the editor—not cite one Spanish document from the Archive of the Indies? Why did he so uncritically accept the one source for the biographical sketch of Bernardo de Gálvez? Why did he not visit the Military Archives in Madrid to ascertain if the original document was deposited there, as he surmised? For those historians who have spent countless hours in going through *legajos* in search of new sources, this volume indicates an interest not in scholarship but simply in publication.

California Historical Society

MANUEL P. SERVIN

*O Rio de Janeiro no século dezessete.* By VIVALDO COARACY. Rio de Janeiro, 1965. Livraria José Olímpio Editôra. Coleção Rio 4 Séculos. Illustrations. Maps. Index. Bibliography. Pp. xli, 268. Paper. \$5,000 (Braz.).

Not the merits of its scholarship but an accident—the quadricentennial of the founding of the “muito leal e heróica cidade de São Sebastião do Rio de Janeiro”—explains the recent reissue of this chronicle, first published in 1944. This festive edition appears now, revised and enlarged, with forty-three handsome maps (mostly of the period), photographs, poems, two indexes, and a short bibliography.

In a preface Francisco Assis de Barbosa presents the chronicler as a tough old journalist and amateur historian who systematically cut into the virtually unexplored wilds of seventeenth-century south Brazilian history. Coaracy's account, if not “fundamental,” has begun to fill the gap between the legendary period before it and the golden one after. When he rings down the final curtain on Salvador Benevides (whose death at 94 he puts in 1688), Coaracy recommends that more detailed study be made of that flinty character. Less than a decade later appeared C. R. Boxer's *Salvador de Sá and the Struggle for Brazil and Angola, 1602-1686*. This masterwork contains frequent, explicit references to Coaracy's work and minor corrections. Boxer agrees fully with the principal fresh interpretation which Coaracy claims to have made—raising the carioca tumults of 1660-61 to the dignity of a successful popular revolution that removed once and for all the heavy signorial hand of Governor de Sá from Brazil.