
How much meat did the Greeks eat? Where did they run their herds? How did they guarantee a ready supply for sacrifice? These practical stock-raising questions, and the symbiosis between the ancient Greeks and cattle that underpinned them, are some of the themes tackled by McInerney in *Cattle of the Sun*. This study is about both empirical and symbolic relationships. McInerney offers a theoretical approach that allows for historical contingencies, “for the values, ideas, decisions, and actions that occur within a cultural matrix that informs an individual’s conscious and unconscious choices” (5). The study is multidisciplinary by nature; the literary, epigraphical, archaeological, and comparative evidence requires theories and methodologies from anthropology, sociology, literature, economics, and political sciences to bring ancient Greek society into focus.

McInerney argues that Greece did not operate in a bovine idiom, as did some of the historical African herding cultures, but worked as a settled, agricultural, manufacturing, trading society that retained a “bovine register.” For the Greeks, keeping cattle engendered certain practices and experiences that ended up dominating entire cultural fields—from marriage rituals to war declarations; everything ended up being refracted through the prism of herding. Consequently, McInerney is able to chart a spectrum of encounters from the empirical observations of Aristotle—what cattle were raised, in what places, by what means—to the symbolic observations of Homer—what social currency cattle had and how cattle facilitated negotiations of status and identity.

The book is organized into two parts, the movement of cattle into the religious sphere (Chapters 1–6) and the emergence and character of the sacred economy (Chapters 7–9). Chapter 1 sets out the goals and conceptual scope of the work. Chapter 2 explores the changing relationships between humans and cattle that were created by domestication. Chapter 3 looks at the Bronze Age through the lens of cattle culture, focusing on the palatial culture of pre- and post-Mycenaean Crete. Chapters 4 and 5 probe the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* of Homer and the myths associated with Herakles to trace how cattle entered into conceptions of heroic behavior. Chapter 6 considers the influence of cattle-breeding practices on the emergence of the Greek pantheon. Chapter 7 explores religious sanctuaries as central consumers (and producers) of cattle to demonstrate the emergence of a sacred economy among the Greeks. Chapter 8 shifts to the secular, examining the development of an urban commercial meat industry from sacrificial offerings. Chapter 9, the final chapter, shows how sanctuary authority over animals provided the basis for a true monetized economy.
McInerney admirably demonstrates “how the deep-seated patterns of thought, feeling, and symbolism that arise from the interaction between humans and cattle continue to crop up across the spectrum of cultural production, in plastic arts, in myth, and in performance, as well as in specific institutions from marriage to imperial pageants” (8). The book is well written, exhaustively researched, and accessible to both the general public and the specialist. Those interested in interdisciplinary approaches to traditional societies, especially their religious and agricultural identities, will find the book particularly useful.

Timothy Howe
St. Olaf College

Thucydides, Pericles, and Periclean Realism. By Edith Foster (New York, Cambridge University Press, 2010) 243 pp. $85.00 cloth $68.00 eBook

Foster’s book on Thucydides will have an appeal well beyond her own field of classics. International-relations specialists and others have long looked to Thucydides as the first exponent of the realist school of interstate politics; he writes of the Athenian Empire, the Spartan war that Athens’ fearsome power sparked, and the politics of his day in a hard-edged manner, scarring any who would mistake specious words for the real causes of events or the true, self-interested motives of state actors.

But not everyone has accepted that Thucydides is the coldly rational realist that he is often taken to be. Especially in recent years, some observers of international politics have rejected the association of Thucydides with the modern realist point of view, arguing that Thucydides’ history, properly understood, undermines any possible faith in the principles of power politics, showing the tragic costs of such an approach to policy. Inconvenient for such a view has been Thucydides’ praise for Pericles, the chief advocate of Athens’ swaggering imperial power on the eve of its war with Sparta. Foster’s book would solve this dilemma, since she applies her philological training and a narratological approach to the first two books of Thucydides’ history to argue a striking thesis: Contrary to the received opinion among ancient historians, Thucydides did not approve of Pericles’ vision of Athenian greatness and power. Rather, the ancient author constructed his early narratives in such a way as to undermine completely the worldview propounded in the speeches that he gave to Pericles.

Foster analyzes large chunks of Thucydides’ early accounts, proceeding in order from the opening section (the “Archaeology”) to the battles of Corinth with Corcyra, the Spartan War Congress, the

Pentekontaetia, Pericles’ background, and finally Pericles’ speeches. She argues, often with meticulous attention to the Greek language, that Thucydides repeatedly showed the self-destructive folly of states accumulating resources and using them aggressively, whether in Greece’s distant past or in contemporary Corinth and Corcyra. He countered Pericles’ high-flying, confident rhetoric centered on Athenian money, ships, and imperial glory not only with the horrors of the plague narrative but with subtle reminders about other kinds of civic and military strength, such as that of the Spartans and their allies. Foster even argues that Thucydides’ famous encomium of Pericles (at 2.65) is qualified, depicting the leader as misguided and fatally overconfident about Athenian resources.

Foster’s book deserves a wide audience for its thought-provoking argument, but it is not entirely convincing. The passage at 2.65 does not read as Foster would have it—carefully limited praise amid a narrative that portrays Pericles as a tragic, hubristic failure. Rather, Thucydides heartily endorses the leader, not just for his political talents, but explicitly for his insights about Athenian resources and capabilities, thereby rendering dubious all of Foster’s labors to show that Thucydides must have disapproved of the Periclean-style pursuit of resources and power because of subtle themes lurking in Thucydides’ narratives. Also weighing against her interpretation is the fact that neither ancient commentators like Dionysius of Halicarnassus nor leading modern classicists noticed any consistent authorial agenda bent on undermining Pericles’ vision. Foster does not help her cause by occasionally overstating her case—for instance when she finds Athenians showing “contempt” for the Corcyrean navy (59), and when she cites “acquisition” (instead of, say, power) as the distinguishing theme of Pericles’ speeches (191). But such occasions are uncommon, and balanced by many useful insights. Hers is, in all, a thoughtfully argued and worthwhile study.

Eric Robinson
Indiana University


This is a clever book. At first, it seems like a genuine attempt to create a comprehensive explanation for the fall of the Roman Empire and the rise of medieval Europe in the light of modern sociological studies of migration. Upon closer examination, however, it is revealed as a spectacular lesson in how to reverse-engineer narrative and analysis to get back to a long-held belief; that is, it turns out to be a more elaborate re-statement of Heather’s long-standing project to restore rampaging barbarian hordes as the sole cause of the fall of Rome. Heather has told this story three times already: this time it gets both less subtle—"the connec-
tion between immigrant violence and the collapse of the western Empire could not be more direct” (339)—and more insidious; the trappings of both sociological theory and archaeological research hang heavy on the footnotes. Sadly, the result is not actually interdisciplinary in any meaningful sense: Heather has a very traditional view of the fall of the Empire and its aftermath—one that has barely advanced beyond the communis opinio of the 1890s. His tactic in this book is to descend upon other, more modern and nuanced studies in order to pluck whatever bits of theory or data can lend this reactionary project an aura of authoritative modernity.

The technique is to make an assertion so often that it is transmuted into fact—for example, “repeat large-scale migration was of the essence of continued existence for barbarian groups on northern territory” (104). Restated with variations throughout 600 pages, migration becomes the universal key to European history in the first millennium. Contradictory evidence, literary and archaeological, is relentlessly excluded because the “better evidence” always supports whatever Heather wants it to: On the one hand, because Goths were so numerous and large a group, their material culture was highly tenacious; on the other hand, because the early Slavs were such a numerous group, their material culture was highly flexible and malleable, far more open to the adoption of foreign modes. Never mind the simplistic assumption that material culture always reflects ethnic identity—impervious to thirty years of theoretical advance. One can only marvel at the way identical patterns of evidence can be said to produce diametrically opposed conclusions, so long as those are congenial to the argument.

There are also good things in evidence, particularly regarding the sudden consolidation of Slavic kingdoms in the ninth and tenth centuries—a reminder that Heather has always come at late Roman questions with a medievalist’s preconceptions. Elsewhere, he is right to try to deduce governing apparatus from the actions that kings and chief-tains were able to compel their followers to take. This approach, more than anything, goes some way toward justifying his assertion that a broad class of nonaristocratic “freemen” warriors must have existed in many of the barbarian cultures of the first half of the millennium. Yet to claim the point proved and build further hypotheses upon it is not legitimate; he comes perilously close to recreating the old, volkisch notion of an inherent “Germanic” belief in freedom. Throughout, in fact, Heather makes the tacit assumption that evidence from any “Germanic,” “Celtic,” or “Slavic” group can be used to analyze any other “Germanic,” “Celtic,” or “Slavic” group—in other words, that linguistic identity and socio-institutional behaviors go inevitably together.

Historical comparanda are certainly a legitimate tool of analysis, and Heather picks some apt ones that support his mass-migration hypothesis, not least an extended analogy between what he regards as a mass Gothic migration from the Baltic and conquest of the Black Sea littoral and the Afrikaner migration to, and conquest of, the Transvaal and Natal. It
must be said, however, that a great many historical comparanda would support a model that he ignores—that the Goths were formed from a large number of indigenes and a small number of migrants under the pressure of Roman imperialism, and in the shadow of the Empire. From seventeenth-century Spanish Florida to the whole history of European involvement in India and Russian involvement in its “near abroad,” the formation of polities and identities at the frontiers of imperial powers is a dramatically more powerful explanatory model of the Roman frontier than the mass migrations on which Heather insists.

This book is worth reading, if only as a masterful exercise in intellectual sleight of hand. It is not interdisciplinary in any meaningful way, and it will persuade no one not already persuaded of the author’s main contention that mass migration brings down empires and that immigrants have a strong tendency to destroy the society that hosts them. It is a contention widely appealing in politics and will no doubt help this book find an audience.

Michael Kulikowski
Penn State University


This book takes an important lesson to heart, namely, the importance of understanding each historical period on its own terms. That implies freedom from teleological and linear assumptions that tend to downplay historical actions as obsolete or utterly premature. European economic history, in particular, has been full of grand narratives equating the “rise of the West” with the long march of a conquering capitalism. Publications of that sort generally struggle to define the threshold of a “capitalist society,” a conundrum only partially solved by the Marxist notion of “transition.” Every age, after all, is always in transition.

Howell admirably escapes the reductionist fallacy of considering European economic history as a mere prelude to bigger and brighter things. To avoid that pitfall, her mode of analysis consists of embedding economic history in its social and cultural milieus. Hence, she adheres primarily to the methodologies and sources of legal history, although—as she herself admits—her “touch is very light” (46). This “lightness” of construction is not to be interpreted in pejorative terms. Rather, it allows her to draw from an impressive amount of wide-ranging literature and source material, and enables her to make refreshing inroads into existing debates on property relations, marriage practices, gift giving, sumptuary laws, and the perception of commerce between 1300 and 1600. At its most unsuccessful—such as in Chapter 5 (“Rescuing Commerce”)—this essayistic approach seems all too nimble, its argu-
ments merely scratching the surface of complex issues regarding trust and information asymmetries in exchange, “just price” formation, and so on. Most of the time, however, Howell succeeds in strong and clear reasoning, unfettered by the wealth of debates that she engages. A case in point is Chapter 4 (“The Dangers of Dress”), in which she inventively connects the rise and fall of sumptuary legislation to the “birth” of discourses about individual, self-fashioning consumers.

The central theme of a “commercial revolution,” as opposed to capitalist developments, runs through all of the chapters. According to Howell, this commercialization is not to be interpreted as an infant or primitive capitalist exchange. It had an inherent logic of its own, simultaneously shaping, while being shaped by, the social and cultural conventions of its time. Thus, although Howell rescues economic culture from the false wisdom of hindsight, she nevertheless creates some new ambiguities. The basic assumption of the existence of a commercial “big-bang” already presupposes another “great transformation” between a less and a more commercialized past. Such an opposition transposes the old question about the meaning of capitalism to one about the inception of commercialism: When did Europe pass the threshold of a “commercial society,” and was this process truly as comprehensive as Howell suggests?

Even more important are questions regarding the motives of economic agents. Although Howell convincingly demonstrates that society as a whole was driven primarily by non-market calculations and imperatives, it is hard to imagine the eventual emergence of efficiency maximizing—dare I say, “capitalist”—institutions without at least a core of genuine profit-seeking utilitarians. Rather than emerging out of the blue in the eighteenth century, capitalist activities had been practiced openly for a long time; it was their ideological cementing that happened gradually.

Ilja Van Damme
University of Antwerp

Witch Hunts in the Western World: Persecution and Punishment from the Inquisition through the Salem Trials. By Brian Pavlac (Santa Barbara, Greenwood Press [cloth]; Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press [paper], 2009), 228 pp. $49.95 cloth $17.95 paper

The purpose of this book, according to the preface, is “to help illuminate errors and fantasies” about “witches and witchcraft” in popular writing while participating in the academic discussion, which has “increased by leaps and bounds over the past few decades” (vii). The book certainly has the potential to accomplish the first goal: It is relatively short; it is written in a reasonably accessible style; it provides broad background information; it is based on a solid survey of current as well as
older works on the subject, including published collections of original documents and demonological texts; and it covers the subject from its roots in antiquity through the Enlightenment roughly to the present day. Its contribution to scholarly discussion, or even academic instruction, however, is more limited.

On a technical level, the author’s decision not to include citations for anything except direct quotations diminishes the book’s usefulness as an introductory survey or general reference. Although most of the material will be familiar to specialists, they will find it impossible to follow up on the occasional, unfamiliar points that Pavlac raises, or to use the book as a quick entry into an unfamiliar topic. These limitations will similarly frustrate non-specialist scholars and students.

On a structural level, after a survey of the Middle Ages, the book’s chapters divide by nation and region in a fragmented, chronologically jumbled presentation of anecdotes and isolated observations rather than a systematically developed, analytically informed overview. The sense of discontinuity is heightened by the profusion of major headings within chapters and only occasional use of subheadings. For example, the discussion of Switzerland within the Holy Roman Empire is not presented in a cohesive section internally divided into subsections but as a series of major topics strung one after another: “Witch Hunting in Switzerland,” “Devil’s Mark,” “Hunts in Geneva,” and so on (71–73).

The problems with this structure are most apparent in the book’s handling of the decline of witchcraft, in which common legal developments and cosmopolitan discourse receive only patchy coverage toward the end of each national sequence. As a consequence, “Arguments against Witch Hunting [in Germany during the early 1600s]” immediately precedes the discussion of the continent’s earliest hunts around 1400 in Switzerland (70–71), and the section on Balthasar Bekker’s publications in the 1690s comes just before “The Decline of Hunting in the Empire,” which began around 1660 (76–77). The upshot is that Pavlac exaggerates the importance of early-Enlightenment criticisms of magic while obscuring the recent insight that witch hunts in the core areas had begun to dwindle decades earlier, mainly because of legal caution rather than any new metaphysics.

On a conceptual level, the book suffers from a superficial understanding of the subject. In the first place, it chronically conflates witch hunts, witch trials, witchcraft beliefs, and prosecutions for other forms of magic. Pavlac acknowledges in specific places that zealous inquisitions and mass panics were just a subset of the total reactions to suspected witchcraft, and that separate laws existed for beneficent practitioners, but in general, he refers to all actions against magical activity (except when considered to be fraud) as hunts.

More broadly, the book is hampered by its traditional, rationalist perspective, which leads it to assert that “no witches existed who made pacts with demons and worked harmful magic” (190); that a relativist understanding of the mentality of people who believed in witchcraft...
neither clarifies nor excuses” them, since “voices spoke out against the natural reality of magic . . . throughout the age of the witch hunts” (188, 190); and that the hunts ended when people rejected the “aberration of Christian thought” that credited magic with physical power and returned to the “common sense” apprehension that magic is impotent (82, 187). However, without denying the illusoriness of the purported diabolical conspiracy, the wanton cruelty of the mass panics, the injustice of most small trials, and the inefficacy of many magical activities, recent work has established that there is ample evidence that some people did indeed practice harmful magic, sometimes by invoking demons; understanding the place of witchcraft in early modern people’s mental universe is critical to clarifying why they believed and acted as they did; almost none of the “skeptics” before the late 1600s denied the existence of supernatural forces, just the ability of witches or the devil, as opposed to God, to command them; and our “common sense” understanding of magic is the product of a long process of cultural development that included first the imposition and then the rejection of the witch trials. As with the points about the trials and hunts, Pavlac evinces awareness of most of these points in specific places, but he fails to account for them in his overall presentation.

Edward Bever
SUNY College, Old Westbury

The Book in the Renaissance. By Andrew Pettegree (New Haven, Yale University Press, 2010) 421 pp. $40.00

Pettegree’s study offers a vivid introduction to current trends in the history of the book. It treads a careful line allowing for popular accessibility while not discounting academic readership. The book’s success in these aims makes it valuable for scholars across disciplines who wish to acquaint themselves with the history of the book (as thing) in the first centuries of print.

Pettegree synthesizes the history of the book as a commodity. Placing trade in books at the heart of his approach marks a generational succession from Elizabeth Eisenstein’s focus on the printing press in The Printing Press as an Agent of Change (New York, 1979) and continues recent use of material bibliography as a servant of a wider book-history project. With this distance from explanations based on technological agency, the foundations of the printed industry in manuscript book trade receive fuller attention than has often been the case. Pettegree’s own projects, a short-title catalog for early French books leading to development of a universal short-title catalog, lend the book its most distinct elements. This account of the early stages of the printed-book industry brings a Europe-wide geography of impressive scope to the fore.

Just as succeeding geographies of trade reflect his interests, Pettegree
hones in on the Reformation to explain much of the transformation in the European book market. He treats fifteenth-century trade as robustly experimental but nevertheless discovers lucrative genres of text only gradually. Falling like a bomb on an industry that was only just achieving some kind of profitable state during the first years of the new century, the Reformation transformed the early modern book trade in scale and geography, sealing producers’ perceptions of profit centers for an extended period thereafter. Unlike Desiderius Erasmus, who perceptively exploited existing markets, the changes that followed on the heels of Martin Luther married printers’ realizations of the more reliable profitability of cheap and popular works to a customer base that, Pettigree underlines, grew during these tumultuous decades.

Where book censuses and the Reformation flag, Pettigree’s account meets some limits. Despite its strong account of the book trade in Western Europe during the decades before the introduction of the press, it offers less than might have been anticipated about the resilience of manuscripts during the print era. The extremely brief treatment of Ottoman and Russian lands is just enough to leave the impression that the continuing dominance of manuscript book production in these areas showed some deficiency (265). This notion seems at variance with Pettigree’s treatment of the Western medieval trade in books. Further, he pays relatively scant attention to concepts like information societies and the public sphere, both of which carry sufficient maturity in academic circles to appeal to the kind of mixed market that this book aims to find.

As a work of synthesis, Pettigree depends on his mastery of the scholarship, combined with recent short-title efforts. Given its concentration on markets, Pettigree’s economics appear largely in costings to illustrate print-run scales and in distribution areas. Reading plays less of a role than might be suspected by the term Renaissance in the title. Pettigree’s study reflects the mixed success of scholarship attempting to reconstruct the experience of the ordinary reader. Ironically, even with his vivid, accessible examples of popular texts and their trade, Pettigree concentrates on learned texts in his discussion of reading. The natural historical and medical texts that he uses benefit from articulate annotation and illustration. Though these texts work well as demonstrations of achievements based on scholarly study, this departure from his account of the popular trade testifies to a continuing difficulty in the scholarship. Thus, where it is most engaging, The Book in the Renaissance is far more about books than about texts. It reflects a continuing struggle to account for people as imaginative readers rather than as simply consumers.

Sara Brooks
Princeton University
The periods between the Restoration of 1660 and the First Reform Act of 1832 have long been viewed as Britain’s “age of aristocracy” or, more controversially, as the period of its ancien régime, when the peerage and gentry were socially, politically, economically, and culturally dominant. These two important studies, written by scholars at different points in their academic trajectories, add significantly to our knowledge of the British landed elite at the apex of its influence and power. Matikkala’s book is more original in its focus and approach, providing the first systematic exploration of the modern origins of the honors system, which would become distinctive to Britain—as, indeed, it remains.

Matikkala demonstrates how the elaboration of a hierarchy of honors during the century after the Restoration was a further and hitherto neglected dimension of the consolidation of aristocratic power. The fourteenth-century Order of the Garter, England’s premier distinction, was notably revived after Charles II’s return, and two new honors—the Scottish Order of the Thistle (1687) and that of the Bath (1725)—were added to provide a more hierarchical system that exactly mirrored the further stratification under way within the peerage itself. Understandable sensitivities about the king’s recent exile and his father’s execution prevented the adoption of two further proposals for new orders—the Royal Oak (commemorating the tree in which Charles I was believed to have hidden after the battle of Worcester) and the Esquires of the Martyred King—since they were potential reminders of an unhappy period for the Stuart monarchy. After 1700, the Garter became almost a hereditary distinction, awarded to successive generations of the political and social elite, ranking between earl and duke.

Matikkala’s final chapter, devoted to “The ‘Symbolic Capital’ of the Orders” is the most interesting, and also the most interdisciplinary in approach. It provides fascinating information about the ceremonies that accompanied installations, rightly viewed as “explicit visual reminders of social hierarchies and patronage networks” (288). But his anthropological perspective could be carried considerably further; too often he is content simply to provide fascinating detail rather than subject it to rigorous analysis. Hence, his book, with its numerous striking illustrations, will be valued chiefly as a source of information, and of numerous revealing vignettes.

In striking testimony to the British-wide dominance of the Irish House of Butler during the Restoration, the only occasion when father...
and son were simultaneously members of the Order of the Garter was the case of Ormond and Ossory after 1672 (139). Revealing in a different way is that Sir Robert Walpole, the sole commoner during this century to be given the Garter (in 1726), had the insignia of the Order added to existing portraits (348). Matikkala offers some valuable comparative material on foreign honors, and his extensive appendixes helpfully list all the holders of the Garter, Thistle, and Bath. Based upon wide reading, especially in the voluminous printed materials, Matikkala’s study will be an invaluable source of reference for decades to come.

By contrast, McCahill’s study is the product of four decades’ research, consolidating his own extensive earlier publications on this theme. The English and, eventually, British peerage was all-but-unique, in that membership was defined by possession of a seat in the House of Lords. This monograph devotes a significant amount of space to politics: Chapters 6–8 bring the upper house satisfactorily into perspective for the first time and chart its transition during George III’s reign from being “the bulwark of the king’s government . . . into the bastion of opposition to many reforming measures” (209).

Earlier chapters provide a detailed, authoritative, and statistically precise picture of the British peerage at the peak of its influence—in its outlines, already familiar from the writings of Cannon and Beckett. But McCahill adds important detail and enhanced authority on the basis of a scholarly lifetime’s exploration of the sources. The peerage was, above all, an “active governing class” (19); more than two-thirds of the 715 “active lay peers and royal dukes held cabinet or non-cabinet offices at Westminster, served at court, as officers in the army or navy, as lords-lieutenant . . . in the administration of the empire or as diplomats” (19).

McCahill is interesting on the relative youth of peers, discovering that more than half of them inherited their titles by the time they were thirty. He also demonstrates the increasing “Britishness” of this new elite: During the half-century after 1760, when the Irish Act of Union was passed, the Scottish and Irish component was almost one-quarter (13, 17). Buoyed by the increased revenues derived from their estates and from the profits that accrued from farming during a period of striking demographic and agricultural expansion, the economic, social, and even political power of the peerage reached its zenith. McCahill’s painstaking research and careful scholarship combine to make this book an indispensable study of the aristocracy during the reign of George III, particularly in its parliamentary role.

Hamish Scott
University Of Glasgow


Apetrei’s welcome study examines a number of women who wrote and published works in which they defended female dignity and autonomy in England during period from 1680 to 1710. The first half of the book examines rationalist author Mary Astell and her circle, and the second half a series of female visionaries and millenarians associated with the Quakers, Philadelphians, and other dissenting and spiritualist groups. Previous scholarship has tended to focus on either one or the other of these groups. Astell and others in this period who criticized women’s subjection and advocated for better education for women are generally viewed within a secular tradition of “defenses of women” that begins with Christine de Pizan and moves through Mary Wollstonecraft to the suffrage movement. Apetrei places the visionaries within the context of religious radicalism, those in this era generally viewed as less innovative and interesting than those who acted during the English Civil War.

Apetrei connects the philosophical rationalists and the visionaries through her central argument that both groups were motivated by religion—religion “was the very origin and goal of feminism” (36)—because both viewed women’s worth as rooted in God’s creation. They argued, in fact, that women’s greater propensity to Christian virtue than men’s made them particularly suited to address the challenges facing the English church and English society in what they perceived to be a time of crisis.

In making her case, Apetrei places her subjects effectively within complex streams of early modern philosophical and theological debate. She carefully lays out the different varieties of rationalism, arguing that Astell’s use and understanding of “right reason” was more Platonic than Cartesian. Platonists viewed reason as a quality imparted by a beneficent and merciful God, subject to legitimate use as a counterbalance to authority; for Astell and her followers, authority included Scripture as well as male ecclesiastical officials. Although the visionaries have generally been seen as “enthusiasts” who downplayed the importance of reason, they, too, used God’s granting of “right reason” to both sexes as a recommendation of their arguments against orthodox Calvinist predestinarians and as a justification for women’s wider social role.

Apetrei’s argument relies primarily on the published and unpublished works of the female writers that she studies, but she also makes innovative use of lists of private and institutional library holdings to trace the difficult issue of who might have actually read these works. In addition, she uses hand-written marginal notes in the books known to have been in Astell’s personal library to explore what kind of reader Astell might have been.

Apetrei explicitly reclaims the word “feminist” for female (or male) thinkers in this era who argued for women’s autonomy and condemned women’s subjugation. She also frequently employs another word that
has been out of fashion in gender scholarship recently, experience. With its insightful analysis of religious subjectivity, the book reclaims experience—and perhaps even, in the author’s words, “a distinctive ‘female experience’” (45)—as a worthy object of historical study.

Merry Wiesner-Hanks
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee


The turn of the eighteenth century is one of the most fascinating moments in English history. Many historians have spent their careers fruitfully studying the Glorious Revolution, England’s emergence as a first-rate military power, and the accompanying debates in the nascent public sphere. A major reason for the period’s vibrancy is the Financial Revolution. The introduction of a widely circulating credit currency, the creation of a long-term funded national debt, and the emergence of an active market in securities contributed to a radically altered culture of credit, which in turn had a profound impact on England’s commerce, politics, and geopolitical standing. Since Dickson’s classic statement on the topic in 1967, there has been a steady stream of important contributions, highlighted by the works of Brewer, North and Weingast, Neal, and Carruthers.¹ In her book, _The Origins of English Financial Markets_, Murphy revisits and critically comments on this body of literature, as well as incorporates more recent scholarly findings, including her own, generating a succinct and accessible account that historians of all specialties will find useful.

Instead of focusing equally on all facets of the Financial Revolution, Murphy concentrates on the development of financial markets. She begins by exploring London’s first stock-market boom and the introduction of tradable public securities in the 1690s, and the debate surrounding these innovations, in particular the derision of the dreaded stock jobbers (Chapters 1–3). One of the many virtues of this book is that it not only offers a sophisticated treatment of such financial mechanisms, but it also informs us about many of the surrounding cultural transformations that were essential for the development of a more sophisticated

system of finance, such as the birth of a financial press and the creation of informational networks (Chapters 5–6). The most original feature of this book is its rare insight into investors’ thought processes, decision making, and trading strategies (Chapters 6–8).

Murphy invites her readers to reconsider the degree to which England’s financial system was—as is often claimed—indebted to so-called Dutch Finance, the extent to which the Glorious Revolution’s changes to the constitution affected the development of confidence in public credit, the plausibility of the idea that changes to public credit were more revolutionary than those pertaining to private credit, and the question of whether early modern investors exhibited rationality in their decisions.

Although Murphy’s carefully constructed arguments on all of these issues deserve the attention of scholars, the intervention that likely will prove most enduring is her highlighting of investors’ subjectivity and agency, as well as the political and cultural context in which they operated. Instead of relying solely on the movement of debt and equity prices, as many previous contributors to the debate about early modern investor rationality have done, Murphy offers a rich analysis of who the investors, projectors, brokers, and stock-jobbers were and how they gathered and processed information; decided and implemented their strategies; and influenced and, at times manipulated, the trade in debt and equity instruments, as well as derivatives. Murphy’s delightful prose, insightful syntheses, and careful research make her book deserving of a wide readership.

Carl Wennerlind
Barnard College

*The Enlightened Economy: An Economic History of Britain 1700–1850.* By Joel Mokyr (New Haven, Yale University Press, 2009) 564 pp. $45.00

This book is both an interdisciplinary study of the impact of the “Industrial Enlightenment” on the British economy and a synthesis of the main economic aspects of Britain’s Industrial Revolution. The second remit is less original than the first, but the consideration of specialist studies by other historians on population growth, agricultural productivity, foreign trade, the service sector, and living standards is thoughtful and intelligent. Professional scholars will enjoy reading chapters on those topics, though they will find few novel interpretations or information. The first remit of *The Enlightened Economy*, however, is more original. Drawing on primary printed and secondary scientific, philosophical, economic, and political literature, Mokyr argues a well-supported case for the diffusion of scientific and technological progress as a distinctive and important reason for Britain’s ability to undergo and sustain an Industrial Revolution ahead of its main rivals. By conjoining literature often kept
The scientific and philosophical, on the one hand, and the economic, on the other—Mokyr suggests that increases in useful knowledge, the desire for progress, intellectual curiosity, and a reservoir of talented, practical men to implement technological change were essential underpinnings of British economic growth in the period from 1700 to 1850. Through these means, and via the networks, institutions, and societies formed to support them, certain macro-inventions—notably smelting iron with coke, the design of the steam engine, and new cotton-spinning machinery—were made possible and diffused widely by the early nineteenth century. “The changing intellectual environment,” Mokyr writes, “created communications between those who knew things and those who made things” (85). Engineers, machinists, and lecturers “spread the culture and values of the new gospel of useful knowledge and impressed upon natural philosophers the need to make their knowledge available to those who could make use of it” (88).

Mokyr’s argument is not simply a restatement of the role of heroic inventors in industrialization. But it differs from historical interpretations that view British industrialization emerging from either the transition from an organic to an inorganic economy or via extensive proto-industrial activity leading to economic growth. What Mokyr provides, rather, is a fuller context than others concerning the role of metropolitan and provincial institutions in stimulating the circulation of industrial and technical knowledge in Georgian Britain. He emphasizes the deeply embedded artisan skills from which Britain could draw to put that knowledge into productive use. Thus, “the great British inventors stood on the shoulders of those who provided them with the tools and workmanship” (121–122). The “Industrial Enlightenment” was disseminated by the famous names who made major technological breakthroughs—Abraham Darby, Richard Arkwright, Samuel Crompton, Matthew Boulton, and James Watt—and by lesser lights with highly competent skills who refined and adapted the techniques of the macro-inventors.

In such a wide-ranging book, certain issues are raised that will need further research and thought. For example, Mokyr argues that a steadily rising number of inventors were influenced by the cultural and social changes implied by the “Industrial Enlightenment.” The comparative dimension to this conclusion will need further exploration in order to ascertain why French or Dutch inventors did not receive similar stimulation, given that the promotion of useful knowledge was not confined to Britain during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Since France had many innovative scientists, and the Netherlands pioneered techniques to improve agriculture and waterways that were later copied in Britain, it is legitimate to question whether the difference between the three countries, in terms of the diffusion of industrial practices, lay in the number of highly motivated, skilled mechanics, engineers, entrepreneurial craftsmen, and adapters of micro-inventions. Moreover, since some significant British inventors, such as Arkwright, Crompton, and Darby, did not receive significant scientific schooling, the source of their
inventiveness needs further elaboration. If they did not have strong connections to the world of Enlightenment science, how did they arrive at their technological breakthroughs? It was probably not through repeated experimentation.

Mokyr’s elegant volume raises these and other issues that will be the source of continuing historical debate. Economic and social historians, economists, and historians of science and technology will learn much from this contribution to the economic impact of constructive knowledge.

Kenneth Morgan
Brunel University

The Life of Property: House, Family and Inheritance in Béarn, South-West France. By Timothy Jenkins (New York, Berghahn, 2010) 181 pp. $60.00

The exciting convergence between historical analysis and ethnographic actuality that Jenkins achieves in this remarkable study of Béarn arises from three major factors. First, he has conducted extensive field and archival research there. Second, access to notaries’ files (rather than official promulgations of decisions already taken) has given him rare insight into the internal dynamics of property management in an area characterized by primogeniture and by the long persistence of a type of “house society” that formally conflicted with French codified law. Third, Béarn—its archival documentation reaching back at least to the twelfth century—has been studied with particular intensity by writers from de Bonald and Le Play in the mid-nineteenth century to Bourdieu in the latter half of the twentieth, with the result that its local peculiarities have influenced regional, national, and even international discourses about social stability and order. In the case of Bourdieu, it helped to propel notions of social strategy into the theoretical vocabulary. A careful reading of novelist Palay’s psychologically acute dissections of inheritance conflicts reinforces Jenkins’ analysis from an internal perspective. 1

Jenkins ably demonstrates that Béarnais society was not a passive recipient of legal interference in favor of equal partible inheritance as some have imagined. Repeated predictions of its imminent demise, he shows, were themselves part of an ongoing structure of self-concealment; conservative and progressive forces—respectively located in tensions between large and small farmers and between men and women—continually adapted to external pressures without ever substantively yielding on fundamental principles of inheritance and house. Indeed, Jenkins shows

1 See Louis de Bonald, Œuvres complètes de M. de Bonald (Paris, 1864); Frédéric Le Play, L’organisation de la famille, selon le vrai modèle signalé par l’histoire de toutes les races et de tous les temps (Paris, 1871); Pierre Bourdieu, Le bal des élébataires: crise de la société paysanne en Béarn (Paris, 2002); Simin Palay, Los tres gojats de Bòrdvielha (Pau, 1974).
that the elegiac quality of Bourdieu’s account is but another iteration of
an old trope, which this reviewer has elsewhere called “structural nostal-
gia” (the assumption, repeated in successive generations, that a more bal-
anced order is just vanishing from memory). The demise of Béarn’s so-
cial order (and generally that of European rural society) has, in another
idiom, “always–already” been about to happen—and has never done so.

One peculiar genius of this book lies in the agile demonstration that
Bourdieu’s failure to live up to his own theoretical principles instantiates
a recognizably Béarnais problem—the conviction of imminent dissolu-
tion. Despite his expressed anti-structuralism, Bourdieu found it practi-
cally impossible to resolve the “tradition–modernity” binary as he
celebratedly did that of structure–practice; Jenkins exposes Bourdieu’s
difficulty in specifically cultural terms that nicely complement Deborah
Reed-Danahay’s excellent analysis in *Locating Bourdieu* (Bloomington,
2004).

The familiar trope of the town as the moral cesspit against which
the countryside maintains purity and honor similarly reproduces a con-
ventional dualism that conceals moral struggle in both loci. Bourdieu’s
agonized, imperfect reflexivity reproduces this nostalgic entailment,
which on Jenkins’ evidence is of considerable antiquity in Béarn and
elsewhere.

At the very end of the book, Jenkins describes such valedictions as
“theodicies,” in which Béarn and the wider world act on each other in
deciphering the intractable problems of society. The Béarnais writers
who address social issues are the mediators of that secretly and para-
doxically regenerative process, elegantly unpacked in Jenkins’ dense,
complex, and richly rewarding historical anthropology.

Michael Herzfeld
Harvard University

Infection of the Innocents: Wet Nurses, Infants, and Syphilis in France, 1780–
1900. By Joan Sherwood (Montreal, McGill–Queen’s University Press,
2010) 214 pp. $75.00

Sherwood’s intriguing monograph relates two stories from eighteenth–
and nineteenth-century France concerning the intersection of the wide-
spread practice of wet nursing and congenital syphilis in newborns. The
first story tells of the Vaugirard hospital in Paris, an institution founded
in 1780 to test the practice of treating syphilitic newborns through mer-
curial solutions administered to their mothers or wet nurses, who were
also syphilitic. What was being tested was not mercury treatment for
syphilis—which was a universally accepted medical practice almost until
the advent of penicillin in the 1940s—but the mode of administration
via the nurse’s milk. Vaugirard was closed down in 1790 because the cost

pub. 1997), 147–182.
of the institution was not judged to be justified by the limited success that it claimed. The practice of treating syphilitic newborns via breast milk, however, persisted in private arrangements. Families, often advised by their physicians, deliberately selected uninfected wet nurses who were not advised of the risks that they faced from both exposure to syphilis and the mercury treatments that they were induced to take. Sherwood’s second story concerns those nineteenth-century arrangements and the lawsuits brought against the families and their physicians by wet nurses infected with syphilis by their nurseries.

Sherwood’s sources for the first story are the records of Vaugirard hospital preserved in the Archives de l’Assistance publique in Paris, along with published writings by the physicians involved. For the second story, she relies primarily on the medical press, which published extensive debates about such issues as the transmissibility of congenital syphilis from infant to nurse and the conflict between a doctor’s obligations to maintain the confidentiality of the families that engaged him and to protect the health of the wet nurses hired by those families. The major compilations of French legal proceedings, out of deference to the medical profession, rarely included these cases.

Sherwood mines the approaches and knowledge of several historical sub-disciplines. Wherever feasible, she has quantified the information that she collected. This is an easier task with the hospital records of Vaugirard than with the spotty nineteenth-century trial reports in the medical press. She deals sensitively with the slowly developing scientific knowledge of syphilis, always attentive to the contemporary understanding of the disease, its mode of transmission, and its treatment. A key development was the consensus formed in the 1850s that, contrary to then-prevailing theory, congenital syphilis could be transmitted from secondary symptoms (such as the sores on a baby’s mouth) as well as from the primary genital chancre. Sherwood also skillfully expounds upon a range of French legal doctrines and practices and their interaction with medical ethics. Finally, she argues that the infected wet nurses, in their legal struggle for damages, belonged to a French tradition of feminist activism dating back to the Revolution. Readers, however, may be less likely to view the infected nurses—poor, uneducated, rural women—as agents of change than as exploited victims, like the African-American subjects of the notorious Tuskegee Experiment.

Putting aside two minor factual errors (the armies of Charles VIII of France, not of Charles V, were infected with syphilis in Italy in 1494 [14], and Middlesex Hospital in London was founded in 1745 to provide smallpox inoculations, not vaccinations, which Edward Jenner did not introduce until fifty years later [181, n.19]), Sherwood has woven together two stories and several social and professional perspectives into a fascinating tapestry of scientific, professional, and social change in revolutionary France.

George D. Sussman
LaGuardia Community College, CUNY
Poverty, Charity, and Motherhood: Maternal Societies in Nineteenth-Century France. By Christine Adams (Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 2010) 251 pp. $45.00

Adams’ Poverty, Charity, and Motherhood explores the history and significance of women’s contributions to civil society and their substantial participation in the creation of the welfare state by focusing on the activities of the Société de Charité Maternelle (the Society for Maternal Charity). One of the oldest and most important of the private organizations that worked with French national, regional, and municipal authorities to provide assistance for poor mothers and their children, the Société de Charité Maternelle founded its first chapter in Paris in 1788 under the leadership of Anne-Françoise d’Outrement de Fougeret and grew to include more than sixty local chapters in cities across France by 1862. Adams’ study of the shifting eighteenth- and nineteenth-century fortunes of the Société is particularly rich because it offers a comparative analysis based on extensive work in the archives of no less than seven of these cities, their surrounding regions, and their individual Société sections: Paris, Lyon, Bordeaux, Rouen, Marseille, Dijon, and Limoges. In each case, Adams shows how the strengths and weaknesses of the city’s dominant industries affected the number of poor people that the city had to serve; how the social situations, political orientations, and religious affiliations of the city’s philanthropically minded men and women affected the resources they were able to mobilize for the Société from their private purses and the coffers of the state; and how changing political regimes and national priorities affected the facility with which the elite women who joined the Société were able to fulfill their primary mission of encouraging poor mothers to raise their infants themselves instead of sending them away to wet nurses or abandoning them outright.

Although Adams claims that her work draws on “the interdisciplinary tools of gender studies and sociological analysis” (24), her book actually engages most closely with the more purely disciplinary findings of history, especially the political history of European and American public policy, the cultural history of French and British emotions, the social history of modern workers and municipal poverty, the family history of men’s and women’s relationships to children, the feminist history of male and female reformers, and the women’s history of mothers both rich and poor.

Readers who are curious about unusual approaches to history may be particularly interested, however, in the opening of Adams’ introduction—a three-page section that builds on her work in the departmental archives of the Rhône to recreate a typical moment in the life of the Société, its volunteers, and its clients. Six eloquent paragraphs ask readers to “imagine the scenario” in which a poor mother who is about to abandon her third child receives a visit from a member of the Société who not only convinces her to keep her new baby but also helps her to retrieve her previous two children from a foundling home and recommit their care (1–3). Adams’ touching account illustrates both
the pleasures and the perils of extrapolating from primary sources to recreate the physical and emotional sensations of past events. On the one hand, the story that Adams tells is much more dramatic than Delahante’s original report to the Société de Charité Maternelle de Lyon, vividly describing “the crooked steps of the dark, dank lodging,” the “overwhelming” smell of the “latrine on the landing,” the poor mother’s “despair,” and her privileged visitor’s mixed feelings of “genuine compassion” and “discomfort” (1–3). On the other hand, even though Adams’ presentation of the episode seems completely plausible based on the weight of the textual evidence from the by-laws, letters, minutes, financial reports, statistical surveys, conference proceedings, and government publications that she eventually analyzes in the remaining six sections of her book, the question of where to draw the line between verifiable fact and speculative fiction in such a historical recreation remains.

In the end, however, Adams’ work should stand or fall not on this small section of its introduction alone but on its overall merits as a scholarly analysis of the social and political networks that formed in and around the Société de Charité Maternelle—and in this regard, Poverty, Charity, and Motherhood certainly succeeds. Anyone who is interested in the history of the welfare state would do well to read it.

Jean Elisabeth Pedersen
University of Rochester

Armour and Masculinity in the Italian Renaissance. By Carolyn Springer (Toronto, University of Toronto Press. 2010) 241 pp. $55.00

In this elegant book, Springer explores the cultural and political significance of armor in sixteenth-century Italy—a worthy subject not adequately addressed by scholars until now. She treats armor as one of the most complicated and ambiguous manifestations of the era’s material culture, embodying various meanings. It was used by political leaders to fashion images of themselves, connected to notions of masculinity.

Armor was, as Springer argues, a singularly elusive artifact because its very form could be changed. Disassembled and reassembled, it was never a “secure possession (4).” Springer employs her training as a literary critic to penetrate the deeper significance of the artifact, effectively linking her arguments with those of art historians, and drawing widely on anthropological, historical, and psychoanalytical literature. The result is a book of considerable depth and erudition.

Springer’s main interest is in the “luxury” armor that came into vogue during the sixteenth century. This armor, unlike its munitions-grade predecessors, was not intended for the battlefield, but for display in processions and parades at court as a species of artwork, commissioned by wealthy patrons. Springer focuses particular attention on the highly
ornate armor produced by Filippo Negroli (1510–1579) of Milan, one of the great manufacturers of the day and the subject of an exhibit at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York in 1998. Springer stresses the theatricality of Negroli’s armor and its role as a means of both self-presentation and self-concealment (161).

Springer divides her book into two parts. The first, consisting of three chapters, lays out a typology of armor, which included classical, sacred, and grotesque as its basic forms. The second section, also three chapters long, deals with the “celebrity patrons” Guidobaldo II della Rovere, duke of Urbino; Emperor Charles V Habsburg; and Cosimo I de’Medici, duke of Florence and later of Tuscany. These men, who were roughly contemporary, employed armor as a means of “self-fashioning,” the subtitle Springer gives to the section.

The first section bears the imprint of Bakhtin and his well-known discussion of grotesque and classical forms in the work of Rabelais. Springer carefully elucidates the types of ceremonial armor in use during the sixteenth century. Classical armor, alla romana, depicted an articulated musculature on the classical model—an ideal of masculinity taken from the Roman world, based on “symmetry, autonomy and closure” (37). Sacred armor projected Christian images, which were both visual (often representations of saints) and textual (verses from the Bible). Grotesque armor, the oldest form, emphasized distortion of the human form and included demonic devices, such as images of Medusa emblazoned on shields, helmets, and breastplates (56). Springer devotes a great deal of space to explicating the popular Medusa motif.

The second part of the book shifts to the activities of important patrons and the ways in which they used armor to allay their anxieties and empower themselves. In this context, Springer most effectively demonstrates, as she promised in the introduction, the ambiguity of armor, which simultaneously expressed both vulnerability and power. The commissions of Guidobaldo II della Rovere, duke of Urbino, strongly linked political authority with masculinity. The famous portrait by Agnolo Bronzino depicted him with a protruding codpiece, intended to emphasize his potency and legitimacy and to distinguish him physically from his namesake, Guidobaldo da Montefeltro, who was portrayed in Balsassare Castiglione’s Courtier (1527) as effeminate and impotent.

The Holy Roman Emperor Charles V, whom Springer calls “a singular connoisseur of armor” (104), employed a broad range of images, combining classical and Christian forms that portrayed him as heir of both the Roman and chivalric traditions. His headpiece had a detachable chin plate that helped mask the Habsburg family deformity, the protruding jaw (107).

The most steadfast in his use of armor to project images was, however, Cosimo I de’Medici. Cosimo maintained close control over his ar-

1 Mikhail Bakhtin (trans. Hélène Iswolsky), Rabelais and His World (Bloomington, 2009; orig. pub. 1965).
mored likeness ("Cosimo armato"); usually rendered in classical form and relayed in numerous paintings and medals, including those commissioned after his death. For Cosimo, like the other patrons, armor fashioned his image in a distinctly political context.

The strength of Springer’s book is in its detail. She offers keen insights into the “language” of armor and draws seamlessly from several scholarly traditions. She is at her best connecting visual and literary images, as in her discussion of Charles V’s helmet and lion shield, in which she moves gracefully from consideration of the textual influences of Vegetius and Ariosto to explication of visual echoes in Titian’s equestrian portrait and Leone Leoni’s sculptural statues. Springer does similarly well with Guidobaldo II della Rovere, whose armor and codpiece have received much attention from art historians, but primarily as a generic emblem of his masculinity. Springer explores the more formal and expressive attributes of his personal armor collection, beyond mere portraiture (85). She calls his batwing breastplate “one of the most dazzling, enigmatic and bizarre inventions in the history of Renaissance armor (90).”

The weakness of the book is tied to its strength. The flow back and forth across disciplinary lines and the detailed analysis of individual pieces of armor hampers Springer’s attempt to find an effective framework to situate her overall thesis. She highlights the role of the military revolution and changes in sixteenth-century warfare in creating the insecurity and thus the need for political rulers to project their masculinity and images of power. But Italian states were insecure long before then. Furthermore, granting that the invasion by French and Spanish armies exacerbated the situation, it is not entirely clear why Springer chooses to link Charles V, one of Italy’s chief enemies, with his Italian antagonists. Surely Charles’ projection of himself was contextually different. The difference matters little in itself, but Springer needed to address the point, or perhaps even to omit the military framework that appears at the beginning and end of the book but is never fully integrated into it.

Overall, however, Springer deserves much credit for crafting an insightful, learned, and richly detailed analysis of an elusive aspect of the material culture of Renaissance Italy.

William Caferro
Vanderbilt University

Civil Society and Dictatorship in Modern German History. By Jürgen Kocka (Hanover, University Press of New England, 2010) 162 pp. $85.00 cloth
$29.95 paper

Kocka has turned the Menahem Stern Jerusalem Lectures that he gave ten years ago into a book, addressing the changing questions and methods with which the course of modern German history has been in-
interpreted. The book is both history and a discussion of traditions and innovations in the study of Germany from national unification to dictatorship, partition, and re-unification, offering observations on the methodologies with which Kocka and others of his generation, in reaction to current pressures and opportunities, constructed interpretations of the past.

Kocka’s emphasis throughout is on social history, but social history expanded—attuned to a fuller reality—by the inclusion of political and cultural elements, not as embellishments but as significant forces that shaped society as they were shaped by it. He begins with a discussion of Germany’s bourgeois culture and civil society in a European context, using the “semantic ambivalence” of the German word Bürger to signify both bourgeois and citizen to develop a model for studying the creation of a society possessing great strengths, which were also peculiarly susceptible to forces destructive of their own values.

Next he compares the East German dictatorship with the earlier dictatorship of the Third Reich, stressing some of the ways in which the historical interpretation of these systems is influenced by the consequences of their break-up. The collapse of the German Democratic Republic (GDR) and of other European state-socialist regimes emphasized the strength of their replacements—civil societies “whose logic distinguishes them both from capitalist markets and from state-controlled bureaucracies,” which in turn shaped the interpretation of the Third Reich and the GDR (64). He suggests that if the achievements of these successor societies fade under the current economic crisis, our view of their predecessors may also change.

Kocka then discusses the phenomenon of “Difficult Pasts,” a major factor in the history of the two Germanies after 1945—the collective German memories of the Third Reich, and, after re-unification, the recollections of the now vanished GDR. The reconstruction in memory of the two German dictatorships did not follow a straight path, but adjusted itself to changing political and economic conditions. Driven by the concerns of a later time, collective memories searched for, and emphasized, certain particulars while obscuring others, even as historical research continued to add new facts that the young generation and its parents had to face or repress. Kocka admirably sorts out and analyzes the major currents of this process, the most recent of which he identifies as the integration of Europe. As it progresses, he suggests, the comparison of European memories and their interaction may be turning into a new area of enquiry.

He concludes with comments about the role of fashion in the writing of history. The motives for changes in theme and method and for their wider adoption range from the perception of new issues to narrow career considerations, contradictory tendencies that even in a work as brief as this one might have been treated more expansively. The book as a whole, personal yet even-handed, does not claim to break new ground in its positive evaluation of comparative and interdisciplinary history.
But as the author reflects on his work, on that of his contemporaries, and on the ways in which historians think about the past as they confront the present, he creates a valuable and interesting addition to our discipline’s efforts at self-understanding.

Peter Paret  
Institute for Advanced Study

_Death in Berlin: From Weimar to Divided Germany._ By Monica Black  
(New York, Cambridge University Press, 2010) 324 pp. $80.00

Black’s _Death in Berlin_ is a refreshing, fascinating, well–researched, and well–written monograph that focuses on funerary culture and experiences and notions of death from the 1920s through the postwar era in Berlin. Black argues that the massive upheavals experienced by Germans and Berliners are revealed by how their cultures of death and burial changed. The manner by which cultures deal with the dead and the afterlife has long been a central focus of anthropology, and nothing casts as large a shadow over twentieth–century Germany as death itself.

Black’s first chapter focuses on death in Weimar Berlin, where she describes a city with a variety of death subcultures. Left–wing social reformers and proletarian culture pushed for rationalism in burial and a demystification of death. The commemoration of the war dead was often a touchstone for political battles over the legacy of the war, and the Nazis built a great deal of their ideological agenda on the idolization of both the war dead and the death of party members.

Black’s second chapter argues that Nazi views on death went beyond simply worshipping battlefield deaths, embracing a larger cosmology of life and death with a mystical union of racial collective and homeland at its center. This perspective, she claims, broadens the meaning of _Lebensraum_ to mean “vital space”—not just living space. For the Nazis, the blood of fallen German soldiers consecrated the territory where they died and made it German.

Black’s third chapter, “Death in Everyday Life,” is by far the best in this work. She documents what happens when the death unleashed by Germany elsewhere comes home to Berlin itself. Her sources for this chapter includes an amazing array of memoirs, diaries, and archival sources, which she uses to show how individual death and the death of Germany and the Third Reich came to be intertwined in the eyes of ordinary Berliners. Most powerfully, she shows how death, the presence of corpses and body parts, and ad hoc graves became integrated with the material–culture landscape of the city itself.

Her fourth chapter explores the meaning of death in the German Democratic Republic (GDR), where authorities in East Berlin attempted to whitewash the traces of death to create a tabula rasa, a clean break with the dark past. The GDR tried, with mixed success, to change funer-
ary culture to erase mysticism, superstition, and sentimentality in the
new socialist culture that they were creating, but as Black argues, death
transcended the East–West divide. The GDR could dynamite the Hohen-
zollern castle, but it could not erase the tens of thousands of bones that
lay around the city in shallow graves, many of them exposed, and as
Black notes, residents of West and East Berlin were united in their
mourning of their dead and missing loved ones.

In her final chapter, Black explores the painful construction of a
narrative inculcating a return to normalcy through West Berliners’ treat-
ment of war dead, as well as their construction of myths of mass death,
including the legend of the flooded S-Bahn tunnel during the battle for
Berlin in May 1945.

Eli Rubin
Western Michigan University

The Quest for the Lost Nation: Writing History in Germany and Japan in the
American Century. By Sebastian Conrad (trans. Alan Nothnagle) (Berke-
ley, University of California Press, 2010) 392 pp. $39.95

This study of the way in which historians in Germany and Japan en-
gaged their respective national histories after World War II originally
appeared in Germany in 1999. It is a careful and detailed analysis of post-
1945 historiography in Germany and Japan (the author has the unusual
advantage of being fluent in Japanese), relating developments before
1960 to prior developments and concluding with a brief survey of the
decades after 1960. The focus on Germany is restricted almost entirely to
the West German Federal Republic, with only incidental references to
East Germany. Conrad’s aim is to illuminate how historians in both Ger-
many and Japan struggled to resolve issues of a proud national past in the
wake of utter defeat and total occupation. Although Conrad mentions
the initial differences between the three western occupation zones in
Germany, he shows how American influence came to affect all of West
Germany as it did Japan, which was not divided into zones.

Much of the work and debate in the immediate postwar period
centered on the origins of the modern state—the foundation of a uni-
fied Germany by Otto von Bismarck and the Meiji Restoration in Japan.
Conrad stresses the influence of a small number of returning émigrés in
Germany alongside Gerhard Ritter and a few others (full disclosure: this
reviewer studied at the University of Chicago under Hans Rothfels,
who is prominent in the book). In Japan, Marxist-oriented historians,
who had been driven out of the profession, came to occupy key posi-
tions after 1945 and continued to have major influence for decades. Both
countries evinced important continuities as well as some innovations, es-
specially in social and economic history, attention to everyday life, and
women’s and gender history in Germany (as contrasted with an earlier
In both countries, the concept of the country and its population as victims, in contrast with any focus on those who had been the country’s victims in war, came to play a major role—and still does.

In this effort to illuminate the stages through which historical work moved within a comparative framework, Conrad stresses the similarities rather than the differences that have informed discussion of the greater willingness of Germany than of Japan to confront the past. This stress would have been more convincing had he engaged the difference in government actions. Tokyo made endless difficulties for Ienaga Saburo, who published an honest and critical book—published in English as The Pacific War 1931–1941 (New York, 1978)—whereas Bonn established the Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung (Federal Institute for Political Education) that tried to enlighten Germans about the realities of the country’s past. In spite of this and other minor reservations, this is a fine comparative study that will make readers think.

Gerhard L. Weinberg
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Manors and Markets: Economy and Society in the Low Countries 500–1600. By Bas van Bavel (New York, Oxford University Press, 2010) 512 pp. $140.00

Before the sixteenth century, Flanders was the economic heart of northern Europe. Its urban communes used the profits of woolen-cloth production to extend their commercial influence across the North and Baltic Seas. The achievements of artists and architects in Antwerp, Ghent, and Bruges and surrounding towns rivaled those of the Italian masters. By the seventeenth century, however, the power of Holland, its neighbor to the north, had eclipsed that of Flanders. The conventional explanation for this shift rests on events growing out of the Revolt of 1568 to 1648, specifically, the blockade of the Scheldt, the decline of Antwerp, and the flight of hundreds of Calvinist merchants northward. But in Manors and Markets, Van Bavel counters that argument with one that stretches back centuries in a genuine example of longue durée history. He argues that the dominance of the Dutch Republic that emerged from the Revolt was actually the result of socio-institutional factors with their roots in the early Middle Ages.

Van Bavel launches his investigation at the point when Roman authority disintegrated, leaving behind neither central authority nor economic integration; the various divisions of the territory under study were left to follow whatever paths of local development best suited their individual landscapes. He identifies some twenty to twenty-five regions that thus emerged, each with distinctive land-tenure systems and property rights, social structures, urban development, and market orienta-
tion. The book’s first three chapters show how these differences grew larger over time, as competition among the regions led to specialization. As circumstances changed, different social and institutional frameworks were better suited to nurture economic growth, leading to the changing dominance of one region or another. Specialization also led to the development of markets, which is the focus of the next part of the volume. Van Bavel traces how markets for land, capital, labor, and goods took form, beginning in the tenth century. Finally, chapters on the late Middle Ages demonstrate the continuing relevance of regional differences, even as central authorities began the process of unification. The fact that the institutional frameworks deriving from the earliest phase of this history did not easily adapt to secular trends explains how the Meuse and Guelders regions were replaced by Flanders in economic dominance, and how Flanders was in turn replaced by Holland.

Van Bavel’s immense synthesis of economic, archeological, and geological research covers a thousand years. To bring coherence to such a wide range of studies, he makes use of path-dependency theory, which emphasizes the contingent nature of economic change. The book is a valuable source of data not only for historians of the Low Countries but also for interdisciplinary historians seeking insights into the nature of long-term change. However, the book would benefit from more than four maps, given the significance of regional variation to the analysis. The discrepancy between the twenty to twenty-five regions that are supposed to make up the geographical framework of Bavel’s inquiry and the book’s map of “Regions in the Low Countries,” which identifies only thirteen regions, could be confusing to those unfamiliar with the Low Countries (26, 16). More importantly, the structure of the volume tends to confound Van Bavel’s detailed, complex argument. An introduction that asserted more explicitly that the point of the book is to reveal the socio-institutional factors behind fundamental historical change would help to ground the information in this otherwise useful book.

Marybeth Carlson
University of Dayton


Snyder’s ambitious survey of the captivity practices of southeastern Indians from the pre-contact era through the nineteenth century attempts “a new perspective on race, slavery, and freedom” (12). Snyder uses a multitude of primary and secondary sources to trace a change from kin-based captivity motivated primarily by the need to replace community members to a race-based pattern, feeding directly into the racialized enslavement of African Americans that came to characterize much of the
Southern economy in the nineteenth century. In eight chapters, Snyder provides one example after another drawn from firsthand accounts, archaeological data, and ethnographic descriptions. Her narrative is full of violent images and quotations, emphasizing the ferocity of southeastern Native life in the pre-contact and early contact era, and the links between warfare and the taking of captives. She is less detailed concerning the subsequent fate of captives in pre-contact times; although it is likely that, as in the later period of Native histories, captives were fully integrated into their host communities and rarely treated as chattel.

Snyder argues that pre-contact captivity practices and warfare were re-made to satisfy the European colonial demand for labor (45–47). In this respect, Snyder sometimes conflates captivity and enslavement. For example, she writes, “The capture and trade of enemy people was nothing new for Indians, but as they began to participate in a trans-Atlantic economy that placed a high value on slaves, warriors began to take unprecedented numbers of captives” (48). She suggests, however, that this slave trade coexisted alongside the continued practice of replacing lost community members through capture, as in the Iroquois Mourning wars (48). Her second chapter, focusing on the Chickasaws—whose power and influence in the region was tied to their heavy involvement in the slave trade with Carolina colonists—is also replete with violence, emphasizing the Native view of others as fearful and distrustful (58). Yet even the Chickasaws adopted and integrated captives, especially women and children. In the end, Snyder concludes that the slave trade led to new power relations among Native societies, elevating groups such as the Chickasaw to power and serving, ironically, to preserve native order (79).

Snyder returns several times to the subject of how native people incorporated others into their communities, seemingly without racial prejudice. Thus, she argues in Chapter 5, “Owned People,” that eighteenth-century travelers were likely to encounter captive people of many backgrounds in Native communities, some of whom were enslaved or forced to do menial labor. Snyder further suggests that after the Revolution, Natives began to categorize their enemies and captives racially (180), and some of them began to purchase African slaves themselves (187). Yet, even then, blacks in Native communities were sometimes incorporated into Indian families (201). The Seminoles in particular, as discussed in Chapter 8, incorporated African members as “junior members” and tributaries (213, 227).

Although its historical detail and wealth of sources is welcome, this book represents a dangerous trend: Like several other recent histories that focus on the American South, this book erroneously implicates the Native Americans who lived there not only in their own displacement but also in the development of racialized slavery.

Kathleen Bragdon
The College of William and Mary
Motives of Honor, Pleasure, and Profit: Plantation Management in the Colonial Chesapeake, 1607–1763. By Lorena S. Walsh (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 2010) 736 pp. $70.00

“Honor,” “pleasure,” and “profit” would accrue to settlers in the new colony of Maryland, claimed Robert Wintour in his “Short Treatise,” written during the 1630s. In numerous earlier works, Walsh has helped to make the colonial Chesapeake among the best-understood early modern societies anywhere. Now she provides an impressive, sweeping account of the conditions faced by Chesapeake planters from the beginnings of settlement to 1763. Drawing on family account books, diaries, and letters as available, and otherwise from court and probate records, archaeological findings, and other sources, Walsh traces planters’ strategies and decisions across one-and-a-half centuries. Motives of Honor, Pleasure, and Profit offers an indispensable guide to the economies of early Virginia and Maryland.

The story of early tobacco culture has rarely been told in such breadth and detail. Wintour cited independent landownership among the “pleasures” of settler life; Walsh shows how tobacco made it a reality in the mid-seventeenth century for those lucky enough to survive. The successful were those who abandoned English husbandry and adapted to their new surroundings. Given the favorable prices that lasted until 1670, circumstances benefited small and middling planters as much as large ones. But as prices slumped for the next sixty years, the advantage went to those who could control enough labor to raise subsistence crops and sell tobacco in quantity at slim margins. Productivity in tobacco cultivation fell, and continued to do so even after 1730, when prices rose again and greater prosperity returned to the Chesapeake. The “golden age” that lasted into the 1760s cemented the preeminence of large planters, though smaller producers also shared in a new measure of comfort. Slaves, however, bore the burden of increasing output without sharing in their owners’ higher incomes. Though not primarily concerned with the “management” of slaves, Walsh duly notes the “exploitation and violence that underlay [planters’] economic achievements” (630).

Walsh finds larger planters using permanently enslaved workers early in the history of tobacco culture; she discounts the 1670s as a turning point in the consolidation of slavery. Planters’ circumstances influenced the shift from servant to slave labor, which occurred at varying speeds. As in her previous work, Walsh emphasizes regional differences. Sweet-scented and Oronoco tobacco had different histories. She explains both the timing and effects of the tobacco inspection laws that were introduced in Virginia and Maryland, respectively, in 1730 and 1747. Whereas Virginia’s Tidewater planters converged upon similar strategies between 1730 and 1763, Maryland gentry varied crop and livestock patterns according to local conditions. Walsh demonstrates how location, plantation size, soil quality, and slave labor-force size shaped
planters’ approaches to soil exhaustion and crop diversification—two perennial issues in Chesapeake history.

Motives of Honor, Pleasure, and Profit combines the sharp focus of individual family studies with the broad range of general accounts. It takes its place alongside the other works, from Edmund S. Morgan’s American Slavery, American Freedom (New York, 1975) onward, that have illuminated the colonial Chesapeake world. Walsh’s clear-sighted and subtle account of planters’ material circumstances and calculations is a distinguished addition to the literature, which all scholars of early America will need to absorb.

Christopher Clark
University of Connecticut

The Brothertown Nation of Indians: Land Ownership and Nationalism in Early America, 1740–1840. By Brad D. E. Jarvis (Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press, 2010) 358 pp. $45.00

Jarvis provides a thorough account of the genesis of the Brothertown Indian Nation, a tribe formed in 1785, bringing together some of the members of the Mohegan, Pequot, Narragansett, Montauk, Tunxis, and Niantic nations. After years of planning, and then awaiting the outcome of the American Revolution, these people were able to focus on their new lives in Oneida country in upstate New York. Their common religion (Christianity) united them in an attempt to heal the wounds of colonization, warfare, disease, and land encroachment. These likeminded Indians continued to act in a manner that had, as its first and foremost goal, survival, both tribal and individual.

Jarvis’ chronological account of the Brothertown clearly demonstrates the necessity of having at least a cursory understanding of the history of the tribes from which the Brothertown Nation was formed. His detailed account of the events that led to the tribe’s formation serves to ground his overarching message: Despite eventually owning their reservation land in severalty, farming that land, and requesting (and receiving) U.S. citizenship, the Brothertown Indians have not disappeared into assimilation as many expected. Rather, they used the tools that they acquired from the colonial (then state) and federal governments to craft a plan that would allow them to survive within a system established by the dominant culture.

Jarvis notes in the introduction that the first published and most often cited book on the Brothertown, Love’s Samson Occom and the Christian Indians of New England, spun a tale of assimilation and absorption into mainstream culture (2). Love’s book assumed the tone prevalent at the turn of the twentieth century, offering the story that those Indians who dared to tread into “civilization” left their “Indian-ness” behind.

He also detailed the Brothertown rocky road to civilization, noting that “the curse of the race is rum.”2 Contrary to this depiction, Jarvis provides a more complete history of the Brothertown, their citizenship, and their land ownership, drawing upon the methodologies of history, political science, anthropology, and American Indian studies. This history includes a twenty-year quest during the early nineteenth century for land farther away from disruptive and malevolent influences.

The early years of the Brothertown settlement in New York coincided with the expansion of the early republic and a rabid desire for land that failed to take into account current occupants’ presence. The Brothertown sought to separate themselves from these influences, “construct[ing] boundaries around their town” (148). When fences and laws failed to protect them, the Brothertown sought land farther west, first in Indiana (1809–1825) and then in Michigan Territory (1820–1832) (150–178,179–215). In Michigan Territory, they arranged to purchase land, first along the Fox River, then along Lake Winnebago, both in the area that would become the state of Wisconsin (200).

The Brothertown experienced many uncertainties during this time. In 1830, Congress passed the Indian Removal Act, which coincided closely with the Brothertown move from New York. Although the move was their idea, necessary to maintaining their identity and asserting their sovereignty in the young country, the Brothertown feared that they would be removed farther west against their wishes. Reasoning that the federal government would not remove U.S. citizens who owned their own land, tribal leaders petitioned Congress for citizenship and allotment of their reservation land (10–11). In 1839, Congress granted their request. Not fully understanding the situation in which the Brothertown found themselves in the early 1830s, many people thought that Brothertown citizenship, individual land ownership, and Christianity amounted to assimilation. Jarvis disagrees with this interpretation, instead finding that the Brothertown were attempting to maintain their unique Indian identity.

From the time the tribe was first formed by Samson Occom (Mohegan), Joseph Johnson (Mohegan), and David Fowler (Montauk), the Brothertown desired to control their own destiny, finding strength in unity. Jarvis notes that “the Brothertowns had long sought the power to create such boundaries separating our People from your People, as Samson Occom may have phrased it, and citizenship offered a hopeful situation” (233). It no more represented a path to assimilation than the Indian Citizenship Act of 1924 represented the eradication of Indians or their culture.

Jarvis concludes with the most recent chapter in Brothertown history, the August 2009 negative proposed finding of federal acknowledgment by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (239). To this reviewer, who is a Brothertown Indian and chair of the tribe’s Federal Acknowledgment

---

2 Ibid., 166.
Committee, this finding was nothing short of shocking and disturbing, since the history, governmental interactions, and continuing existence of the Brothertown as a tribal entity are highly documented, as Jarvis has demonstrated throughout this work. Ironically, the negative proposed finding determined that the Brothertown Indian Nation was, throughout the thirty years that it spent in the administrative federal acknowledgment process, ineligible for that very process because of the 1839 act that gave the Brothertown citizenship and individual land ownership. The implication is that a tribe that works within the system established by the federal government, whether in 1839 or 2009, must abandon its identity as a tribal entity. Jarvis disputes this conclusion, providing evidence to the contrary in his astute observations of Brothertown tribal history.

Kathleen A. Brown-Pérez
University of Massachusetts Amherst


In this timely and elegant new book, Carp views the Boston Tea Party as a rich opportunity to explore Boston’s political culture and as “an expression of political ideology about taxes, rights, and authority,” both past and present (3). The narrative focus of Defiance of the Patriots is both its strength and its weakness. It is a great read, full of telling detail and informed speculation, but it also shares the limitations of its genre. Like other crossover scholars of the American Revolution, Carp struggles to include people who were not white men in his story, sprinkling tea-drinking women into occasional chapters and offering a melancholy last chapter about sugar and slavery.

The book is strongest when Carp looks up from the streets of Boston and convincingly explains the wider contexts that pushed Boston radicals to toss tea into Boston Harbor. Carp begins with a fascinating discussion of the East India Company (EIC) as Britain’s imperial agent, carefully delineating the sovereign power of the EIC in India. Rather than treating the company’s politics as mere background to a local colonial protest, Carp weaves this story into a larger account of British imperial power as both EIC agents and Bostonians experienced it. This global perspective, far more than previous work on luxury and consumption, helps to explain why Bostonians clogged up Boston Harbor with tea rather than bales of dry goods.

Other glimpses of a wider perspective are equally effective. Because Bostonians had consistently violated non-importation agreements, radicals in other cities had begun to distrust Boston. Thus, far from being the “ringleader of all violence” that Lord Frederick North branded it (191),
Carp convincingly demonstrates that Boston protested in order to prove their mettle to New York and Philadelphia.

The research is excellent. Carp has meticulously and intelligently combed through official papers, memoirs, and newspaper accounts to create, by far, the most comprehensive list of the men who tossed the tea. Given the secrecy that surrounded their names for generations, this detection is no small feat. Carp defines the radicalism of the Tea Party as “the ability of ordinary men to engage in defiant, democratic protests” (233). Yet Carp’s drive to figure out the participants in the action results in a misleadingly tidy definition of their rebellion. Attacks on private property cannot be understood without consideration of slavery and family relationships, including coverture. Carp’s narrow prosopographical emphasis, though useful, misses the connections between property and power.

The epilogue beautifully sets out the ambiguities of the original Tea Party and its later namesakes. Yet those ambiguities are less apparent in the body of the book. Weaving sugar and slavery along with tea and imperialism throughout the book would have made Carp’s history more truly global. These shortcomings notwithstanding, this fine achievement is without doubt the definitive book about the Boston Tea Party.

Serena R. Zabin
Carleton College


Lord Dunmore’s Proclamation, first announced by John Murray (Lord Dunmore), Virginia’s royal governor in 1775, and eventually adopted by other British military leaders in the conflict in North America, offered freedom to slaves who fled to him from masters who were sympathetic to the independence movement. The proclamation offered these “Loyalist” runaways the opportunity to take up arms against their former oppressors, thereby threatening the security of slaveholders’ property rights and their ability to sustain profitable production. Dunmore hoped to frighten Virginia slaveholders into renouncing the independence movement, but his strike at the raw nerve of the plantation colonies backfired, provoking anger and resentment against the British and propelling many reluctant revolutionaries in the southern colonies into strong support for independence. In The World of Thomas Jeremiah, Ryan persuasively argues that, in South Carolina, fears of British-inspired slave insurrection preceded Dunmore’s proclamation, and that the actions of enslaved and free black men in and around Charleston—more than the British policies—created the fear and determination that moved the revolutionary movement forward there.
To further his argument, Ryan re-examines the execution of Jeremiah, a former slave, fighter, harbor pilot, fisherman, and business entrepreneur. Working to counter previous histories of Revolutionary Charleston that dismissed Jeremiah’s importance, Ryan carefully combines a narrative about this free black man, who was hanged and burned for planning a major slave rebellion in 1775, with a description of the waterfront of Charleston. Jeremiah and other free black or enslaved maritime workers were recognized at the time as extremely important but potentially rebellious contributors to the successful South Carolinian export economy. Ryan reveals how Charleston, with its waterside markets and streets extending inward from the extensive wharves along the Cooper River, was clearly designed with ease of access to the waterfront in mind, allowing slave pilots, fishermen, boatmen, and innumerable other members of the Low Country’s black majority to permeate the city’s physical and social spaces.

In determining the motives for, and implications of, the actions of those responsible for Jeremiah’s execution, Ryan uncovers a degree of anxiety among the owners and employers of black maritime laborers previously unrecognized by historians. Looking toward the menacing presence of several British naval vessels just outside Charleston’s inner harbor in 1775, South Carolina’s local leaders felt that any evidence of insurrectionist activities among maritime workers, slave or free, needed a swift and brutal response. Thus, they quickly determined Jeremiah’s guilt and publicly executed him in gruesome fashion. Realizing that violent intimidation of the slave and free black population was only part of the solution to their problem, they then committed to open hostilities with Great Britain in hopes of removing a potential ally for rebellious slaves.

Ryan draws much of his evidence from a pool of extant correspondence and official records of South Carolina’s local white elite and the royal officials and British military officers on the scene in Revolutionary Charleston. Although the thoroughness of the author’s research is commendable, the actions and thoughts of Jeremiah and other free and enslaved men of African descent become lost in the bulk of the author’s analysis after the opening chapter, despite their centrality to his argument. Notwithstanding this flaw, which may have been unavoidable given the nature of the sources, Ryan’s contributions to our understanding of Revolutionary Charleston, bolstered by two appendixes that provide extensive primary documentation of Jeremiah’s trial and the actions of two other maritime slaves, are unimpeachable.

Ryan has created a work that gets to the heart of revolutionary movements. His study reveals the divisions and social stresses in the southern colonies, delves into the psychology of slaveholders in pre-revolutionary Charleston, highlights the dilemmas of the free and enslaved laborers in the Low Country of South Carolina, and determines the motivations of those who participated in the Revolution. As such, it will be
of interest to sociologists, political scientists, cultural studies scholars, and historians alike.

Craig Marin
University of Rhode Island, Providence


In this volume, Van Cleve offers a particularly uncompromising version of the common wisdom about slavery and the founding of the United States. In this interpretation, colonial, Revolutionary, and early national slaveholders perceived a variety of threats to their property in slaves—ranging from the antislavery decision by William Murray (Lord Mansfield) in the _Somerset_ case through the Missouri controversy in 1819–1821—and repeatedly succeeded in grasping the control over the state necessary to protect and even expand slavery. Van Cleve, along with the majority of current scholars, thus places slavery at the heart of the Founding of the United States, in no instance more so than the Constitution; proslavery bargains “were essential to its drafting and ratification” (143). The American Revolution, far from being a major practical or even ideological blow to slavery, actually left the institution stronger than it had been under British rule.

Northerners join slaveholders in this docket, as Van Cleve puts the worst possible spin on their every move, both local and national. The abolition of slavery by the Northern states after the Revolution was ideologically impoverished, friendly to property rights in men and focused entirely on the racist project of ridding the North of black people. Even the much-ballyhooed Northwest Ordinance’s restriction of slavery figures in this narrative as a step backward for antislavery (153–54). On the national level, Northerners (Van Cleve tends to write of them as a unit) proved all too willing to sacrifice slaves’ interests for their own narrow economic interests from the 1780s to 1821. One (unacknowledged) irony of this line of argument is that if true, the South need not have been concerned about any Northern threat to slavery.

In the process of advancing this argument, Van Cleve takes no prisoners. From the dedication page forward, he has no patience with those who read antislavery in any way, shape, or form into the platform on which the country was founded. They are practitioners of the worst sort of “Whig history,” purveyors of “fables” meant to “deflect this indictment of the Constitution” (v, 5, 135).

This volume adds more to the standard story of the proslavery Constitution than adamancy, however. Van Cleve’s training in both law and history pays dividends. He attends unusually closely, for instance, to “the
problem of compensation” involved in abolishing slavery in the North. Because it involved “a powerful—almost unprecedented—use of government coercion to outlaw a specific form of previously lawful property,” it constituted “an unusual use of eminent-domain authority” that could have threatened all forms of property if not properly hedged (72). A more extended insight comes in a chapter-length examination of “The Missouri Compact and the Rule of Law.” The Missouri Crisis and compromises, he argues, “transformed the Constitution into a sectional ‘compact’ on slavery, since the Constitution lacked the essential elements of a rule of law” (226). One such element included a clear medium for resolution of disputes centered in the courts, but the inflamed “members of Congress were determined to have Congress—and not the courts—address the constitutional issue” of restricting slavery in Missouri (243).

Although, on the whole, this volume offers merely an extreme version of the majority view about slavery and the founding of the United States, its contributions derive from the interdisciplinary nature of Van Cleve’s inquiry, which confer added interest to its findings.

Matthew Mason
Brigham Young University

Steam Coffin: Captain Moses Rogers and the Steamship Savannah Break the Barrier. By John Laurence Busch (New Canaan, Conn., Hodos Historia, 2010) 736 pp. $35.00

Following in the wake of Frank Braynard, S. S. Savannah, the Elegant Steam Ship (Athens, 1963), and other works, Busch has crafted an exhaustive study of the Savannah—the first steam vessel to cross the Atlantic Ocean—that places it within the context of not only American but also European history. Steam Coffin is a substantial work, a popular history with a scholarly tone. Its simple yet elegant maps and its black and white illustrations are extremely useful. Busch penetratingly consulted both primary and secondary sources in what was clearly a labor of love, providing a full range of helpful end notes and an extensive bibliography.

Busch takes the time to develop his story fully, starting with the early steamboats that plied the rivers and coasts of America. He also fleshes out the life of Captain Moses Rogers, the most prominent mariner involved in steam navigation. Rogers involved himself in steam navigation from the early days of Robert Fulton’s efforts on the Hudson and the spread of steam navigation to other urban centers such as Philadelphia, Charleston, and Savannah. In tracking Rogers’ career, Busch places his life in context with political, social, and economic developments. He carefully traces the construction of the first steam vessel intended to cross an ocean, and the extent of the interest in it, both among
Americans and Europeans, such as Axel Leonhard Klinkowström, a Swedish baron and naval officer.

Nor are the investors who funded the project or the artisans who actually built it ignored. Busch deftly considers complex engineering and navigation details in an accessible manner. In tracking the Savannah’s important Atlantic crossing, he also considers topics as varied as American presidential politics, the U.S. Navy’s response to steam engines, Napoleon’s exile on St. Helena, the Peterloo Massacre, and Swedish and Russian court politics. As the subtitle of the book hints, Savannah and steam navigation in general broke an important barrier in bringing transportation to a new level of speed and reliability, one of the first steps in the transportation revolution that transformed American society.

Academicians might have some concerns about this work. Its publisher, Hodos Historia, has produced exactly one book, and it does not solicit manuscripts. In other words, Steam Coffin was self-published, and thus not independently vetted. In this instance, apart from a few stylistic infelicities (like the lack of an introduction and the tendency to place nautical terms in italics and explain them ad nauseam), the book does not seem to have suffered too much. The research is thorough, the writing clean, and the production values high. Bibliophiles will want a copy of Steam Coffin on their shelves simply because of its beauty. Academic historians will probably be less interested simply because the tone of this book is more celebratory than analytical, but maritime buffs will find it an engaging read.

Joshua M. Smith
U.S. Merchant Marine Academy

A Most Magnificent Machine: America Adopts the Railroad, 1825–1862. By H. Craig Miner (Lawrence, University Press of Kansas, 2010) 325 pp. $34.95

In this account of America’s first generation of railroading, Miner acknowledges the work of earlier economic historians such as Fishlow and Fogel in analyzing the early railroads’ impact on the American economy.1 His own purpose is the more descriptive one of discussing their impact on Americans’ lives and culture. He is concerned with popular attitudes toward the new technology, not with the technology itself. He visits all parts of the country, from New England to the South and West, yet he is highly selective within each region. South Carolina, Georgia, and Virginia stand proxy for the South; Massachusetts, New York, and Pennsylvania for the Northeast; Illinois and Michigan for the Midwest; and Texas and California for the West.

That said, Miner’s focus is less geographical than it is social, cultural, and psychological. Individual chapters are devoted to the earliest railroads, their origins, construction, and impact, especially the Baltimore & Ohio and the Charleston & Hamburg; their financing; the perception of their ownership as “soulless corporations”; the reaction of passengers, ranging from euphoria to terror (a chapter entitled “Scalded by the Steam” deals explicitly with accidents); the difficulties of transit presented by the Great Lakes and the Mississippi River; the effect of the Panic of 1857; racial discrimination, both in construction and operation; and finally, the first moves toward the Pacific. The book stops in 1862, when Congress passed the bill subsidizing a transcontinental railroad.

Miner’s chief sources are contemporary writings, especially newspapers, many of which have become available in digital form in recent years. He claims to have consulted about 400,000 articles in 185 distinct newspapers; it takes more than four pages in the Bibliography to list them all. Miner is acquainted with the later historical literature as well, and he refers frequently to relevant books and articles.

Despite his tapping of modern research technology, Miner’s emphasis throughout the book is traditionally historical and primarily descriptive. “This book is a history, not a sociological study or a philosophical tract. . . . It is a history of the interaction of technology and public opinion” (261). Miner, however, makes judgments. He agrees with recent historians who protest that the antebellum South was not technologically backward: “The Charleston & Hamburg was one of the first railways in the country, and the Central of Georgia was one of the best managed and most profitable right up to the outbreak of the Civil War” (xv); “It is a myth of history textbooks that the South tried to ignore the new technology due to some Jeffersonian nostalgia about the primitive yeoman, to an incompatibility of slavery with industrialization, or to a disinclination to develop or live in cities. It saw a way to build railways, advance cities, and continue a slave-based cotton economy along with the new technology. In fact, the South well understood that it could no longer pursue its regional goals successfully without rail” (155). As Miner and others have shown, southern railroads depended on slave labor, both in construction and operation.

Despite a few typographical errors and puzzling geographical gaffes—for example, Taunton, Massachusetts, is placed in New Jersey (36) and seven southern states are said to border the Ohio River (161)—Miner’s book is well researched, authoritative, and easy to read. In general, its findings will be familiar to students of early railroading, but it combines them into a nationwide synthesis.

Allen W. Trelease
University of North Carolina, Greensboro

In 1903, Du Bois lamented America’s failed effort to realize universal freedom in the aftermath of slavery. The Freedmen’s Bureau in particular emerges as a lone bright spot in an otherwise bleak narrative of lost opportunities. But despite Du Bois’ proclivity for placing black people at the center of American history, his portrayal of Reconstruction contains a curious twist. While discussing ex-slaves’ pursuit of literacy, he credits not African Americans themselves but the “New England schoolma’am” for this herculean task. Butchart asserts that in this respect, Du Bois missed the mark. A product of prodigious research and painstaking archival analysis, Schooling the Freed People provides clear and convincing evidence that the teaching force that instructed emancipated African Americans was far more diverse than Du Bois and subsequent historians have thought.

Butchart set out to identify every person who schooled ex-slaves between 1861 and 1876 under the auspices of the Freedmen’s Teacher Project. To accomplish this objective, he traversed beyond well-trodden archives like that of the Freedmen’s Bureau and the American Missionary Association and excavated military and pension records, collegiate alumni records, the manuscript census, slave schedules, and city directories. He emerged with an impressive database of nearly 12,000 men and women who taught for at least one month in a freedmen’s school. This composite picture suggests that the Yankee schoolmarm existed more in myth than in fact. First, he notes, “Freed people’s education was . . . emphatically a work performed by African Americans for their own emancipation” (19). Specifically, one of every three educators was African American; one of every two was southern; and black teachers remained with their students far longer than their white counterparts. Second, an equal number of men and women taught in the freedmen’s schools; with a mean age of thirty, these teachers were often much older than the stereotype suggests. Third, factors other than evangelical Protestantism and abolitionism prompted both black and white teachers to educate ex-slaves. Indeed, financial demands rather than spiritual callings led many teachers to school the freed people in the Reconstruction South.

Butchart plans to publish the Freemen’s Teacher Project database and its findings at a later date. In this volume, he skillfully blends quantitative research with anecdotal analysis to produce a nuanced and sweeping account, rich with compassion, insight, and precision. Chapter 3 exemplifies the originality and breadth of Butchart’s research, tracing the educational activities of former slaveholders, veterans of the Confeder-
acy, who were motivated more by poverty than by politics. Unlike teachers from the North and Midwest, who often published memoirs about their time in the South, these individuals rarely, if ever, wrote about teaching African Americans. Only by scouring both southern archives and census records could Butchart bring their experiences to light.

Although Butchart locates teachers at the center of his story, he never loses sight of freed people’s educational agency. Like Du Bois, however, he also remains cognizant of the persistent power of white supremacy. Ex-slaves appreciated the spiritual, political, and economic benefits of educational opportunity, he notes, but without a sustained, national commitment to racial equality, literacy stood little chance against the terror, poverty, and segregation endemic in the post-Reconstruction South.

Hilary Moss
Amherst College

Rescue and Flight: American Relief Workers Who Defied the Nazis. By Susan Elizabeth Subak (Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press, 2010) 342 pp. $40.00

Rescue and Flight is devoted to the work of a group of American Unitarians and the rescue networks that they created in Europe to help several thousand refugees to escape the continent before and during World War II. The story begins in Czechoslovakia and moves to southern France, Portugal, Switzerland, and the United States. Overall, only a minority of refugees were rescued. Yet the efforts of relief workers to aid civilians who became “stateless” due to the Nazi persecution were significant in the context of reluctant and inefficient help from Britain and the United States.

Despite the weakening power of Unitarianism during the 1930s, this group of liberal Christians was responsible for the rescue efforts initiated before the war. Helping individual Jewish refugees to flee Germany and other regions under the Nazis had never been the mandate of the American Unitarian Association. But exposure to the misery and the frustration of European Jews applying for visas to the United States under a quota system and the restrictions of the 1924 immigration law inspired Robert Dexter, a local Unitarian leader, to launch a direct international program on behalf of the refugees. He, and others like him, made a case for the contribution that refugees could make to American life. Such engaged sympathy was uncommon at a time when isolation and a degree of anti-Semitism prevailed. Yet this small number of American Christian rescuers—a group that included Elizabeth Dexter, Charles Joy, Martha and Waitstill Sharp, Noel Field, and collaborators like
Varian Fry and Donald Lowrie—were willing to risk their lives for the cause.

These individuals tried to stay in France and Portugal as long as possible, at times making last-minute escapes. When they returned to the United States, most of them spent their time raising awareness about the refugees’ predicaments and the unfolding Holocaust. While in Europe, they were often the first to meet new waves of refugees traveling through France and Portugal. Collaborating with Jewish organizations, they helped refugees cross borders and obtain exit visas, identity papers, and immigration documents. They corresponded with consulates and government officials (as well as with Eleanor Roosevelt), provided emergency financial help, secured releases from prisons, and arranged for refugees to cross the Atlantic by boat.

The Unitarians and their collaborators also managed to relieve the living conditions in French internment camps, to release some children imprisoned there, and to open medical clinics and kindergartens. They worked to strengthen underground networks, and they financially supported Jewish orphan children immigrating to Palestine. Overcoming massive hurdles, they helped thousands of notable intellectuals and artists—among them Lion Feuchtwanger, Franz Werfel, Heinrich and Thomas Mann, Otto Meyerhof, and Marc Chagall—as well as ordinary adults and children, to emigrate from Europe.

The book traces the little-known efforts of Unitarians and those who worked with them in great detail, but more attention to the hardships endured by the Nazis’ victims, to immigration policy, and to attitudes toward refugees in different countries could have enriched the book. Subak also might have explored the relationship between religion and international intervention, as well as the motivations of religious activists, in greater depth. Complementing recent historiography concentrated on the actions of relief workers in Displaced Person Camps after the war, Rescue & Flight is valuable, focused research on the important and relatively few efforts undertaken before and during the war to save lives.

Michal Shapira
Barnard College


This book is better than its lurid title and cover suggest. It is a serious, albeit historically traditional, history of the 1970s. Like many current writers, Stein takes this eventful decade to be a pivotal one in postwar (that is, post–World War II) history. She builds this story from presidential papers and recounts events chronologically. The narrative is brisk, but de-
tails often get in the way of dominant themes in the sequential account. In her words, “The records do not demonstrate a rising conservatism, but a contentious polity (xiii).”

The book starts with the great compression of wages during World War II and goes rapidly to President Nixon’s choices. Stein recounts the story of the “Nixon Shock,” when the United States abandoned the Bretton Woods system, imposed a temporary wage and price freeze, and instituted a uniform 10 percent tax. Only the first of these actions was lasting, but it was enormously important for subsequent events. Stein gives the details of the complex negotiations around this event (40–50), but she fails to note how important Nixon’s choice was, or even to include the Nixon Shock in the index.

Stein’s focus on domestic policy is revealed in her equally detailed discussion of the Revenue Act of 1978 (192–204). She says, “The [1978] proposed tax changes revolutionized the way government promoted business investment. . . . It gave money to savers, not investors (194).” As is her wont, Stein concentrates on the intricacies of political negotiations, concluding, “[President] Carter ended up with the worst of all possible worlds (204).” Again, Stein chooses to look at the immediate political contests and ignores the rise of the financial sector that was an integral part of the succeeding decades—affecting the distribution of income and perhaps even causing our 2008–2011 crisis. One would not want to cite the Carter tax bill as the sole cause of this change, but consideration of the longer run would have helped the book in this matter as well as in the account of the Nixon Shock.

Stein’s description of the second oil crisis and the poverty of economic thought about it includes a fascinating glimpse into the thinking of James Schlesinger, typically regarded as the originator of gas regulation in the 1970s. In a National Energy Plan presented to Congress in 1977, Schlesinger proposed a crude-oil equalization tax to be returned to consumers in tax credits (209). Given the recent demise of cap-and-trade in Congress, it surely is noteworthy that the hapless Carter proposed a simpler way to limit oil imports and consumption.

Stein closes her book with a brief look at the remaining two decades of the twentieth century with surprisingly little reference to the preceding account of the 1970s. Many publications have described how the economy after 1980 differed from the earlier economy. In writing about a pivotal decade, Stein clearly wanted to set the stage for this change. She provides a competent narrative, but she misses the opportunity to show how the events of the 1970s, the pivotal decade, set the stage for the Reagan revolution of the 1980s.
Bodies of Knowledge: Sexuality, Reproduction, and Women’s Health in the Second Wave. By Wendy Kline (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2010) 201 pp. $75.00 cloth $22.50 paper

This compact but well-written exploration of the ways by which second-wave feminists deployed “the” feminine body in the struggle for women’s rights unfolds less as a linear narrative than as a series of carefully crafted episodes. Kline assesses the power and weakness of “thinking through the body” in chapter-long discussions of reader responses to Our Bodies, Ourselves (New York, 1973) (2); the politics of teaching the pelvic examination using “model” patients; feminist abortion providers in Chicago; resistance to Depo-Provera; and the woman-centered home-birthing movement. She unifies her analysis around an assessment of how far—and no further—an essentialist politics of the body moved the women’s movement forward. Employing archival research, oral histories, and cultural analysis, Kline tells this story economically and expertly, if more episodically than one might wish.

In Chapter 1, Kline examines how the personal stories embedded in Our Bodies, Ourselves (obos) helped to establish the epistemological legitimacy of experiential, body knowledge (read: feminine body knowledge) both in the patient–provider relationship and as a source of insight into the science of women’s health (11). The paradox that Kline exposes through excellent sampling of readers’ letters to the obos collective is that the bodies and experiences of women do not fall into unified categories; many women read obos looking for themselves, experiencing the book as a simulacrum of feminist community, and often, especially if they were women of color or lesbians, not finding themselves in it. Yet, often they responded by trying to help the collective improve the book. They believed that their personal experiences represented a legitimate entrée to this virtual community of women.

Kline’s second chapter, takes a fascinating look at the successes and failures of feminist-inspired reforms aimed at the learning environment of medical students, specifically the teaching of pelvic examinations during the third-year clinical rotation through Obstetrics–Gynecology. The Women’s Community Health Center in Boston opened in 1974 in an attempt to provide direct health services in a feminist context. One outgrowth of its work was a contract with Harvard Medical School to provide “model” patients to help medical students. The project’s underlying philosophy emphasized that women’s experiential knowledge could empower, enlighten, and even unite diverse groups of women. The entire specialty of OB–GYN was under siege from feminists and consumers during this decade, and many medical schools were considering new strategies for better teaching with enhanced opportunities for feedback from patients or “models.” The experimental program at Harvard failed, however. A taint of sexual shame never really lifted from the encounters; the power imbalances between the “patients” and their examiners could not be dissolved. Experiential, essentialist knowledge was not enough.
The story of abortion-rights activists, especially in Chicago, provides another example of “body” thinking that did not ignite widespread popular support. Begun during the years prior to Roe v. Wade as an underground movement known as “Jane” and transitioning into above-ground abortion and women’s health-care clinics, feminist groups in Chicago, Los Angeles, and elsewhere attempted to generate a full-scale critique of women’s health care around the issue of abortion. This, too, turned out to be too narrow a focus to attract the necessary support, as well as a politically exposed one. Not even the National Organization for Women (NOW) mustered much enthusiasm for the projects.

One of the best chapters in the book concerns the politics and epistemology surrounding the FDA’s 1983 Public Board of Inquiry hearings about Depo-Provera, the injected contraceptive. These hearings represented the first national showcase for the National Women’s Health Network (NWHN), established in 1974, the leaders of which advocated against a drug that they believed to be dangerous to women. Worse, they were incensed about the millions of (especially) poor and black women who had been railroaded, they believed, into using Depo-Provera shots for contraception in advance of FDA approval. Kline analyzes the NWHN’s realization that it would be ill-advised to rely on “emotional” individual case histories as testimony rather than on more quantitative, “scientific” data. The strategy worked because of ample evidence of the scientific flaws in the one large study that had been conducted of the effects of Depo-Provera. The NWHN’s methodological critique was an effective counter to the claims of the drug’s manufacturer, Upjohn, and the FDA denied its approval. Kline emphasizes the NWHN’s move away from personal testimonials toward impersonal, but more creditable, measurable data.

Discussing the movement for home births and its corollary, lay midwifery, Kline traces the history of women like Fran Ventre—first a lay midwife and later a graduate of Georgetown University’s certified nurse midwife (CNM) program and founding member of the Midwives Alliance of North America (MANA)—as well as midwives Ina May Gaskin, Janet Epstein, and others. They became lay midwives and/or certified nurse-midwives to re-humanize or depathologize childbirth. Kline writes, “These women . . . were the living and breathing examples promoted in Our Bodies, Ourselves. Experience, in this case, having borne their own children, made them experts (141).”

She tracks the cultural tensions between graduate-educated nurse-midwives and lay or “direct-entry” midwives, willingly exploited by obstetricians threatened by the competition from independent midwifery practitioners. More fundamentally, Kline argues, these divisions reflected the growing polarization within the women’s health movement between its early reliance on thinking “through” the body—privileging the personal, experiential dimension of childbirth—rather than by invoking technical expertise and scientific grounding. Kline contends
that as lay midwives increasingly sought CNM status, they gained access to hospitals and birthing centers but also lost access to the special bonds generated within the home-birth milieu, the touchstone of their core ideology. In fact, as Kline observes, childbirth in our time has moved slowly back toward the era of the medicalized, high-tech, hospital experiences that characterized the world before the feminist-inspired reforms advocated in the 1970s and the 1980s. The extraordinarily high rate of C-sections testifies to the trend.

In this highly recommended book, Kline reveals the cultural complexity of what second-wave feminist health reformers tried to accomplish and the obstacles that they encountered along the way.

Ellen More
University of Massachusetts Medical School


The principal intent of this volume is to present the sociodemographic characteristics of Latino groups from 1980 to 2005, a task for which the authors are expertly qualified. Bergad and Klein employ a conventional social-scientific frame, parsing the data into ten themes, prefaced by two chapters on the period before 1980. Each chapter provides rich tabular displays with limited discussion; narrative is largely confined to the introduction and conclusion. Utilizing Hispanic identifier and subgroup nationality categories in IPUMS for the censuses of 1980, 1990, and 2000 and in the American Community Survey for 2005 (and jarringly including Brazilians among Hispanics), they demonstrate what most researchers know, that Latino nationality groups should not be lumped together. As a comprehensive collection of data, the volume fills a gap since the publication of Frank D. Bean and Marta Tienda’s *Hispanic Population of the United States* (New York, 1987).

Scholars have reason to be thankful for the prodigious generation of information and for the comparisons between not only nationality groups, generations, and genders but also six metropolitan areas (and, more rarely, states); the comparative exercises yield useful surprises. In interpreting these data, Bergad and Klein insist that Latino groups be seen as the latest wave in the long immigration history of the United States rather than, as is now the rule, racially defined and disparaged minorities. Moreover, they draw highly optimistic conclusions from the evidence. Thus, the appearance of a vigorous middle class and growing economic inequality in Hispanic groups gives them reason to believe that this immigrant wave will do as well as those that preceded it.

Since this conclusion depends upon historical comparison, the authors’ failure to display much command over history is disappointing.
Errors in the first paragraph do not inspire confidence, and such missteps continue in the two historical chapters. The authors appear to be unaware of historical work directly related to their argument, such as Joel Perlman’s *Italians Then, Mexicans Now* (New York, 2005). They locate “a large Mexican population” in the Southwest in 1848 (1), despite acknowledging that it amounted to, at most, 81,000 persons, a population so small and so beleaguered by indigenous polities that it attracted the rapt attention of American expansionists. They blithely repeat the canard that the “U.S. government actually repatriated 345,000 Mexicans to Mexico” between 1929 and 1932 (33). In a magisterial assessment of the effects of fertility and mortality on early twentieth-century Mexican emigration, they describe that movement of people as purely circular: Young men arrived, worked, and returned home. Yet, by 1930, the Mexican-origin population in the United States exceeded 1.7 million; near sex parity and a rising native-born component promised permanence.

Most important, the authors assume, but do not test, the ahistorical proposition that the current wave is not distinct. They never contemplate fundamental changes in the context of reception in the United States (for example, the decline in semiskilled factory work) nor what fifty years of restriction might have meant for the incorporation of previous immigrants. They do not seriously engage the exceptional features in contemporary immigration that Kennedy posed nearly fifteen years ago in the pages of the *Atlantic Monthly*.¹ For these reasons, the conclusion’s impassioned attack on any objection to current or past immigration (an opposition largely equated with bigotry) seems partisan rather than scholarly. Readers of this volume can profitably partake of the material that its authors painstakingly generated for the period from 1980 to 2005, but they should take with a grain of salt their historical observations.

Brian Gratton
Arizona State University

*Babies without Borders: Adoption and Migration across the Americas.* By Karen Dubinsky (New York, New York University Press, 2010) 199 pp. $20.00

Intensely researched and historically relevant to current trends, Dubinsky’s book provides insight into both the social workers and political realms of adoption from a multinational perspective. Separated into three parts, from Cuba’s Operation Peter Pan, to Canada and the United States’ transracial/hybrid baby-adoption dilemmas, to the harrowing accounts of the adoption process in Guatemala, this book incorporates the

vast history of adoption as rarely seen or told from the peripheral perspective of a researcher. Of upmost importance is Dubinsky’s firsthand account of adopting a child herself, which supplements the critical-historical perspective with a personal one that is too-often forgotten when talking about adoption and the adoption process.

The work that Dubinsky, her research assistants, and a myriad of unseen players and supporters conduct is fascinating to read. In her chapter “The National Baby,” she discusses how she obtained archival information about Operation Peter Pan and the Elian Gonzales socio-political debacle in Cuba. Because of her uncanny ability to find social workers and advocates who were willing to discuss Operation Peter Pan, she was able to uncover facts about political and social-welfare systems that are rarely delivered in even the most liberal of media sources.

In the chapter “The Hybrid Baby,” Dubinsky sheds light on the transracial adoption issue and process from both a Canadian perspective and U.S. perspective. The two countries’ respective systems and attitudes create different consequences for the advocates and groups that both promote and demote transracial adoption from both sides of the Canada/U.S. border. For one thing, Canada in the 1950s began to push for white families to adopt black children, which ran counter to the U.S. policy of only black families adopting black children (per the National Association of Black Social Workers in the 1960s).

The most riveting chapter, “The Missing Baby,” Dubinsky’s account about Guatemala, is a disturbing look at what it can mean to adopt from a third-world country. Dubinsky maintains objectivity both as a researcher and an adopting parent when sharing the harsh details, from the Guatemalan perspective, of what it means to relinquish a child, either by force, kidnapping, or one’s own accord. This chapter stirs emotions of anger, hatred, fear, and sadness that are often missing in clinical discussions of adoption. This chapter could easily have sustained a book by itself.

Methodologically speaking, the research would hardly have been so strong were it not for the persistence and attention that Dubinsky and her colleagues pay to maximize accuracy and validity. One sobering moment that Dubinsky recounts speaks to the dark side of a system that too often remains hidden: “One afternoon, at another agency, two employees didn’t notice me taking notes, tucked in a corner of a huge file storage room. As they searched for a particular file, one of them said to the other, ‘God, think of all the history in this room. Think of all the people we’ve screwed over.’ ‘I don’t want to know,’ said the other” (59–60). The valuable archival accounts and narratives that constitute the research for this book undoubtedly opens doors to further work in this arena.

Farnad J. Darnell
Consultant, the Gibson Group
Andrews situates his intriguing study of this small corner of the African diaspora at the uneasy intersection of national mythology and racial discrimination practiced across the twentieth century. Though today constituting between 6 and 9 percent of the national population, Afro-Uruguayans disappeared from the historical narrative in the late nineteenth century. Andrews seeks to rescue their history for an English-language audience, building on recent scholarship while offering the dual perspective of a social historian and a participant observer in the annual celebration of Carnival. He draws from rich data to examine how blacks came to be seen as “extraneous to Uruguayan modernity” (5): dozens of interviews with Carnival performers and directors, historians, artists, and politicians; an anthropological study from the 1950s; a documentary film from the 1940s; and an official history from 1930. Situating the study in Uruguay provides some key opportunities, since the country “generated by far the most active black press anywhere in Latin America” (5), numbering at least twenty-five newspapers before 1950. It was also home to one of only three black political parties in the region. In the arts, blacks created a musical form, the *candombe*, which was eventually adopted by whites, hybridized, and performed publicly in whiteface, before becoming what Andrews identifies as “a national rhythm” (17).

Andrews has conceived a far more ambitious study than simply resurrecting a lost narrative. He unravels an alternative history to the one in which Uruguay imagines itself as a European country in the New World—imbued with “whiteness,” “civilization,” a high rate of literacy, and a frequently iterated commitment to egalitarianism. In the process, he deciphers the contradictions between this progressive official ideology and an array of evidence that demonstrates a prolonged pattern of discrimination against blacks—a lack of access to such public places as theaters, restaurants, cafés, and schools; segregation in menial jobs and poor neighborhoods; and disproportionate conscription into the military. Emblematic of these contradictions is the fact that only five Afro-Uruguayans graduated from the national university in the first half of the twentieth century in a country that prided itself on making education accessible to a broad public (91).

Through juxtaposing accounts in establishment newspapers with stories in the black press, Andrews uncovers the historical agency of Afro-Uruguayans in constructing strategies of resistance to the racial hierarchy. Combining these tactics with the observations and memories of his oral-history subjects, Andrews is also able to provide a spatial dimension to the history, leading him into the world of the working-class neighborhoods in Montevideo that gave birth to Afro-Uruguayan popular culture and, in the 1970s, to its erasure through the demolition of buildings that had provided the communal housing in which candombe
arose. His discussion of networks and community in these neighborhoods benefits from his participation as a drummer in a *comparsa*, a corps of performers that ritually march in named groups through the streets of the city during Carnival, playing candombe tunes and competing for recognition.

Though Andrews makes a good case for the value of comparative history (19), he does not follow this approach in a sustained way. Rather than employing case studies, Andrews occasionally uses examples from African-driven popular culture in Cuba, Brazil, and Argentina to provide a wider context for his study of Afro-Uruguay. The last chapter offers a short analysis of black access to social services in contemporary Brazil and Uruguay, based on recent census data, but it also bypasses an opportunity to develop a briefly mentioned institutional alliance with Jews into a comparative discussion of discrimination against a different “outsider,” another subject of much recent historical scholarship (149).

Andrews’ engagingly written, creative, and politically relevant study contributes to a trend in scholarship that emerged in the 1990s. It has subjected the “social imaginary” of Uruguay, constructed in the early twentieth century, to an autopsy occasioned by a brutal military regime that cracked its foundational tenets. By focusing on the world of the *comparsas*, Andrews finds that, contrary to national mythology, Uruguay is not unique; it has followed a cultural trajectory throughout Latin America in which African musical forms were deprecated, modified, and eventually legitimized at the same time that blacks were socially distanced. This book poses useful questions for labor historians about the absence of blacks from that narrative and for urban historians about popular culture maintaining a small public space in the face of dictatorship.

Anton Rosenthal
University of Kansas


Deutsch presents a comprehensive view of Jewish women’s lives in Argentina, their contribution to the nation’s development in its social, political, economic, and cultural dimensions, and the mechanisms that they employed in both crossing cultural boundaries and sustaining traditions. The work’s temporal coverage spans from the era of mass European immigration, beginning in the 1880s, to President Juan Perón’s fall from power in 1955. Deutsch returns to women, and away from gender, as the historical subject of inquiry by attenuating the focus on domestic spheres and privileging instead the depiction and analysis of power relationships in the public sphere. In this regard, she conceptualizes the environment and interactions under the notion of “border,” an intellectual
construct meant to signify the negotiations with boundaries encountered by Jewish women, first as immigrants and then as a cultural and ethnic minority. Rural and urban environments presented highly differentiated conditions to which Jewish women had to respond in forging their development. “Borders”—a term that Deutsch employs with great frequency—appears to signify a more current version of previous attempts to document the mechanisms and strategies by which cultural identities incorporated, adapted, and resisted host societies’ norms.

Deutsch studies Jewish women spatially and thematically, dedicating considerable material to their involvement in agricultural cooperatives or colonias, in which around one-quarter of Jewish immigrants lived toward the close of the nineteenth century. There, such challenges as isolation and limited opportunity, which were inherent in these distant rural settings, led to their significant de-population by 1940. The chapter dedicated to daily life in the city of Buenos Aires presents an incomparably more cosmopolitan setting and economically dynamic environment, but without ignoring its dangers. As in the case of immigrants from Europe to New York and other metropolitan areas in the United States, Jews concentrated residentially in Buenos Aires at first, particularly in working-class quarters, though never to the point of forming homogeneous ghettos. Buenos Aires offered a wide variety of cultural and political venues in which Jewish women participated, including educational and vocational organizations, along with leftist and workers’ movements. Although they were precluded from most leadership positions, Jewish women appeared to have made their marks on leftist organizational activities, spurring reading circles, publications, and motivational performances. Themes covered in other chapters include occupational profiles and professional development, prostitution, family environments, responses to nationalist antisemitism, and commitment to sustaining the needy in Argentina and Israel.

The work is not based on a quantitative approach, despite the ten tables presented in the appendix. Quantitative indeterminacy characterizes descriptions throughout each chapter. “Some,” “many,” “not all,” and similarly weak substitutes for clearer boundaries betray multiple—and sometimes frustrating—instances of lost opportunities to depict proportionality: For example, on the power of pimps over prostitutes, “men’s power varied” (119); on interacting with available cultural outlets, “Jewish women crisscrossed the cultural divide,” and “some women felt secure in their confinement”; on gender belief-systems, “gender norms confined . . . and marginalized many Jewish women” (42); on ethnic identity, “some accepted the racist aspects of the reigning liberal project” (43); and on socioeconomic positions, “Many . . . families could not take care of their daughters and wives,” and “large numbers of widows and women forsaken or abused by their husbands were also in need” (49).

Deutsch seems to be committed to mentioning all of the possible al-
ternatives to the naturally multiple situations that Jewish women faced in everyday contexts. However, despite the diverse nature of human activities, behavioral manifestations seldom escape from distribution along central tendencies. In this regard, Deutsch does not provide much quantitative clarity or a measurable sense of change over time. Of the ten tables, eight present static data for a single year (1914, 1936, or 1960), and only two present data dynamically across time. To be fair, quantitative data on the Jewish population is notoriously difficult to gather, highly inconsistent, and often subject to debate, but a greater sense of the temporal component in the interactions covered in this well-written work would have been helpful.

Deutsch erroneously conflates *state-building* with Jewish women’s social, cultural, and political activities in Argentina. In fact, she presents no evidence to suggest that Jewish women contributed to strengthening the states; indeed, much of the plight suffered by the defenseless and needy segments of this population was made more difficult by the absence of state regulations. It would be much more accurate to associate Jewish women’s intersections outside the boundaries of their own groups as steps that, along a secular path, contributed to the community- and nation-building processes of Argentina, and especially Buenos Aires as the most culturally diverse region of Latin America by the start of World War I.

The descriptions of Jewish women’s responses to the challenges and opportunities that Buenos Aires presented as it developed into one of the most cosmopolitan cities in the Americas are rich and deep. The ample vignettes depicting “lived experience” effectively convey the Jewish experience. The work draws from a laudably copious documentation comprising archival, secondary, journalistic, and literary materials, significantly amplified by interviews. Well-researched and well-told, this work is worth reading, particularly in conjunction with other histories of international migration.

Mark D. Szuchman
Florida International University


The source of much of Brazil’s population until the slave trade’s end in the 1850s, Africa long served as the antithesis to the Brazilian elite’s Europhile civilizing project. In the 1930s and 1940s, this elite reversed course and came to celebrate African contributions to national culture. Gilberto Freyre described his country as a racial democracy, the product
of “lusotropicalism,” the alleged Portuguese proclivity for harmonious race relations through miscegenation.\(^1\)

How overwhelmingly white diplomats and intellectuals wrestled with these aspects of Brazilian national identity during their country’s engagement with newly independent African countries is Dávila’s principal concern in this fine monograph. In the early 1960s, white diplomats clumsily presented their country as a kindred nation to baffled Africans annoyed at Brazil’s continued support for Portugal’s colonization, which Freyre and his ilk considered an exemplary case of progressive lusotropicalism. Brazilians extolled their country’s racial democracy, but only one token black man served as ambassador, to Ghana (in his memoirs, he describes humiliating treatment at the hands of fellow diplomats and alienation from Africa, where he did not feel at home). White diplomats, too, struggled with their country’s contradictory racial ideology.

This outreach ended with the 1964 military coup, but in the early 1970s, the military regime (then at its most oppressive) charted a new policy of engagement with Africa. Portugal’s revolution (1974) and rapid decolonization overtook this demarche, and while Brazil fumbled diplomatic relations with most of Portugal’s ex-colonies, the country’s recognition of Angola’s Movimento Popular de Libertação de Angola (MPLA) regime (Brazil was the first and, for some time, only Western country to do so) restored its credibility. Brazilian manufactures briefly found markets in oil-rich Nigeria, where Brazil’s black soccer star Pelé advertised household appliances. A rhetoric of racial democracy permeated these initiatives, and Brazilian diplomats worked to silence such critics as Abdias do Nascimento, an exiled black activist who denounced Brazilian racism at the 1977 Lagos Festival of African Arts and Culture. Ties with Africa languished during the economic crises of the 1980s, but even today, Africa remains “a canvas on which Brazilian national aspirations and racial values [are] rendered” (255).

Not only does Dávila thus show how domestic racial ideology shaped Brazil’s foreign policy, but he also effectively demonstrates the many levels on which international relations take place. The 1961 goodwill visit of an Angolan ice hockey (!) team to São Paulo was disrupted by decolonization activists, some of whom were in Brazil thanks to Senegal’s policy of issuing passports to students from Portuguese colonies who thereby benefited from Brazil’s scholarship program for Senegalese students. António de Oliveira Salazar’s Portugal was no less active (and much more successful until the early 1970s) in influencing Brazilian policy through goodwill visits, cultivation of Brazilian congressmen and intellectuals (like Freyre), and sentimental appeals to the politically influential Portuguese expatriate community.

Impressive research in Brazilian and Portuguese archives (especially

---

1 Although the concept of “racial democracy” is widely attributed to Freyre, he used the term only later in his life. Dávila effectively summarizes the evolution of Freyre’s thinking and its appropriation by others in *Hotel Trópico*, 11–26.
those of the foreign ministries and the secret police), newspapers on three continents, memoirs, and interviews with retired Brazilian diplomats and intellectuals make this book a model diplomatic history and a sophisticated meditation on race and national identity.

Hendrik Kraay
University of Calgary


Hellenism in the Roman Near East has been a welcome subject of scholarship since Millar and others from Oxford first pioneered investigations into aspects of Greeks and Greek culture in the Roman Empire during the early 1960s. In the twenty-first century, scholarship has broadened from that of the late 1950s and early and middle 1960s to investigate languages (often beyond Greek and Latin) and cultures in addition to literary works. This volume testifies to such changes. It is an admirable collection of eighteen focused and well-proportioned essays on sociocultural trends. The conveners managed to bring together a powerful group of highly qualified and distinguished scholars to report and reflect on broad, significant, and difficult questions that hitherto have lacked any convenient comprehensive treatment.

The authors have avoided forcing their sources, even though some readers still might want more details. From Hellenism to Islam covers areas of the formerly Roman Near East understandably concentrating on southwestern Asia, but its scope includes subjects stretching from Egypt to Anatolia. Even though the Eastern Mediterranean is the focus of many of these studies, the Mediterranean itself is not the key aspect of the environment or historical context. Instead, the authors explicitly concentrate on the Roman Near East. The essays’ approximate chronological scope is the first through seventh century C.E., a lengthy period in the Near East that has suffered neglect but now is attracting more interest. Coverage is reasonable, but the collection cannot and does not cover everything. Omissions include (except indirectly or occasionally) Sasanian and Parthian studies and history and conditions in mainland Greece, the Greek islands, Cyprus, and the Caucasus.

As the subtitle indicates, the subject of From Hellenism to Islam is cultural and linguistic change, especially as illuminated by inscriptions, papyri, and archaeological evidence, not by individual literary sources in Greek, Latin, or nonclassical languages. Contributions are at least as valuable for philology (not necessarily for sociolinguistics) as for history.

1 See, for example, Fergus Millar, A Study of Cassius Dio (Oxford, 1964); Christopher P. Jones, Plutarch and Rome (Oxford, 1971).
and cultural studies. The authors address methodological problems of tracing the complexities of long-term continuities and gradual changes. Most of these studies are not conceived as analyses of change resulting from or accompanying any sudden violent rupture. Several of the authors have specialized skills in nonliterary texts, such as inscriptions. The essays are interdisciplinary; they cross textual, geographical, chronological, cultural, and conceptual boundaries.

These essays deal with cultural and linguistic changes in process, usage, and conditions, not primarily with the history of events or individuals or with political and military developments. Some of the more specialized essays may never have large constituencies, measured, for example, by course enrollments. Omnipresent are aspects of religion, though unstated realities of political and military power are also intertwined with linguistic change in many cases. Yet, no case involved outright political compulsion or coercion as the explicit cause for linguistic change, as pointed out by Werner Eck, “The Presence, Role and Significance of Latin in the Epigraphy and Culture of the Roman Near East” (15–42), and by Nicole Belayche, “‘Languages’ and Religion in Second- to Fourth-Century Palestine: In Search of the Impact of Rome” (177–202, esp. 186–187). It would be inappropriate to invoke simplistic generalizations and formulations about power as causal explanations. The role of political power receives attention (especially in the incisive contribution by Benjamin Isaac, “Latin in Cities of the Roman Near East,” [43–72]) but not explicit, singular attention. Relationships between and within communities and the process of linguistic and cultural change involve more complex variables than the eventual change from Hellenistic to Roman to Muslim power.

The five subsections are I, “The Language of Power: Latin in the Roman Near East”; II, “Social and Legal Institutions as Reflected in the Documentary Evidence”; III, “The Epigraphic Language of Religion”; IV, “Linguistic Metamorphoses and Continuity of Cultures”; and V, “Greek into Arabic.” Despite their rigor, these chapters do not pretend to offer exhaustive coverage, but they are as nuanced as they are erudite, containing extensive references to primary sources and modern scholarship. The various entries evince a reasonable coherence, with no sharp disagreements, together with thorough and rigorous reviews of evidence, inferential reasoning, up-to-date citations of modern scholarship, and careful, sober conclusions (no wild theses intrude). They are all relevant to the subject of Hellenism and Islam, but the transition from one to the next is not always smooth. At one level, many contributions are highly technical, whereas at another, their authors manage to develop topical syntheses.

Many of the subjects of these contributions are not easy to understand. They involve major historical and cultural questions, such as the relative roles of Greek and Latin in the Roman Near East (including the role of Greek as the medium of communication between Roman au-
authorities and subjects in the Near East), aspects of bi-lingualism and bi-literacy (which are not synonymous, as Price and Shlomo Naeh, “On the Margins of Culture: The Practice of Transcription in the Ancient World,” 260–266, and Walter Ameling, “The Epigraphic Habit and the Jewish Disaporas,” 223–227, make eminently clear), and the variable survival and slow death of other languages. Survival in legal documents does not necessarily mean survival of a specific spoken language. Latin was a language of power but to what extent? Likewise important are several roles and contexts for Aramaic. What was the nature and importance of pre-Islamic Arabic, especially outside South Arabia? Issues of institutional, economic, and military history are not primary objects of study, although some of these studies illuminate them.

Without in any way detracting from the erudition and painstaking labor of other contributors, Millar’s admirable introductory essay and synthetic overview—“Introduction: Documentary Evidence, Social Realities and the History of Language” (1–12)—is worthy of special mention. Also fascinating are the contributions of Angelos Chasiotis—“Ritual Performance of Divine Justice: the Epigraphy of Confession, Atonement, and Exaltation in Roman Asia Minor” (115–153)—Leah Di Segni—“Greek Inscriptions in Transition from the Byzantine to the Early Islamic Period” (352–373)—and Hoyland—“Arab Kings, Arab Tribes and the Beginnings of Arab Historical memory in Late Roman Epigraphy” (374–400). The essay on the death of Coptic by Tonio Richter, “Greek, Coptic and the ‘Language of the Hijra’: The Rise and Decline of the Coptic Language in Late Antique and Medieval Egypt” (401–446), is enormously instructive. The little-known Nabataeans and their linguistic traces receive careful and sensitive attention from Cotton, “Continuity of Nabataean Law in the Petra Papyri: A Methodological Exercise” (154–174), and from Ernst Axel Knauf, “The Nabataean Connection of the Benei Hezir” (345–351).

From Hellenism to Islam improves our understanding of aspects of Hellenistic, Roman, Mediterranean, Jewish, late antique, Byzantine, early Christian studies, Coptic studies, and early Islamic history, as well as the history of the ancient Near East. It is a learned volume of truly interdisciplinary historical and cultural studies. Can more be said about some of its topics? Perhaps, but, nonetheless, its authors have much to offer, while prudently avoiding many predictions concerning the future of scholarship in their respective specialties. This volume and its contributions will receive extensive citation. Broader audiences can learn much from reading sections of special interest.

Walter E. Kaegi
University of Chicago
In this well-written and extensively researched work on traditional medicine in late imperial China, Wu examines how medical literature in the Ming and Qing dynasties considered fertility, pregnancy, childbirth, and the postpartum period, collectively referred to as *fuke*, or medicine for women. Wu presents important findings that contradict earlier interpretations of traditional Chinese medicine. First, late imperial fuke had an optimistic view of women’s bodies as fundamentally the same as men’s—“simultaneously sexless and sexed” and “governed by the same dynamics of illness and health” (231, 51)—challenging the earlier thesis of a fundamental sex difference. Second, Wu’s discussions of the womb contest the common theory that late imperial Chinese medicine focused on function rather than structure, revealing instead the paradigm of a universal body complete with a womb (in both men and women), reimagined as a universal structure, a life gate, a container, and a crucible for gestation (86). Finally, Wu argues that childbirth was considered inherently safe, though undue interference by humans could interrupt the “cosmologically resonant childbirth” to produce difficulties or death (187).

Wu’s sources span centuries and include local gazetteers, collections of medical cases, compendia of prescriptions and formulas, and numerous versions of fuke classics like the *Treatise on Easy Childbirth* and Bamboo Grove Monastery texts. She acknowledges the wide geographical space and extensive time frame of her study, questioning whether she can legitimately “cite a seventh-century text in the same paragraph as an eighteenth-century one” or “discuss a writer from Sichuan together with an author from Suzhou” (8). In fact, it is this breadth that provides one of the central themes of this book—that these popular and widely circulated texts, largely published by gentlemen amateur medical writers, form the primary corpus of late imperial Chinese medicine. Scholars anthologized and reprinted popular texts, often for prestige or merit, thus providing classic references for centuries to come. The scholars encouraged a drug-based approach to treatment rather than a focus on religious or manual techniques (9).

*Reproducing Women* is organized into six chapters with an introduction and an epilogue. Each section effectively begins with an illustrative medical case that reveals the chapter’s main ideas. Chapter 1, for example, explores the sources of men’s medical authority in fuke. To illustrate her point, Wu introduces the case of a woman who was diagnosed as suffering from “stagnation” by one physician and from “depletion” by another. Each physician prescribed and administered drugs specific to his different diagnosis. The one who cured her—of depletion—was Wei Zhixiu, who then collected this story and others like it in a book about medical cases, thereby buttressing his medical authority.
Chapters 1 and 2 examine this popular amateur medical literature as a distinct genre and as the accepted mode for transmitting medical knowledge and authority. Chapter 3 is a “revisionist reading” of the relationship between function and structure in the human body, and Chapters 4 through 6 trace philosophies of fertility, birth, and postpartum, respectively. The epilogue discusses the late Qing Chinese medical writers who turned their criticisms toward foreign obstetrics that they believed contradicted the natural order of the cosmos. It reinforces the idea that medicine is culturally based, and that examining the medical landscape brings broader social issues to light, in this case Qing conservatism and Western imperialism. As the embodiment of many aspects of gender relations, social structure, politics, and philosophy, childbearing was, and is, “the warp on which the fabric of society was woven”.

Tina Phillips Johnson
Saint Vincent College