turned again and women are presumed unable to give free consent and men are presumed to be the antagonists" (p. 205). Unfortunately, the issues imbedded in both the legal and the public debates over recent cases are given short shrift. Drawing a parallel from the early feminists' support of a conservative purity movement to speculate that "the second wave of feminism may be evolving into a new puritanism" (p. 204) seems to have its own political agenda.

Nancy K. Parker
Athabasca University

Martin Bruegel — *Farm, Shop, Landing: The Rise of a Market Society in the Hudson Valley, 1780–1860*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2002.

Martin Bruegel's study of the emergence of a market economy and its social and political consequences in early-nineteenth-century upstate New York brings fresh insight into what has become an old, if not tired, debate in American historiography.

The rural economies of the Northeastern United States experienced dramatic changes between the end of the colonial period and the Civil War. Increased population density, followed by urbanization and industrialization, expanded infrastructure, accrued specie and paper money circulation, and technological innovations ranging from new machinery to improved seeds all contributed to enlarging the markets for agricultural commodities and enabling farmers to take advantage of this expansion. It also made markets more competitive. For instance, the prevalence of western wheat made growing this grain in the seaboard states unprofitable. Farm communities responded positively to these incentives: they left behind the local self-sufficiency of the late colonial period and steadily increased their market participation. By mid-century, farmers had become specialized producers of commodities for the market and buyers of goods they had once made, grown, or raised themselves.

There is nary a disagreement over the broad outlines of this transformation, and Bruegel's book will not force us to reconsider the process. But American historians have sharply disagreed over the social and cultural impact of this "transition to capitalism", and this has led to a protracted debate over the past 30 years. Did the structural changes of the early nineteenth century unleash the farmers' innate acquisitive instincts, and did they embrace these with enthusiasm? Or, as the "household economists" believe, did a non-capitalist "moral economy" dominate the countryside until the beginning of the nineteenth century? According to those historians, easy access to land preserved older communitarian and family values antithetical to those prevailing in a market economy. Rural communities regrouped egalitarian, interdependent, and patriarchal farmers and artisans, who primarily sought long-term stability and security for their families.

Lately, this debate has led to another over the nature of the "Market Revolution", stimulated by the publication of Charles Sellers's monumental study of the same title (*The Market Revolution: Jacksonian America, 1815–1846* [New York: Oxford University Press, 1991]). Sellers linked the discussion of the "transition to capitalism"

with debates over the nature of Jacksonian politics, arguing both addressed the same underlying issue: the struggle between "capitalist" seaboard entrepreneurs (merchants, manufacturers, bankers) and yeomen and craftsmen in the rest of the country, which played out in the corridors of power as well as in church halls. The book stirred a debate, but more importantly reminded historians, social or otherwise, that the transition to capitalism also spilled into public and religious life.

Several scholars who have recently published on the topic have adopted this broader view of a "transition to capitalism", encompassing economic, political, social, and religious dimensions. Bruegel's contribution to this ongoing debate highlights three characteristics that have often been downplayed or ignored. The first is that concepts like "capital" or "market" need to be historicized: the way nineteenth-century people understood them was not fixed. Secondly, people make events happen; events do not simply happen to people. Thirdly, economic changes transformed the nature of public life, bringing it closer to a model with which we are familiar.

The objects of Bruegel's study are two contiguous counties in upstate New York between the end of the Revolution and the eve of the Civil War and the landing (later town) of Hudson, where merchants and artisans established themselves. He describes the mid-Hudson valley of the late eighteenth century as a "thoroughly local place" (p. 39), where the distance to the market and its small size combined with climatic vagaries and the uncertainties brought by the Revolution to create among the local population deep anxieties about their livelihood and their future. Farmers engaged in local exchanges not only to ensure their subsistence, but also to create dense social networks that could be called upon in times of need. Exchanges, argues Bruegel, constituted and sustained neighbourhoods. Client-patron relationships with merchants and landlords also created unequal but reciprocal relationships that made life more predictable.

This world faded away under the impact of growing metropolitan demand, developing infrastructure, and western competition. Farmers switched to specialized production for market, and New York investors opened textile mills, tanneries, and brickworks in the valley to take advantage either of its water power or of its raw material. The transformation met little resistance: farmers chose to produce for the markets; journeymen chose to work in the mills (and went on strike, not to prevent deskilling or to protect a traditional organization of production, but because their wages were too low). Most Hudson valley residents viewed the opening of new markets less as a threat than as an opportunity. The local government also became an advocate of the market economy and dismantled controls, like the Assize of Bread, over economic life.

The "moral economy" of eighteenth-century Hudson valley residents appears to have been situational. Bruegel describes it as stemming from the difficulties experienced by farmers, craftsmen, and merchants in making a living. Their precarious economic situation made the existence of social networks imperative. Once the fear of want was gone, so were the reasons to perpetuate a culture of interdependence. By the 1820s, notes Bruegel, "Comments revealing anxiety about material standard of living disappeared from diaries and ledgers" (p. 218). The Hudson valley embraced the market economy.

The strength of Bruegel's study is its ability to uncover the mentality behind behaviour, rather than deducing mentality from behaviour. Bruegel, who was able to put his hands on a very large corpus of qualitative sources (personal papers, diaries, farm account books, correspondence, minutes of local associations, and no fewer than 25 local and regional newspapers), can document the attitudinal changes that accompanied the growth of the market economy. On one hand, he can document the shift from an "understanding of the world rooted in concrete and particular experiences to general abstractions". "Capital", for instance, is a word that did not enter Hudsonites' vocabulary before 1800; it was first used to refer to a merchant's material assets. By 1840 it was being used as an abstraction for "investors". "Market" underwent a similar semantic transformation, from a place of exchange, to the exchanges themselves, and finally to price-setting mechanisms (pp. 1–2). Capitalism could not have taken over the Hudson valley earlier because it had to be invented first. This approach allows Bruegel to avoid one pitfall of many studies on the emergence of a market economy: a propensity to reify "the market" and treat it as if it were some juggernaut imposing itself upon unwilling individuals. In *Farm, Shop and Landing*, people built capitalism one decision at a time.

Public life was also affected by the economic transformation and subsequent changes in values. Profits replaced mutual help, and "respectability", the private practice of "small virtues" (p. 189), replaced Honour, the reputation attached to one's name. The "better sort" showed less and less tolerance for social bonding rituals like drinking and fighting. Political life, initially a "gentlemanly exercise in exchange of personal favour for power", became a battleground between disciplined parties (p. 204). The older forms of public life had been inextricably linked with the "moral economy" and disappeared with it, replaced by individualism and voluntarism.

One feels like the Grinch, finding weaknesses in such a detailed and nuanced analysis of the emergence of a "market economy", but the book has the vices of its virtues. Bruegel's emphasis on mentality and culture leads him to underuse his quantitative sources; however, the book is already 300 pages long, leaving not much space for a more detailed analysis of farm production or merchants' records. One can also wonder whether all farmers faced the growing markets with the same equanimity. Farm account books were almost by definition kept by people who wanted to keep a close eye on their activities. Those were the most likely to see the market as a source of opportunity rather than a threat. The discussion of politics (less than a chapter) is also very limited, despite the state of New York undergoing considerable political changes during that period. Bruegel's skimpy treatment leaves the reader wondering what the Jacksonian period meant for Hudson valley residents.

Joyce Appleby, in a recent article, notes that historians writing about early American capitalism have been talking past each other for the past 25 years. She proposes a strategy to end this state of affairs: recover meanings and treat capitalism as a cultural phenomenon. Bruegel could not have read this article before finishing his manuscript. He nonetheless followed Appleby's agenda, and we should all be happy that he did.

Béatrice Craig
University of Ottawa

Frédéric Charbonneau — *Les silences de l'histoire. Les mémoires français du XVII^e siècle*, Québec, Presses de l'Université Laval, 2001, 299 p.

La richesse des mémoires a été soulignée par de nombreux travaux depuis les 30 dernières années. Plusieurs chercheurs se sont entre autres penchés sur le problème posé par la définition même du genre. Dans la foulée de ces travaux, Frédéric Charbonneau livre ici une analyse, fine et érudite, recherchant « les facteurs de cohérence et de cohésion entre les mémoires, aux plans de la genèse historique, de l'ancrage social et du déploiement rhétorique » (p. 6). « Tous les Mémoires sont d'abord des anti-histoires » a affirmé Pierre Nora (1997) : le thème est ici développé dans ses multiples dimensions. Selon Charbonneau, le principe d'unité de ce « genre gigogne » qui accueille des oeuvres disparates, est à voir dans le refus de l'histoire officielle, de sa pratique et de sa représentation des faits. Ainsi, le genre mémorial se construit en opposition à l'histoire, dans sa forme et sur le fond.

L'ouvrage est divisé en quatre parties. Les deux premiers chapitres montrent la genèse du conflit entre mémoires et histoire, deux conceptions qui s'affrontent depuis l'Antiquité. Se dessinent dès lors les tensions entre vérité et mensonge, entre l'objectivité de l'historien et la subjectivité de l'acteur ou du témoin, sur le plan formel entre le style simple, dépouillé et le style orné et éloquent. Les *Commentaires* de César, ouvrage précurseur du genre, ouvrent la voie aux mémorialistes et offrent « une caution et les lieux d'une rhétorique virile » (p. 37) en recherchant le style et la forme du vrai. À la Renaissance, au moment où émerge la notion de méthode dans la pratique historienne, avec notamment Jean Bodin, le genre mémorial s'impose en rejetant la recherche stylistique, la prétention à l'histoire universelle et la dépendance à l'égard du roi. La traduction latine de l'oeuvre de Philippe de Commynes au XVI^e siècle anoblit ce type de narration historique qui se définit avant tout par l'observation d'un seul.

La seconde partie intitulée « L'anti-histoire » analyse dans les chapitres 3 à 6 le parcours paradoxal de la construction et de l'autonomisation du genre. Les mémorialistes se mêlent en effet de faire de l'histoire alors qu'ils s'opposent à sa pratique et à ses praticiens. Le genre des mémoires n'est pas codifié ni théorisé par les contemporains, mais son autonomisation au XVII^e siècle passe d'abord par la définition d'un territoire particulier qui s'exclut de celui des historiens : « Les mémoires s'opposent à l'histoire comme le particulier au général, l'officieux à l'officiel, le privé au public, c'est là leur rébellion, c'est là qu'ils intéressent le curieux et le libertin » (p. 72). Les mémorialistes se mêlent également d'écriture alors qu'ils sont avant tout des hommes d'action et d'expérience, issus de la noblesse, du clergé ou de la bourgeoisie. Contrairement aux historiens, hommes de cabinet à qui l'on reproche leur incompétence et leur dépendance à l'égard du pouvoir royal (qualifiés « d'hommes de néant » par le cardinal de Retz), les mémorialistes participent à la