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public health officials increasingly held sway over city agencies. Also overlooked has been the influence of city delegates to the state legislatures, most of which deferred to the desires of these urban representatives. As a result, pluralism characterized urban decision-making with power vested in the hands of several competing factions.

While these various administrators sometimes governed ineffectively and occasionally abused their positions for personal gain, they also recorded notable triumphs. American cities produced some of the most magnificent engineering feats ever, including the Brooklyn Bridge, Central Park, and the New Croton Aqueduct. Moreover, Teaford asserts, American cities' record of service purveyance compares quite favourably with that of their supposedly superior European counterparts. Admittedly deficient in caring for the poor and in providing police protection, U.S. cities excelled in such areas as water and sewerage facilities, streets and bridges, mass transportation, fire protection, parks, and public libraries — and at a cost not out of line with the boom-and-bust national economy of the late nineteenth century.

If American cities performed so admirably, then why the nearly universal denunciation of their efforts by a disgruntled citizenry? The author suggests that dissatisfaction hailed from the “balanced system of municipal decision making” (p. 308). No single person or group achieved hegemony, so compromises resulted from the often-bitter wranglings of several competing interests. These groups fiercely disliked having to work with each other but reluctantly did so out of necessity. The constantly critical middle class frequently approved of the ends but not the means of city government, finding dishonourable the work of the plebian city councils. In short, the system of municipal government accommodated everyone but pleased no one.

The Unheralded Triumph is a provocative revisionist argument that will challenge the beliefs about city governance held by Gilded Age specialists and urban historians. Teaford builds a compelling case that, for all their deficiencies, American cities truly stood in the vanguard of technological change. By the turn of the century, he argues convincingly, American city dwellers enjoyed a standard of public services unsurpassed anywhere. Readers may balk at some of his conclusions, contending that the author too quickly dismisses the failures of U.S. cities (as he does in discussing their indifference to combatting slum housing, for example). Nonetheless, his emphasis on the positive would seem essential in establishing a corrective to traditional misconceptions. His trenchant use of statistics comparing American and European cities lends particular authority to his contentions. This is an important book whose findings will have to be considered by historians of the period. One quibble: the notes suggest that the author made judicious use of a wide variety of sources, but the absence of any sort of bibliography is bothersome. Particularly in a large interpretive work of this nature based upon research in several locations, a bibliographical essay would be of great value to readers and researchers. This fine book would be even better with such an inclusion.

Roger Biles
Department of History
Oklahoma State University


This volume presents some of the findings of the historical archaeological program at St. Augustine, which is sponsored by a myriad of organizations including, among others, Florida State University, the University of Florida, the St. Augustine Historical Society, and the Historic St. Augustine Preservation Board. Deagan is associated with the Florida State Museum at the University of Florida. Four of the book's eleven chapters, and one of its three appendices, are provided by six other contributors who have differing institutional affiliations but who have participated in the project over the years. Though primarily a report of archaeological findings, the work takes exceptionally thorough account of a wide variety of historical sources, and its preparation was assisted by a number of historians.

The time period focused on is 1702 to 1763, which is the era between the rebuilding of the city following its destruction by the raid of the English governor of South Carolina, James Moore, to the cession of Florida to the English (who held it for only twenty years before returning it to Spain). Although it was never more than a fortified frontier settlement (presidio) in the Spanish empire, St. Augustine reached its zenith as a colony during this period, with a total population of 3,104. Like all of Spanish America, it was a melting pot for Indians, blacks, mestizos, American-born Spaniards (called créoles in Spanish America), and peninsular-born Spaniards. It is this very special characteristic, perhaps unique among colonial cities in the United States, that Deagan finds more important than the accidental fact that St. Augustine was also the first city in the United States (founded in 1565 by Pedro Menéndez de Aviles). St. Augustine's primary function was to provide defense for the Spanish treasure fleets that passed through the Florida Straits. Never self-sufficient, it was financed (like Santo Domingo, Puerto Rico, and Louisiana) by a yearly grant of cash and goods, called the situado, from Spain's colonial treasure house, Mexico.

Concentrating on the social stratification of Spanish colonial society and the process of European adaptation to a hostile environment, Deagan and her collaborators study the
life of the town’s residents that documents cannot reveal. Excavations in a variety of house lots, the parish church, and a former Indian settlement, reveal fascinating details of everyday life, diet, social customs, community relations, Indian life, and burial practices. Often the archaeological data permit the scholar to correct (and certainly to augment) the documentary record by the colonists. As one example: the settlers frequently complained in reports to Spain of the necessity of eating dogs, cats, and rats when food supplies were low. Yet the archaeological study of household trash pits reveals no evidence of consumption of such unappealing fare. It does reveal, however, considerable monotony of diet and the absence of preferred foodstuffs, at least for the poor. It was not so much that people were starving, rather, they had to eat indigenous products such as fish and corn rather than “Hispanic” foods such as beef, pork, and wine. St. Augustinians, like many other Spanish colonists, faced the need to convert from what in Mexico is called the “wheat culture” (meaning European) to the “corn culture” (meaning American), and this was socially less desirable. Excavation of the parish council and its yard, which was used by both the Spanish and later the British settlers, shows fascinating differences between Spanish and English burial practices, reflecting religious distinctions.

Much of the information about social relations between the classes is facilitated by the fact that eighteenth-century maps reveal the ownership of each city lot. When the cession to Britain occurred, all of the Spanish and even the Indian residents of St. Augustine withdrew, and it was necessary to establish ownership for the purpose of transferring deeds to the English settlers. This makes it possible, after the study of parish records which indicate the individual’s ethnic status, to compare the lifestyle of colonists from differing social levels.

Thus the archaeological artifacts from a poor mestizo or créole household can be compared to those from a wealthier créole household. It is even possible to trace the process of acculturation and adaptation in this racially mixed society by comparing household artifacts between the various classes. The Indian women who married the Spanish garrison soldiers were, of course, the instruments of acculturation, and this study reveals differences between the kinds of adaptation of men compared to women. Anything “Spanish” was socially more acceptable than anything indigenous. Each household exhibited a distinction between its street face and its inner face. The front rooms uncover European ware, such as Spanish or Mexican majolica ceramics, brass buttons, jewelry; while the kitchen areas that stood separate from the houses in the back yards reveal Indian ceramics and indigenous cooking techniques. As Deagan points out, historical archaeology permits us to observe both what people did and what they said they did.

The volume is well illustrated with photographs, maps, drawings, and tables of data. The archaeological methodol-
ogy is clearly explained, and frequent comparisons are made with archaeological findings at early colonial British settlements in Georgia and South Carolina. Though somewhat marred by repetition, this book is a satisfying and convincing example of the uses and value of historical archaeology in the urban setting.

Timothy E. Anna
Department of History
The University of Manitoba


P. J. Waller begins this book by asking whether a distinct urban history is possible: “How can the study of towns and cities supply a sharp focus for the discrimination of particular trends when the urban condition was common to most people at this time?” (p. vii). He answers that, as pervasive as urbanization was in England during the post-1850 period, it is still an open question how far it went in various areas — geographic, economic, cultural, social, and political. Furthermore, urbanization was not monolithic: urban experiences, influences, functions, and dysfunctions varied within and among towns. The most persuasive argument for the viability of urban history is, of course, this book itself: “History is concentrated in towns quite as obviously as in courts, cabinets, and parliaments. The history is there: it is another matter to extract and interpret it” (p. 318). Waller extracts much and his interpretations question prevalent stereotypes in English historiography and advance the definition of urban history itself.

This is true despite the fact that Waller does not succeed in defining the unit of his analysis — the town. In chapter one he tries various numerical measures: “In 1901 there were 361 towns each with 10-15,000 people, 39 large towns each with 50-100,000 people, 23 cities each with 100-200,000 people, 14 large cities each with populations of between 200,000 and a million, and one, London, with a population greater than a million” (p. 6). But such definitions ignore “places which remained small and relatively undeveloped, that nonetheless furnished for their dependent rural areas some urban services, primarily a market, additionally specific industrial or technical facilities” (p. 4). Throughout the text, Waller skillfully introduces relevant statistics, but these are always only a first step toward discerning “similar entities, common functions, and shared problems amid the singular histories” (p. 11) of towns and cities. In many cases the problems that urban historians examine have been posed by sociologists (especially the rural-urban dichotomy), geographers (spatial form, site choice, transport change), and economists (fiscal policies of central and local government). This appears to be a definition of towns by specifying the