

priate behavior, Dabel would enhance our appreciation of women's resistance to this traditional authority. In what ways did men push back against women's independence? And how did those women respond? Nevertheless, Dabel's book reminds us that in order to understand the lives of people confronting the many hardships that African Americans faced, we need to consider women in their own right.

MARCY S. SACKS  
*Albion College*

ANTHONY E. KAYE. *Joining Places: Slave Neighborhoods in the Old South*. (John Hope Franklin Series in African American History and Culture.) Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 2007. Pp. x, 365. \$34.95.

In recent years, a growing number of scholars have been rethinking some of the basic analytical concepts—agency, resistance, and community—that have organized revisionist historiography on U.S. slavery since the 1960s. Anthony E. Kaye's study plunges into this historiographic ferment with an original and persuasive interpretation of slavery and slave life.

Kaye argues that slaves in Mississippi's "Natchez District" conceived of their world in terms of "neighborhoods," which they defined "as adjoining plantations." Neighborhoods grew out of the stuff of daily life: most prominently work and intimate relations, but also gossiping, trading, stealing—in short, all the things that have long come under the heading of "slave agency." For Kaye, neighborhood "opens a window with a panoramic view of antebellum slave society" (p. 1), particularly four key topics that have preoccupied revisionists: intimate relations, independent production (which Kaye calls "auxiliary production"), resistance, and the slave community. Most of the book proceeds topically, roughly in that order. An all-too-brief epilogue hints at how neighborhood was transformed by war, emancipation, and the entry of blacks into formal politics.

This is an important book, one that will surely become a staple in graduate courses on southern and African American history. Boldly conceived and fluently written, it is informed by careful readings of the historical scholarship, with a dash of political theory, although it tends to bury its theoretical and historiographic interventions in the name of readability. It strategically references regions beyond the Natchez District: the Upper South, the Low Country, and Latin America, both for comparisons and to highlight the essentially diasporic character of a region so dominated by people born back east. It is also deeply researched, primarily in slaveowner letters and diaries, records of the Southern Claims Commission, and (expanding the pioneering work of Noralee Frankel and Elizabeth Ann Regosin) records of the U.S. Pension Office.

What sets Kaye's concept apart from the old "slave community"? Part of it has to do with intentionality, and here Kaye asks us to rethink the agency idea—along with the notions of work, family, and resistance that underpin it—by borrowing from the sociologist

Anthony Giddens's theory of structuration. Nobody gets married or tells stories *in order to* create community; it is a byproduct, "a secondary effect" of actions people take for other reasons—say, falling in love (p. 42). Slaves made their neighborhoods, but there was nothing natural, inevitable, or intentional about it. At the level of terminology, neighborhood simply hews closer to the language mid-nineteenth-century Americans used. Perhaps most important, by cutting loose from the boundaries of the plantation, "neighborhood" offers a way to take account of the multiple centers of gravity that scholars have long recognized in slaves' mental universe. Finally, the neighborhood concept makes it simpler to confront questions of power than the slave community concept does, because it purposely encompasses slaveowners' social spaces and puts them into dialogue with those of the slaves.

The neighborhood concept delivers its biggest dividends in Kaye's discussions of work and resistance. As Ira Berlin, Philip D. Morgan, and others have underscored, work was the key battleground of master-slave struggles over power. Kaye points out that masters did not have to confront slaves everywhere, merely at the choke points where decisions about labor got made: who would supervise (master, overseer, or driver); drawing the lines between staple and auxiliary production and between men's and women's work; and who got put into field or house work. Work defined not only power but space, too. Consistent with Stephanie M. H. Camp's notion of rival geographies, Kaye argues that intimate relations pulled slaves outward from the plantation's core, while work exerted a "centripetal" force that pulled them inward. Thus, there were multiple "centers" to each neighborhood. At another spatial level, looking at the internal slave trade shows us how contingent and "contrived slaves' profound sense of place was" (p. 31). A similar sense of dynamism animates a nifty account of how masters managed to extract more work out of slaves during the antebellum period, waving the banner of "reform" as they shoved "the balance between staple production and reproductive labor" in their favor (pp. 97, 102). Indeed, Kaye's analysis of what many of us have called "independent production" is powerful because it accounts for change over time, and because it treats these activities as *anything but* independent.

"Neighborhood" also provides useful leverage on some perennial questions about slave resistance. "[T]he politics of neighborhood," with its sharp distinction between insiders and outsiders, "all but doomed slave revolts," not just in practical terms but even for slaves to conceive of the kind of broad shared identities necessary for success (pp. 124, 128) except in the most "extraordinary circumstances." For similar reasons, runaways were often strangers, their arrival fraught with mutual suspicion and risks. Indeed, Kaye argues more broadly, "conflict [among slaves] was intrinsic to solidarity," not corrosive of it (p. 120). When Kaye concludes that "[s]laves' most enduring accomplishment in their pervasive battles was the creation of neighbor-

hoods," he comes close to replicating the very formulation of agency-through-community he is critiquing (p. 151). In the end, though, what matters is how fertile the concept is for making sense of broad areas of slave society. And with his sensitive readings of evidence, his attention to the complex valences of intentionality, his ability to conceptualize the overlap between slaves' and masters' worlds, and his attentiveness to the complex geometries of struggle, Kaye has shifted the scholarly conversation.

DYLAN C. PENNINGROTH  
*Northwestern University and  
 American Bar Foundation*

DAVID I. DURHAM. *A Southern Moderate in Radical Times: Henry Washington Hilliard, 1808–1892*. (Southern Biography Series.) Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 2008. Pp. xv, 241. \$40.00.

That biography can enhance the understanding of a historical period elevates the value of David I. Durham's sound study of the life of Henry W. Hilliard. Durham's subject was a prominent man before and after the Civil War era, but his actions during that era justify the biography. The author has produced a solid and valuable book that provides insight into the ideas of a southerner who was defined by a moderate approach to increasing sectional tension.

Born in North Carolina in 1808, Hilliard would demonstrate his intellectual acumen throughout a lengthy life. He graduated from South Carolina College, acquired oratory skills, read law, and developed a strong and lasting strain of nationalism. Hilliard became a professor at the University of Alabama by Andrew Jackson's presidency, began editing a newspaper, and, moving in 1834 to Montgomery, settled in the city that became his home as a lawyer. Hilliard entered politics and became a staunch Whig. An initial attempt at gaining election to Congress failed, but he represented the United States in a diplomatic post in Belgium during the administration of John Tyler. Able and hardworking, Hilliard spent two productive and pleasurable years in Brussels. It would not be his last successful diplomatic stint.

In an era when candidates spoke (an audience listened) for several hours at a time, Hilliard was a formidable campaigner. He won election to Congress in 1845. Durham observes that in the years ahead the southern moderate would face the challenge of "delicately balancing his southern interests against his devotion to the Union" (p. 78). The man who prized intellectual over military pursuits believed reason could settle sectional differences. His admiration of Daniel Webster was appropriate. On the house floor, Hilliard deplored the "spirit of conquest" (p. 91), which he associated with the Mexican War, and true to his erudite bent, issued a warning by quoting Shakespeare's Macbeth.

On the vital issue of the period—slavery's expansion to the territories—he pursued compromise. Alabama's

congressman advocated adopting an amendment extending the Missouri Compromise line to the Pacific Ocean. In the years ahead Hilliard disagreed with William Lowndes Yancey, a Montgomerian who epitomized raging southern nationalism. Democrats considered Hilliard weak on the question of the right of spreading slavery to the territories and attempted to unseat him in 1849. Yancey spoke for Hilliard's opponent but to no avail, for Hilliard was re-elected. Moderation defined the Whig congressman but so did an attachment to the South. On the floor of Congress he would warn the North of the implications for the Union if aggressive attacks on the institution of slavery continued. Three congressional terms ended in 1852 when Hilliard declined to seek reelection.

Hilliard was a lawyer in Montgomery for the remainder of the decade. As sectional passions increased nationally, he faulted both abolitionists and southern rights radicals. Hilliard believed the latter constituted the most critical threat to the Union. Although holding no public office after leaving Congress, he remained a public man whose views were embraced and condemned. Hilliard and Yancey, both lawyers in a very small city, would have had substantial contact. The author does not speculate but it would be interesting to know what personal relations were like between the men so temperamentally and politically different. Hilliard faulted Yancey and the Alabama Platform (1848)—a militant declaration that slave owners could take slaves into the territories—as extreme in 1860. In that presidential year, with the disruption of the Union near, Hilliard campaigned for John Bell. The election of Abraham Lincoln, catalyzing secessionist arguments, placed him in a dwindling minority of Unionists. Hilliard continued to argue against secession but ultimately supported the Confederacy. His military career was brief and undistinguished. Durham theorizes that was possibly so because his subject "was a man of letters and oratory, not a man suited to field service" (p. 146). Hilliard retired from military service in 1862.

Before the war ended, Hilliard moved to Augusta, Georgia, and after conflict he joined the Republican Party. As a Whig, a Unionist, and a reluctant Confederate, Hilliard fit the profile of a certain class of white southerners who converted to the party of Lincoln. His Republican affiliation led to an unsuccessful run for a congressional seat in 1876. Soon thereafter, however, Hilliard parlayed his political loyalties to an appointment as minister to Brazil under President Rutherford B. Hayes. Several productive years in Brazil followed. Hilliard's accomplishments were substantial, but he drew the most satisfaction from contributing to the end of slavery in Brazil. The antebellum Hilliard defended slavery as a legal institution. The postbellum man, baptized as a Republican, concluded as Durham writes "God himself condemned by the inhumanity of slavery" (p. 194). So it was that a public career begun in Alabama's Black Belt ended some forty years later in Rio de Janeiro. Upon his return to the United States in 1881, Hilliard lived the final thirteen years of his life in