perfectly fashionable women to be seen as sex symbols or as members of the military? Such contradictions present what Trasker calls the "auxiliary" and the "provocative" that create "gendered anxiety" (9). She also explores the visual presentations of the military nurse, in films about nurses set on Bataan (*Cry Havoc*, *So Proudly We Hail*). The women are soldiers in active combat danger, but are also, as nurses, representing the traditional nurturing female figure.

Part Two of *Soldiers' Stories* addresses how Hollywood continued to use the image of the military woman after World War II. Trasker extends her central point – and the paradox created by women in uniform – across the series of escapist musicals and light comedies of the era which feature military women (*Skirts Ahoy* etc.) as the central story figure. Although military service in peacetime (or in a nostalgic World War II setting) liberates a female into a freer, more authoritative position, it also subjects that authority (and her compromised femininity) to becoming the source of humor, with the foregrounding of the femininity-versus-authority contradiction. Female military experience which might have become transformative, providing an escape hatch for women, becomes instead a comic lip service to the concept.

In Part Three, Trasker brings her discussion forward from the 1970s to the modern era, in which real-life women are actual combatants. This cultural change, however, does not cause the media to address the issue directly or create any new clarity regarding sex and power. Although there are exceptional stories, such as the television drama *China Beach* (with its purpose "to make visible military women and female veterans"), military women are more often seen in thrillers or movies casting them in legal or criminal situations. Their characters are often isolated emotionally, and they are either heroes or victims. Times change, but the paradox endures.

Studies such as this, grounded as cultural and analysis and research, seldom consider any detailed visual analysis of actual cinematic usage: framing, lighting, editing, and so on. The cinematic apparatus itself can very powerfully shape a viewer's opinions and attitudes about what is being seen, and sometimes provides a subtle subtext that has a contradiction of its own. Trasker doesn't do in-depth cinematic analysis, but she has written a comprehensive social and cultural history of how we've been asked to view women in the military since World War II. Her book provides a foundation for further examination because it goes beyond her military boundaries.

Wesleyan University JEANINE BASINGER

Journal of American Studies, **46** (2012), 4. doi:10.1017/S002187581200182X

Peter S. Onuf and Nicholas P. Cole (eds.), *Thomas Jefferson, the Classical World, and Early America* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2011, $45.00). Pp. ix + 314. ISBN 978 0 8139 3131 9.

A collection of essays written by leading early American scholars and edited by two highly respected Jeffersonian experts offer readers an opportunity to reexamine not only our understanding of Thomas Jefferson but also the impact of classicism in the development of the American republic. Far from a consensus, the prologue and ten essays depict dissension amongst the contributors in assessing the importance of classicism in such a process. Historians have polarized on the question of classical "influence" since Gilbert Chinard (in the 1920s) discovered the ubiquity of classical allusions in Jefferson's writings. In the following decades, scholars broadened their inquiries to produce a paradigm – led by Richard Gummere, Hannah Arendt, and

others – that maintained that classicism had played a "formative" role in the development of America. Meanwhile, revisionist historians – led by Clinton Rossiter, Bernard Bailyn, and others – developed a competing perspective, the extreme of which suggests that classicism provided intellectual "window dressing" for educated Americans, privileging instead Whig ideology (as especially mediated through Renaissance and Enlightenment texts). The essays in this volume are indicative of the historical trend since that time to account for the impact of multiple traditions, change over space and time, and Americans' direct and indirect engagement with (and understanding of) the Classics.

Gordon Wood's essay (a précis of his most important contributions to his craft) offers the historiographical context for the volume, demonstrating that classicism is inherent in modern European discourses about republicanism, which became central for American political thought. Questioning Wood's assessment and the centrality of antiquity in Jefferson's thinking, however, Peter Onuf and Michael Zuckert delve into Jefferson's engagement with classical texts. Onuf argues that Jefferson believed republicanism in America to be quite different to any experiment ever attempted, thus Jefferson rejected classical political theory as an exemplar for American republicanism. Likewise, Zuckert concludes that Jefferson's sense of morality is influenced as much by modern traditions as by ancient ones. Taking into account change over time and the impact of multiple traditions more broadly conceived, Nicholas Cole and Peter Thompson question the formative role of classicism in American political thought. The former rightly suggests that the "influence" of classicism for Americans changed based on historical contexts, while the latter demonstrates that colonial Virginians, including Jefferson, sought models for emulation not in antiquity but in Anglo-Saxonism. Likewise, Eran Shalev notes Jefferson's use of the Anglo-Saxon tradition in the years 1774–76, arguing that Jefferson deliberately chose not to use his classical knowledge to support American independence, because he saw the Classics as a source of "intellectual delight" in his private sociocultural sphere rather than as a source of utility for his public sociopolitical sphere. Shalev, however, seemed to disregard the impact of Ciceronian natural law in Jefferson's thinking as he penned his greatest intellectual achievement: the Declaration of Independence. Nonetheless, these scholars suggest that Jefferson (ever the optimistic visionary) recognized the uniqueness of the American experiment, thus he looked to modernity and the future for inspiration and support more than to the classical past.

Embracing the formative paradigm, or the centrality of the classical tradition in American thinking, Caroline Winterer explores Jefferson's relationships with women in his own family, arguing that Jefferson's concern for instilling a classical education into the women at Monticello is a reflection of a broader trend at that time of defining gender roles in the years following the Revolution. Likewise, Richard Guy Wilson delves into Jefferson's fascination with classical architecture. Although Wilson admits that Jefferson gained a refracted image of classical architecture from the Renaissance architect Palladio, he maintains that it nevertheless provided a foundation for the neoclassical style indicative of Jefferson's public and private architectural projects. Similarly, Maurie McInnis points out that Jefferson sought to use classical imagery – of George Washington as Cincinnatus, defender of republicanism – to memorialize Washington's legacy, a trend that evolved in the antebellum period as Virginians began to compare Washington with Marcus Aurelius, defender not of republicanism but of Virginia's constitutional rights. Paul Rahe, while recognizing Anglo-American critiques of Cicero and classical republicanism, nevertheless concludes that "those who

have argued that the writers of classical antiquity were brought in as mere window dressing are clearly wrong," precisely because ancient writers kept "alive the memory of self-government through a long epoch in which despotism was the norm" (256).

Is the use of classicism by early Americans a formative paradigm or merely illustrative of a descriptive language employed to explain modern revolutionary situations? Attempting to answer the question of "influence," these essays reflect the methodological problems of assessing the impact of classical writers (and their ideas) upon generations of people far removed from them. In the end, scholars will make up their own minds with regard to the "influence" of classicism. Nonetheless, Jennifer Roberts, in perhaps the most methodologically provocative essay in the collection, traced the modern reception of the Thucydidean Pericles. Most important, Roberts, rather than asking if Americans were "influenced" by classicism, asked instead what Americans' engagement with antiquity reveals about modern "developments in contemporary history and ideology," concluding that as American thinking evolved, so too did Americans' interpretation of Pericles (266). To be sure, Roberts offers scholars a unique methodological approach for investigating the modern reception of antiquity, thereby pointing the way for future scholarship in this field.

Louisiana State University JONATHON DEREK AWTREY

Journal of American Studies, **46** (2012), 4. doi:10.1017/S0021875812001831

Adam Lifshey, *Specters of Conquest: Indigenous Absence in Transatlantic Literatures* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2010, $55.00). Pp. xii + 182. ISBN 978 0 8232 3238 3.

The idea that absent indigenous peoples haunt the spaces now occupied by the descendants of their conquerors, that their absence therefore constitutes a paradoxical presence, is not new. In 1854, Chief Sealth of the Dwamish, or perhaps his translator, declared that "when your children's children think themselves alone in the field, the store ... upon the highway, or in the silence of the pathless woods, they will not be alone ... The white man will never be alone." D. H. Lawrence, in *Studies in Classic American Literature* (1923), applied this notion, among others, to map the American "spirit of place" as represented in major "white" texts produced in the preceding century or so. *In the American Grain* (1925) by William Carlos Williams, an important US study that paralleled Lawrence's work, although ostensibly oblivious to the spectral indigenous presence, is itself, as Adam Lifshey shows, also haunted. And, more recently, in *Fugitive Poses* (1998), Gerald Vizenor cast a searching indigenous eye over "Native American scenes of absence and presence" as represented in a range of North American texts.

But there is much that is new in Lifshey's book. First, in responding to "the transatlantic turn" in American studies, especially the hemispheric reach of such works as Diana Taylor's *The Archive and the Repertoire* (2003), Lifshey conceptualizes his subject very broadly and, if we accept his premises, coherently. His book "posits 'America' as not a particular country or continent or hemisphere but as a reiterating foundational narrative in which a conqueror arrives at a shore determined to overwrite local versions of humanity, culture, ecology and landscape with inscriptions of his own design" (1). The outcome of "the Conquests" is that we are all, worldwide, Americans now. He thus reads Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* (1719), written in London on the back of a Pacific shipwreck, and Leoncio Evita's *When the Combes Fought* (1954), the first