

diverse types of cities in different regions, and the different ways state-level policies affected them.

Because of the surface treatment of topics, the assumption of urban similarity across the U.S. and the lack of coverage of some issues, this book should not be viewed as an in-depth analysis, but as an overview. I have an additional criticism regarding the choice of citation style. Teaford uses a “bibliographical essay” at the end of the book with no in-text citations. While this style might initially seem appealing for undergraduates because it eliminates distractions in the text, adding to readability, it makes it very difficult to assess Teaford’s research, including the sources for direct quotes or statistics in his book.

The new chapters update the text and help to make it more relevant to classes and students interested in how the history of U.S. urban development has contributed to current urban conditions. The most recent chapter also introduces the idea of new urbanism and smart growth, which are popular theories in urban studies. The text feels like it ends somewhat abruptly, though. The last chapter is simply more of the historical description that dominates the rest of the book. There is no concluding chapter that returns to his initial argument or points the reader in a new direction.

Overall, I found Teaford’s updated *The 20th Century American City* to be very readable, if somewhat glancing in its approach. I can see an audience for this book in some undergraduate classrooms. However, it is not robust enough to be the primary text for a class. It seems most appropriate as a supplement to some other set of texts. In fact, individual chapters of Teaford’s text would be useful as a background overview of what was happening in U.S. cities to provide context for other material.

Jennifer Chernega

Winona State University

Richard Alan Ryerson, *John Adams’s Republic: The One, the Few, and the Many*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2016. 555 pages. ISBN: 978-1-4214-1922-0.

This is a majestic book on the republican political thought of one of the key figures of the American Revolution and the second President of the United States, John Adams (1735-1826). In its most classical mode, republicanism

refers to the ideal of a mixed government encompassing the virtues of the one, the few, and the many, as the very title of this volume indicates. Hence, even a monarchy can be viewed as republican in its formal construction just as a republic with a strong executive power includes a monarchist element. Indeed, Adams is also known for his – in retrospect, amusing – suggestion that President George Washington should actually be addressed as “His Highness, the President of the United States, and Protector of the Rights of the Same.”

To further open up the subtitle of the book with its Aristotelian-derived republican concepts of the one, the few, and the many, which Ryerson does not explicitly acknowledge: The terms refer to three different virtues that every decent political community was thought to ultimately rest on. The virtue of the one consisted in the talent for leadership and executive power. It could also be conceived as the virtue of the one presiding over the popular debates about the best policy, for there should be one who decides when the discussion should end and be turned into a decision. The virtue of the few was that of wisdom, underlying the traditional view of the senate as the chamber of older statesmen with long experience of politics and human affairs in general – a feature reflected in the American Constitution, which requires a higher age for senators than for the members of the House. Finally, there were the virtuous many, honest free men providing the discussions of the public good with their knowledge of local interests and inclinations. Embodying the democratic element in every proper republic, the many would eventually decide which course of action would be the best for the public good, because all free republicans were considered capable of deciding between different policies in a given circumstance even if not initiating such policies. Hence, the few might lead, but the many would provide the voice of the people.

John Adams was a central figure in the revolutionary Continental Congress in persuading its majority to eventually advocate independence instead of reconciliatory measures long after the outbreak of the War of Independence. It was Adams who used the pen when the Congress eventually in May of 1776 (almost two months before the Declaration of Independence) passed a resolution according to which “it appears absolutely irreconcilable to reason and good conscience” on the part of the colonists “to support any government under the Crown of Great-Britain” (184).

Given that Adams was the best educated in the history of republicanism of all founding fathers, it is a bit surprising that aside from a few references to the legendary historian of classical republicanism, John Pocock, Ryerson

son refrains from suggesting any unified historical interpretation of this time-honored branch of political theory. The strategy leaves the reader a bit confused as to what republicanism actually meant for Adams's authorities, such as Aristotle and the ancient Romans, and how exactly the doctrine was developed by the early modern Italians and such British republican theorists as James Harrington and Algernon Sydney later on.

On the other hand, the strategy makes sense, because it is hard to find two modern historians who would agree on the precise contents of classical, early modern, or modern republicanism. Rather than dwelling on the theory itself Ryerson clings to what he sees as the central problem of aristocratic rule in Adams's republicanism. Indeed, Adams's understanding arose precisely there where his most famous political opponent and a personal friend Thomas Jefferson (1743-1826) saw no problem at all, namely with the notion of natural aristocracy. By natural aristocracy Jefferson referred simply to people with exceptional talents and moral virtue, while Adams saw this aristocracy as not only the most talented but also as the most ambitious and influential people, usually the wealthiest.

What made Adams's political view old-fashioned even in the eyes of most of his contemporaries was that he never ceased insisting that the social elite should be privileged with their own representative branch of government, meaning that the traditional senate of the few (the wise men) would be automatically reserved for them. Adams's point in this was in a sense to isolate them there so as to prevent them from corrupting the entire representative republican government to favor only the interests of the wealthiest. The Jeffersonian Democratic-Republicans could not grasp this reasoning. After all, reserving the senate for the wealthy did little to guarantee that their influence could be truly restricted to that body. Notably, of course, the Constitution's clause requiring a republican mode of government in all states has traditionally permitted a unicameral legislature as well. Such legislatures were tried in a couple of states in the 1780s, and the state of Nebraska has a unicameral legislature today.

As for details, I doubt if Ryerson's understanding of democracy as the opposite of oligarchy (233) can be characterized as the prevailing view. In the traditional scheme of things democracy was most often identified with mob rule or a selfish, oppressive majority rule and was hence thought to be one of the corrupt forms of government, alongside tyranny and oligarchy. An ideal form would be a virtuous people's rule, which is very close to

Adams's notion of the proper definition of republic as "a government of law not of men."

Be that as it may, Ryerson offers us a stunningly detailed account, occasionally with a line by line analysis, of what Adams had in mind when developing his republican thought. And Adams truly developed it for some time, throughout the War of Independence, during his long period as a U.S. diplomat in the European courts, as the author of the Massachusetts state constitution, as a stern Federalist regarding the 1787 Constitution, as the Vice-President and as the second President of the United States, and eventually as a retired statesman. He continued corresponding on politics and philosophy with his friends and opponents till his death on the fiftieth anniversary of the United States, the same day Jefferson passed away.

In sum, Ryerson offers us an admirably detailed, clearly argued, and fully credible account of the developments of Adams's political thought and action throughout his life, although allotting only a few remarks to Adams's term as President (1797-1801). Ryerson is faithful to his subject in an even deeper sense, namely in approaching Adams's republicanism just as Adams did himself, with history first and theory only as a close second.

Ari Helo

University of Oulu

Adam S. Miller, *The Gospel According to David Foster Wallace: Boredom and Addiction in and Age of Distraction*. London: Bloomsbury, 2016. 136 pages. ISBN: 978-1-4742-3697-3.

David Foster Wallace studies is a rapidly expanding field. To the numerous important volumes devoted to Wallace which have enriched the scholarly conversation both on his fictional and non-fictional work and to a formidably vivacious wallace-list (wallace-1@waste.org), some recent newcomers must be added: the newly founded International David Foster Wallace Society (www.dfwsociety.org), whose declared mission is "to promote and sustain the long-term independent study of David Foster Wallace's writing," the pre-announced launch of *The Journal of David Foster Wallace Studies* (peer reviewed), and, of course, the annual DFW Conference taking place in Normal, which is now organizing its 4th meeting at Illinois State University (June 8-10, 2017). In 2016 alone Bloomsbury published three volumes on Wallace (Clare Hayes-Brady's *The Unspeakable Failures of David Fos-*