insightful information on a variety of topics. As an educated, single woman of
the planter class, and as one living on the far western border of the antebellum
South, McNeill wrote from an intriguing perspective. Unlike many diarists of
the period, McNeill intended no public audience for her journal. Her writing
blended nineteenth-century romanticism and spiritual concerns with pragmatic
realism, subtly revealing the complexities of her life and the conflicts inher-
ent in her personal choice to remain unmarried. Carefully edited by Ginny
McNeill Raska, a relative of the diarist, and Mary Lynne Gasaway Hill, this
published version of the McNeill diary is valuable for its observations and ret-
rospection. The editors have provided admirable historical context and suggest
significant room for future exploration.

As the editors point out, McNeill was in many ways typical of antebel-
lum southern white women. She expressed a keen interest in spiritual self-
reflection, displayed ambivalence toward slavery, and engaged in the standard
gender-specific duties of domestic life, and her interest in politics increased
in direct proportion to the inevitability of disunion and reality of war. She
was, however, distinctive in both her unusually high level of education and
in her deliberate decision not to marry. Her diary reflects this interesting
blend.

As a college-educated woman, McNeill craved intellectual stimulation.
She cherished her years at the Female Department of Baylor University both
for the joys of companionship she found there and for the education itself.
After returning home, she repeatedly expressed displeasure at the monotony of
plantation life and maintained an interest in the lives of her collegiate friends.
Although McNeill willingly turned away suitors and consciously chose single-
hood, she admitted difficulty in finding a satisfying and appreciated role within
the family. She described herself as hard to please, and she doubted that any
man could meet her expectations of an ideal marriage partner. Moreover, she
noted concerns about the marriage choices of her friends and family, some-
times struggling to put forth a positive attitude on their behalf. Her frank dis-
ussion will be of value to scholars interested in the lives of southern single
women in this period.

More broadly, McNeill wrote of family life, social connections, plantation
work, and slavery, all of which will be of particular note for students of Civil
War-era Texas and plantation life on the frontier. The Levi Jordan sugar plan-
tation, Sallie McNeill’s home, is currently the site of an archaeological excava-
tion that has already provided extensive artifacts connected to slave and tenant
life. McNeill’s diary offers helpful commentary on this material culture and
contributes to a more complete interpretation.

Texas A&M University

FRANCELLE BLUM


Thomas J. Nettles has written an impressive history of the early years of
the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary (SBTS) and the theological views
of its founder, James Petigru Boyce. Nettles persuasively argues that Boyce,
steeped in the Reformed tradition, sought to establish a seminary that would produce Southern Baptist preachers who were equally committed to confessional Calvinism.

In the introduction Nettles situates Boyce in the context of "Brooks Holifield's category of Gentlemen Theologians," focusing on Boyce's Reformed theology and touching on his views on slavery (p. 13). Nettles maintains that Boyce accepted the paternalistic view of the relationship between slaves and masters that prevailed among the Old South elite; however, the author also emphasizes Boyce's compassion for the slaves and his belief that God had entrusted to Southern Baptists the task of converting slaves to Christianity and assuming responsibility for their spiritual well-being.

More important, Nettles contends that a "scrupulous adherence to confessional Calvinism" was an integral part of Boyce's theological DNA, harking back to the establishment of the First Baptist Church of Charleston, South Carolina, where Boyce was raised (p. 23). Nettles meticulously traces the Reformed influences in Boyce's life and his commitment to extending those influences to Southern Baptist preachers through formal theological education. Early in his career Boyce developed a clear vision for establishing an institution that would produce Baptist ministers who had been trained in the Reformed tradition. Seminary professors would have to sign a creedal statement that affirmed their commitment to a confessional standard. For Boyce, this was essential for maintaining orthodoxy and "guarantee[ing] that the doctrine taught will reflect the consensus of those who established the school" (p. 133). When the institution opened in Greenville, South Carolina, in 1859, faculty members were required to sign the Abstract of Principles, which continues to be used as the confessional standard for the SBTS.

Much of this book details the struggles that Boyce and others faced in starting a seminary on the eve of the Civil War, attracting faculty and students to the fledgling school after the war was over, moving the institution to Louisville, Kentucky, in 1877, and handling the perennial problem of raising money in the financially devastated South. Boyce faced opposition from J. R. Graves and the Landmarkists and dealt with Southern Baptists' antipathy to formal religious training. In his account of the C. H. Toy controversy (chapter 9), Nettles reveals how Boyce had to fend off modernist influences that threatened to undermine the confessional commitment of the institution. Nettles's extensive research reveals a classic story of one man devoting his entire life—including much of his personal fortune and his health—to realizing his dream of a seminary for Southern Baptists.

Nettles's work takes on added significance when placed in the context of the recent debates over who should control the SBTS and the Southern Baptist Convention. Nettles is well known in Baptist circles as a champion of biblical inerrancy and of a confessional theology, and his interpretation of Boyce and the founding principles of the SBTS is designed to support his assertion that these views have deep roots in Baptist history and theology. Aside from some unnecessarily long quotations, there is much to commend in this work. Although it may not appeal to readers who are not already interested in the intimate details of the founding of the SBTS or of Boyce's theology, it is a well-researched and readable book that should
provide even more fodder for the never-ending debates among Southern Baptists.

University of North Carolina at Pembroke  

SCOTT BILLINGSLEY


Michael Fellman sets himself an ambitious task in his provocative new book: to illuminate the role that terrorism has played in the history of the United States and, in turn, to challenge ahistorical abuses of the term in twenty-first-century American politics. Despite the breadth suggested by the title, Fellman’s analysis focuses on five cases drawn from the second half of the nineteenth century, beginning with John Brown’s raid on Harpers Ferry and concluding with the Philippines War. Fellman’s interest in revisiting these mostly familiar episodes lies in the larger patterns he believes they reveal about the centrality of terrorism in the consolidation of the United States’ national and global power.

Although the nation is the book’s primary unit of analysis, Fellman is attentive to particularities and reversals as he traces a dialectical relationship between revolutionary and reactionary terrorism in each case study. For example, Fellman characterizes Brown’s raid as revolutionary terrorism and Virginia’s attempts to quell the uprising, and Brown’s subsequent trial and execution, as reactionary terrorism. Despite the merits of the contention that the response to Brown mattered as much as his actions did in pushing the nation toward civil war, the labels flatten important distinctions in the political premises underlying both actions. Further, time frame is critical to assessing the consequences of these events; the impact of this episode on U.S. power was far from clear in 1859. While violence during Reconstruction stands as the starkest example of domestic political terrorism, the characterization of Mississippi Redeemers as “preemptive reactionary counterrevolutionaries” obscures more than it illuminates (pp. 99–100). Fellman demonstrates that the Redeemers’ success depended on both violence and more conventional forms of political practice, but he leaves the complex interaction between state and federal sovereignty underdiscussed. The success of Redemption is in part a story of retreat from the exercise of federal authority, a dynamic that runs counter to Fellman’s narrative about the expansion of national power.

Fellman’s rejection of a “conventional definition of terrorism” as political violence enacted by non-state actors shapes his assessment of the law’s limited value for containing and directing violence (p. 2). For example, he demonstrates that the moral urgency of the Civil War led both Unionists and Confederates to defy injunctions to wage war within the bounds of law, even as legal theorists attempted to adapt laws to the rapidly changing nature of warfare. Perhaps the grimmest example of law’s utility for sanctioning extraordinary brutality comes in the discussion of the United States’ use of torture and targeting civilians in its efforts to defeat Filipino insurrectos fighting for independence. While Fellman’s contention that law sometimes does little more than cloak injustice is sound, further examination of how it shaped practices and interpretations of nineteenth-century violence might have been fruitful.

THE JOURNAL OF SOUTHERN HISTORY, Volume LXXVII, No. 3, August 2011