

Uncont. cont.  
MAR 26 1980

# NEHA News

The Newsletter of the New England Historical Association

April 1, 1980

Vol. VII, No. 1

## MEETING DATES

April 19, 1980--Old Sturbridge Village,  
Sturbridge, Mass.

If you are not a member of the association you will not receive formal notification of this meeting unless you write the Secretary, Professor Jonathan Liebowitz, History Department, University of Lowell, Lowell, Massachusetts 01854.

October 25, 1980, Mt. Ida Junior College,  
Newton, Mass.

## PROGRAM FOR THE SPRING MEETING:

### Morning Sessions:

#### I. Medieval Historiography

Chair: Archibald Lewis, University  
of Massachusetts

Why Remember Marc Bloch?

Bryce Lyon, Brown University

Comment: Stephen White, Wesleyan  
University; Fredric Cheyette, Amherst  
College

#### II. Institutions and Social Problems;

Boston, 1800-1950

Chair and Comment: Robert M. Mennell,  
University of New Hampshire

##### 1. Romantic Reform Versus the Well- Ordered Asylum

Eric C. Scheider, Boston Uni-  
versity

##### 2. The Boston Almshouse

Brian Gratton

##### 3. Policy, Prevention, and Punishment in Nineteenth Century Reform Schools

Barbara Brenzel, Wellesley College;  
Kenneth R. Geiser

#### III. Workshop in Family History

Introducing Students to Family History:  
The View From Old Sturbridge Village

Warren Leon, Old Sturbridge Village

### Presidential Address:

The Essential Ingredient in American  
Independence

Neil Stout, University of Vermont

### Afternoon Sessions:

#### I. Film and Politics in the Third Reich

Chair and Comment: Saul Gittleman,  
Tufts University

##### 1. The Case of Herbert Maisch

Richard S. Geehr, Bentley  
College

##### 2. Nazi Feature Films

John Heineman, Boston College

#### II. The Northern District in the Amer- ican Revolution

Chair and Comment: Henry N. Muller  
III, Colby-Sawyer College

##### 1. The Command Structure of the Northern Army

Jonathan G. Rossie, St. Law-  
rence University

##### 2. Troop Life in the Northern Army

John W. Kreuger, The Fort  
Ticonderoga Museum

##### 3. Mad Jack M'Alpine, A Soldier of the King

Brian Burns, Sturbridge, Mass.

#### III. Development of the New England Vil- lage Center

Chair and Comment: Richard D. Brown,  
University of Connecticut

##### 1. New England Center Villages as Social Artifacts

Jack Larkin, Old Sturbridge  
Village

##### 2. Family Life in the Center Village

Caroline Fuller Sloat, Old  
Sturbridge Village

Comment: Robert Gross, Amherst  
College

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The first annual Lowell Conference on Industrial History sponsored jointly by Lowell National Historical Park, the University of Lowell, and the Lowell Historical Preservation Commission will be held May 8-9, 1980 at the O'Leary Library, University of Lowell. The Conference theme, "The Social Impacts of Industrialization," will be discussed by leading scholars, focusing on labor, immigration, women and industrialization, and comparative aspects of the Industrial Revolution in Europe and America. For further information or registration forms write to: Professor Oliver Ford, LCIH Conference Chairman, University of Lowell, 1 University Avenue, Lowell MA 01854.

Grants totalling \$430,000 from the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation will fund a three year project at the American Antiquarian Society to recatalogue in computerized format the Society's large and important collection of books and pamphlets printed in North America and the British West Indies before 1801. Further information on the project can be obtained from John B. Hench, American Antiquarian Society, 185 Salisbury Street, Worcester, MA 01609.

The University of Connecticut Department of History announces a graduate program in Public History and Archival Management to begin in September, 1980. In addition to regular academic work in history, students will be expected to enroll in skills courses which may include archival management and organization, management information systems and computer science. An internship of approximately 15 weeks will be required in a public agency or business firm. United Technologies Corporation is offering paid internships as part of the program. For further information contact Bruce M. Stave, Department of History, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT 06268.

The Department of History of Rhode Island College is sponsoring a History Colloquium on Wednesday, April 30, 1980. The topic of the colloquium is "Two Aspects of New England Regionalism" and the speakers are Benjamin Labaree, Williams College, and Cecelia Tichi, Boston University. For further information contact Professor Joseph Conforti, Department of History, Rhode Island College, Providence, RI 02908.

The annual meeting of the New England Council of Latin American Studies will be held at Dartmouth College on October 4, 1980. Individuals interested in presenting a paper or in organizing a panel are asked to contact Prof. Paul B. Goodwin, Department of History, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT 06268.

The Department of History of Boston College and the John F. Kennedy Library will sponsor a conference on Boston Political History on April 25-26, 1980 at the Kennedy Library in Boston. For further information contact Constance Burns, Department of History, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA 02167.

Radcliffe College has announced a new program of support for scholarly research, funded by a grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. The purpose of the program is to encourage scholars to revise and enrich their study of American society by drawing upon the resources available at the Arthur and Elizabeth Schlesinger Library on the History of Women in America. For further information contact Radcliffe Research Scholars Program, Radcliffe Data Resource and Resource Center, 77 Brattle Street, Cambridge, MA 02138.

The Vice-President-elect, Darrett Rutman, urges that anyone interested in presenting papers at the fall 1980 meeting should communicate with him at the

Department of History, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH. He is particularly interested in receiving proposals for integrated sessions. Any proposal that cannot be included in the fall meeting will automatically be considered for the spring 1981 meeting.

NEHA News is a newsletter of the New England Historical Association. It appears twice a year in April and September. The deadline for the April issue is February 1; the deadline for the September issue is July 1. Contributions and suggestions are welcome and should be sent to Robert J. Imholt, Editor, NEHA News, Albertus Magnus College, 700 Prospect Street, New Haven, CT 06511.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Announcements . . . . . 2

Association Business. . . . . 19

Historical Profession . . . . . 18

Meeting Dates . . . . . 1, 21

Program of Fall Meeting . . . . . 1

Session Summaries . . . . . 4

The officers of the New England Historical Association for the 1979-1980 academic year are as follows:

- President: Neil Stout, University of Vermont
- Vice-President: Fred Cazal, University of Connecticut
- Secretary: Jonathan Liebowitz, University of Lowell
- Treasurer: Armand Patrucco, Rhode Island College
- Executive Committee:
  - Ann Beck, University of Hartford
  - John Sutherland, Manchester (CT) Community College
  - Miriam Chrisman, University of Massachusetts
  - Ridgway Shinn, Jr., Rhode Island College
  - Giles Constable, Harvard University
  - Gordon Jensen, University of Hartford

Nominating Committee:

- Richard Brown, University of Connecticut
- Sherrin Wyntjes, Mt. Ida Junior College
- David Grayson Allen, Massachusetts Historical Society
- Thomas Leavett, Merrimack Valley Textile Museum
- Alice McGinty, Bentley College
- James Patterson, Brown University

SESSION SUMMARY: TWENTIETH CENTURY DIPLOMACY  
FALL, 1979

The first paper, "The Parity that Wasn't: Franco-Italian Relations at the Washington Naval Conference," was presented by Professor Joel Blatt of the University of Connecticut, Stamford. Professor Blatt noted that French leaders seemed to have agreed to naval equality with Italy at the Washington Conference on the limitation of armament in 1921-1922, whereas in reality French interests and colonial ambitions in the Mediterranean led France to construct its interwar navy primarily against Italy. The Washington ratios (5-5-3-1.75-1.75) covered battleships and aircraft carriers. French naval planning from 1919 onwards focused on a potential German-Italian enemy and on the construction of lighter ships primarily for the Mediterranean. Far from agreeing to parity with Italy at Washington, French officials actually secured the opportunity to achieve superiority over Italy. France thereafter proceeded to build significant tonnages of lighter ships. Blatt concludes that interwar naval policy towards Italy reveals the attempts of French leaders to maintain France's colonial empire and great power status. On another level, the policy towards the United States and Great Britain, the two largest naval powers in 1921, of attempting to be strong enough to tip the balance in the event of a conflict between the two, presaged the post-World War II French efforts as an intermediate power to retain and regain sufficient influence to be taken into account by the superpowers.

The second paper by H. James Burgwyn of Westchester State College was "The Origins and Nature of Fascist Revisionism." It focused on Mussolini's attempt to expand Italian power and influence in the Danube region and the Balkans during the 1920s. Professor Burgwyn traced the origins of this policy of expansionism to the pre-fascist period, arguing that the Italian people had long favored the annexation of territories with Italian speaking populations as well as the extension of Italian influence to contiguous regions in Southern Europe. Italy's intervention on the side of the Triple Entente in the First World War led to inflated expectations of territorial rewards, expectations that were disappointed at the Paris Peace Conference. Whereas Mussolini's predecessors could issue only ineffectual gestures of defiance in the face of such humiliating treatment by the great powers in 1919, the Duce pursued an active, aggressive policy of revisionism in the years after his accession. Since the United States and Great Britain had shunned firm commitments to the preservation of the Paris peace settlement, France became the principal obstacle to Italian designs. Consequently, Mussolini's approaches to Germany laid the groundwork for the revisionist policy that was to be pursued concretely in the late 1930s. By striving to weaken France's East European alliance system, supporting Hungarian territorial claims against the pro-French Habsburg successor states, and subsidizing separatist movements in Yugoslavia, Mussolini hoped to establish Italy as the dominant power in the Danube region and the Balkans. Aside from the conquest of Albania in 1939, the fascist policy of revisionism proved to be a failure, buried in the Duce's increasingly subordinate position vis-a-vis Hitler.

Comments on the papers were given by Professor William R. Keylor of Boston University and Benjamin Brown of New York City.

William R. Keylor  
Boston University

LUNCHEON ADDRESS: THE IMAGE OF OLIVER CROMWELL IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY  
FALL, 1980

The 18th century reaction to Oliver Cromwell is of considerable interest with respect to one of the most fascinating and least explored aspects of the English Revolution, namely the view that subsequent generations of Englishmen took of these events and their principal actors. It is all too easy to assume that Cromwell's reputation entered on a long-term decline with the Restoration and that the process of recovery did not begin in earnest until the publication of his letters and speeches by Carlyle in the 19th century.

Admittedly, by the beginning of the 18th century there had developed a majority consensus on Cromwell that was to dominate the historical writing of that century. More balanced and thoughtful than the immediate post-Restoration attacks, it remained in the main hostile to both the motives and the actions of the Lord Protector and incorporated a number of features of the stereotyped dictator of Restoration literature, including assertions that Cromwell was a fanatic in religion, a hypocrite in his personal dealings with others, and a dissembler of the first order in his political maneuverings. The writings of Burton, Ludlow, and Clarendon, all appearing close to the beginning of the 18th century, can serve as indications of the general nature of the prevalent 18th century view. Analysis of historical writings throughout the century reveal little variation from this established picture. Politically, the shifting constellations of 18th century Whigs and Tories could not see eye to eye, but when they came to assess Cromwell their views coincided to an extraordinary degree, and that coincidence was equivalent to an agreement to denounce him. The histories written by Echard, Kennett, and Oldmixon early in the century, though reflecting widely differing "party" stances, are at one in their negative assessment of Cromwell. It is sobering to note that neither the passage of time nor the accumulation of evidence did much to change the official image of Cromwell. Hume's Tory denunciation of Cromwell is no more outspoken than Mrs. Macaulay's republican one.

With the wings of historical opinion so firmly united in opposition, it might well seem that Cromwell's reputation was indeed fated to a long-term eclipse. Consideration of the immediate impact of antiquarian research and of the lingering popular image of Cromwell as reflected in popular history and his portrayal on the stage provide little evidence to counter this assertion. But there are two important exceptions to the picture of the period as one of generally unrelieved hostility to Cromwell's memory. The first is the appearance of three biographies of a more favorable kind (Kimber, Banks, and Harris), all to some degree connected with non-conformist roots: the second is the evocation of Cromwell's image in political debate in a favorable context, both with respect to the need for a strong foreign policy and increasingly in an approving, radical context, as in The Political Beacon published on the eve of the American Revolution and identifying Cromwell with the cause of Liberty. Despite the persistence of a negative popular image and the opposition of establishment historiography, the reputation of Cromwell was beginning the process of recovery well before the appearance of Carlyle's volumes, nourished by the views of the non-conformists and some radical elements.

Roger Howell, Jr.  
Bowdoin College

SESSION: NEWS AND VIEWS OF ANCIENT HISTORY  
FALL, 1979

(Editor's note: Because of the nature and scope of the papers presented at this session and their possible interest to members of the Association, it was deemed appropriate to publish them as presented. Special thanks to Prof. Allen Ward for his assistance in editing the papers.)

#### THE ANCIENT NEAR EAST

If history is understood as the account of the experience of humankind which can be constructed from written records--while that knowledge of the past generated by physical anthropologists, archaeologists, art historians and others concerned with pre-literate periods is referred to as pre-history--then in terms of time, though not, of course, of the number of participants, the bulk of the documentation, or the geographical area involved--the history of the Ancient Near East represents almost half of history. From the beginning of the third millennium b.c. to the last centuries of the second millennium, the succeeding cultures of Egypt, Mesopotamia, Iran, Syro-Palestine, and Anatolia alone were literate, and only after the middle of the first millennium was writing employed to any significant extent elsewhere. But while the history of the Ancient Near East is thus today recognized as a very significant part of the total human experience, its study is one of the youngest fields among the historical specializations. For, with the exception of the Old Testament and some widely scattered and largely confused material in Greek sources, no information concerning the Ancient Near East was available to the historian of just one hundred fifty years ago. For example, the object of my own research, the Hittites of the second millennium Anatolia, had been completely forgotten.

Advancement in the translation of the Egyptian hieroglyphs was made relatively swiftly after the initial decipherment was announced by Champollion in 1822, but progress in the understanding of the cuneiform languages of Mesopotamia and the adjacent areas has been much slower. A tentative step was taken by the Hannoverian schoolmaster Georg Grotefend in 1802, but no real understanding of the Semitic Akkadian language was reached until the work of Henry Rawlinson at mid-century. Sumerian, the non-Semitic language of Mesopotamia, was not deciphered until the early years of this century, and still has not yielded many of its lexical and grammatical secrets. Several cuneiform languages, such as proto-Elamite and Hurrian, may still today be read only imperfectly, at best. As a result both of progress in the very understanding of the primary sources and of the continual adding to these sources by new excavations and by the publication and interpretation of material from digs long since completed, secondary sources and text books have traditionally soon been outdated. James Breasted's classic Ancient Times of 1935 is now of only antiquarian interest, and most interpretative volumes on the Ancient Near East from the early decades of this century, although often remarkable achievements for their time, seem to us today hopelessly confused.

But now, if I may be allowed a note of optimism, a sufficient competence in the reading of the most important languages required for the writing of the history of the Ancient Near East has been acquired, and enough reasonably certain information has been accumulated that our current understanding of the broad outlines of

this history is unlikely to be altered drastically in the future. From this vantage point, then, I would like to mention some of the most significant developments in the study of the history of the Ancient Near East in the last ten years, developments which may be viewed as the consequences of three approaches to this study: the introduction of new methodologies, the re-examination of formerly unquestioned opinions, and the continuation of archaeological field work with its attendant contribution of new research material.

With much of the necessary preliminary philological work behind us, specialists in the Ancient Near East are more frequently turning to other disciplines to borrow methodologies, and indeed technologies, to aid in the task of interpretation of data. As in all fields of history, the use of the computer is becoming more frequent. In recent years electronic data processing has been employed, for example, in the project to reconstruct the temple of Ankhnaten at Karnak from disassembled building blocks scattered as fill in the structures of the scornful successors of the heretic pharaoh. Computers are, of course, also increasingly being utilized in the analysis of the masses of data from the cuneiform archives, which are overwhelmingly made up of such prosaic documents as business letters, receipts and ledgers. In this manner, scholars are approaching more efficiently such topics as the fluctuation of prices, the yield of agricultural land, and the relationship of wages to the cost of living in Ancient Mesopotamia. The technology known as neutron activation analysis, by which minute borings from clay objects are processed to yield a characteristic pattern of chemical composition which may then be matched to patterns established for various sources of clay, has allowed us in several cases to determine with reasonable certainty the provenience of types of pottery and of tablets, contributing to our knowledge of ancient trade patterns and in one instance telling us where not to look for the capital of an ancient empire. Where no special equipment is required, scholars are applying the latest approaches of linguistics to the remaining cruxes in the interpretation of the Sumerian language, and the insights of anthropology to the analysis of the ever-present complex interrelationship between the settled population of Mesopotamia and the nomadic groups surrounding it and in its midst.

In our second category of advance, that involving the reinterpretation of long-held views, perhaps the most illustrative example is provided by the discussion concerning Sumerians and Akkadians as ethnic groups in Mesopotamia. From the beginning of this century, starting with the work of the Englishman L. W. King, the received wisdom was that Mesopotamia, originally inhabited by an unknown people or peoples, was in the course of the early third millennium penetrated by Semitic-speaking Akkadians in the north, and by speakers of Sumerian in the south. The two groups, according to this view, dwelt separately in opposed regions of Mesopotamia for several centuries, while the Sumerians in the south gradually developed the first high culture in the region. But around 2300 b.c., the conquests of Sargon of Akkad, who bears a Semitic name, marked the rise of the Akkadians to hegemony over all of the land. When the Sargonic empire collapsed due to the rebellion of its outlying provinces and under the attack of non-Mesopotamian tribes, it was succeeded after a period of disunity by the so-called Ur-III dynasty of King Shulgi and his descendants. Since this dynasty has left us literally thousands of documents in the Sumerian language, its rule has been regarded as a "last hurrah" of the Sumerians, whose language is indeed used from

this point on increasingly as an artificial language of culture, on into the centuries following the end of Ur-III rule. Attacks on this view began as long ago as 1939, when Thorkild Jacobson pointed out that nowhere in Mesopotamian texts is there any mention of racial hostility or recognition of any difference between Sumerians and Akkadians. Recently it has been discovered that the personal names of the scribes responsible for some of the earliest Sumerian literary texts--those found during the 1960's at Abu Salabikh in the northern part of ancient Sumer--are Akkadian. It has also been observed that different members of the same prominent Mesopotamian families of the third millennium bear alternately Sumerian and Akkadian personal names. When we combine these observations with the fact that in the Old Babylonian period--the first quarter of the second millennium--almost all correspondence was carried out in the Akkadian language, while the bulk of legal documentation--often involving the same individuals as the Akkadian letters--was drawn up in Sumerian, we are forced to view ancient Mesopotamia by the middle of the third millennium not as a land of two opposing races, or even cultures, but as a single bilingual culture. According to the Dutch Assyriologist F. R. Kraus in his 1970 work, Sumerer und Akkader, Ein Problem der altmesopotamischen Geschichte, our sources do not permit us to define two distinct language groups at any period, and the earliest texts yet deciphered present us with a "highly developed symbiosis." This newer understanding of Akkadian and Sumerian as two languages of a single community--the latter language, it is true, probably well on its way to extinction as a living language by 2000 b.c.--is considerably more subtle, more true to the actual experience of other eras in history, and less colored by late 19th and early 20th century views of race than the older view.

In the category of new discoveries, the finds of the expedition of the University of Rome at Tell Mardikh, ancient Ebla, in northwest Syria, are, of course, the most notable. Although excavations under the direction of Dr. Paolo Matthiae began at this large site in 1964, it was not until ten years later that the first remarkable epigraphic discoveries were made, and not until 1975 that the archive room containing some 15,000 tablets of the late third millennium (c. 2300 b.c.) were uncovered.

The discovery of an archive of this size--one of the largest yet found, and by far the biggest single deposit known from a third millennium site--has naturally aroused a great deal of interest among both scholars and the general public. Unfortunately, much of the popular and semi-popular writing on Ebla has been at best ill-informed, and at worst irrational and irresponsible. You may have read, for instance, that the language of Ebla is ancestral to Biblical Hebrew, that a short form of the name of the god of the Israelites, Yahweh, is a constituent of many Eblite personal names; that the names of many of the Biblical patriarchs have been found in the Ebla texts, and even that Sodom, Gomorrah, and the other "cities of the plain" are mentioned in an Ebla text in the same order as in Genesis 14. Such claims, made on the basis of at best second-hand oral descriptions of epigraphic finds and published chiefly in semi-popular archaeological journals of a particular ideological bent, and in the tabloid press, naturally led to a reaction on the part of the Syrian government. In September, 1977, a semi-official newspaper in Damascus published a refutation by the Director-General of Antiquities of the above claims, and warned against using the Ebla discoveries for Zionist political purposes. When the epigrapher of the Italian expedition,

Professor Giovanni Petinato, responding to the criticism of many colleagues, reconsidered some of his early and hasty judgments concerning the tablets, certain publications in this country charged that he was giving in to Syrian pressure, and that the Damascus government was suppressing tablets dealing with the most ancient history of Israel. Charges of this sort have even appeared in the legitimate press, as exemplified by stories in the New York Times and in the Los Angeles Times of mid-April of this year.

The truth of the matter is that while indeed few tablets have as yet been published, the time-lag from discovery to publication of epigraphic material is usually of considerable length--some of the material from the Qumran discoveries of the late 1940's is still unavailable to the scholarly world. A program for publication of the Ebla texts by an international committee of scholars has already been announced, and we are eagerly awaiting the results of its efforts.

As for the claims of a close relationship between the Ebla tablets and the Old Testament, these too must be dismissed. Certainly some similarity in personal and geographic names and general outlook is to be expected, since the areas which generated the two groups of texts are very close geographically, and the two cultures in question were rather similar. The Ebla texts, however, were written several hundred years before the earliest date proposed for the original patriarch, Abraham, and cannot possibly include references to any Old Testament figures. Recent study--particularly by Prof. I. J. Gelb of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago--has shown that the Eblaite language is more closely related to Akkadian than to the so-called Northwest Semitic dialects, which include Hebrew, and can in no way have been ancestral to either the Canaanite spoken in Palestine before the rise of ancient Israel, or to Biblical Hebrew itself. In addition, the cuneiform sign read by some as Ya--i.e., a short form of Yahweh--may just as well, and more probably, be understood as a hypocoristic (nickname) referring to no deity at all. In fact, the tablets of Ebla bear an even less direct relationship to the world reflected in the Old Testament than those from several other--second millennium--Syrian sites, where excavations were begun long ago, namely Mari and Ras Shamra/Ugarit.

The importance of Ebla lies then not in its relation to the Bible, but in its significance in its own right. A new, hitherto unsuspected, civilization has been discovered, a kingdom perhaps equal in influence for a time to the realm of Sargon of Akkad in Mesopotamia, a ruler who was previously held to be the first outside of Egypt to hold sway over an extended area. Preliminary reports from Ebla's epigrapher indicate that we will have to rewrite our history textbooks yet once more, abandoning the picture of Syria in the third millennium as a mere crossroads between Mesopotamia and Egypt, and according her a greater, more independent, role in the history of this period.

Gary Beckman  
Yale University

COMMENT:

Three points should be noted in this paper. First, it is extremely beneficial to have a critique of the outdated racial--indeed, often racist--views

that have colored the interpretation of much Ancient Near Eastern history up to now. These outmoded concepts are still often reproduced in textbooks and teachers need to beware of them and correct them. Second, it is good to have some sensible caveats issued on the sensationalism that has been created as a result of the momentous discoveries at Ebla. So far, what has been reported is more what people have wanted to see in the material rather than what, upon sober reflection, may actually be there. For those who wish to follow more careful and deliberate decipherment and interpretation of the evidence from Ebla, a new journal Eblaica will be forthcoming as a responsible vehicle for this new field of Ancient Near Eastern history.

Finally, it is important to be aware of the tremendous methodological advances that have taken place in the study of Ancient Near Eastern pre-history and history. Some of the results of applying these methodologies can be seen in the following three works: Brian M. Fagan, ed., Civilization (W. H. Freeman, 1979); Charles L. Redman, The Rise of Civilization (W. H. Freeman, 1978); Norman Yoffee, "On Studying Old Babylonian History," The Journal of Cuneiform Studies, January, 1978.

Allen M. Ward  
University of Connecticut

#### RECENT TRENDS IN GREEK HISTORY

Traditionally, Classical Greek historians have lagged behind their colleagues in other fields in adopting new historiographical trends. While this remains largely true today, there have been some welcome new developments, especially in social and economic history. Three significant new trends are the use of the methodologies of archeological and cultural anthropology, and the use of comparative history.

Although the application of anthropological methods and techniques to the study of Greek culture began in the early part of the 20th century, this trend has undergone a significant revival in recent years. The use of anthropological techniques of archeology is now common for the study of Bronze Age Greece as can be seen in the works of Colin Renfrew, The Emergence of Civilization (London 1971); Peter Warren, Myrtos, An Early Bronze Age Settlement in Crete (London 1972); Keith Branigan, The Foundations of Palatial Crete (New York 1970); and W. A. McDonald, et al., The Minnesota Messenia Expedition (Minneapolis 1972). These individuals use comprehensive approaches to the study of Bronze Age Greek culture developed by anthropologists in their study of other prehistoric cultures in Mesoamerica and Mesopotamia. Using methods derived from fields as diverse as ethnology, geology, paleobotany, economic geography, and regional science, the new studies aim at understanding the processes of state formation and economic and cultural development. The new approaches are useful models for regional studies in later eras as can be seen in the recent work of M. H. Jameson in the volume, Regional Variation in Modern Greece, Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 268 (1976), who is studying the important problem of the formation of a Greek city state in the 8th century B.C.

The use of cultural anthropology to study classical Greek culture and institutions can be seen in the recent works of S. Humphreys, Anthropology and the Greeks (Boston 1978); J. Redfield, Nature and Culture in the Iliad (Chicago 1975); and Douglas Frame, The Myth of Return in Early Greek Epic (New Haven 1978). Classical mythology has long had a close association with anthropology, an association which has been revived in the recent work of G. Kirk, The Nature of Greek Myths (New York 1974). Kirk reminds us that while it is interesting that some Greek myths follow patterns similar to the myths of other cultures, it is far more significant that the Greeks broke away from the mythological underpinnings of their social and political institutions and thought whereas other cultures did not.

The second new methodological trend is the introduction of the techniques of comparative history, which has been especially helpful in elucidating the economy and society of ancient Greece. Prior to this development, it was assumed that the Greek economy was similar to that of modern Europe and the only differences were of scale, not structure. Recently however, M. I. Finley, The Ancient Economy (Berkeley 1973), has placed the Greek economy squarely among those of the preindustrial era where agriculture was overwhelmingly predominant. The problem of economic and social growth is the subject of an important new work by Chester Starr, The Economic and Social Growth of Early Greece, 800-500 B.C. (New York 1977) in which the methods of comparative history can most clearly be seen. Starr has been eclectic in choosing his comparative models; in his bibliography we find theoretical works on economic growth and other works concerning the growth of later Renaissance and industrializing Europe.

Social history has also benefited from the comparative method and once again we find that one of the pioneers has been M. I. Finley in The World of Odysseus (New York 1978, first edition 1954). In this work Finley delineates the basic institutions and moral values of the society portrayed by Homer; the first time Homer was used as a source for social history. Finley's work has had many fruitful offshoots, among the most important is Alvin Gouldner's study, The Hellenic World, A Sociological Analysis (New York 1965). Gouldner observes that when compared to their contemporaries, the Greeks had a fundamentally different value system and that these unique values were responsible for significant Greek innovations such as democratic political institutions and a genuine scientific tradition. While one may disagree with details, the methodology he suggests represents a significant breakthrough for understanding the formation of our Greek cultural heritage.

Donald W. Engels  
Wellesley College

#### COMMENT:

As this paper makes clear, the application of more sophisticated methodological tools to the study of Greek history is yielding a much more complex view of Greek culture and society than that of the romantic historiography of the past 200 years, which has tended to exalt and mythologize the Greeks into non-existent Platonic ideas. Professor Engels has been too modest, however, by failing to mention his own book, Alexander the Great and the Logistics

of the Macedonian Army (U. of California Press, 1978). (See also E. Badian's excellent and helpful review in the New York Review of Books 26 [Dec. 20, 1979], pp. 54-56). Drawing on such disciplines as nutrition, medicine, demography, soil and plant sciences, geography, geology, and ethnography, he has given practical, concrete explanations for the military success of Alexander. While he does not detract from Alexander's achievements, he helps us to see him as more of a human being than the Übermensch of the German school of Alexander hagiography or the boy-scout hero of W. W. Tarn's Victorian imagination.

Some other areas where cobwebs are being swept away also ought to be mentioned. The repressive and repressed attitudes towards women in a male-dominated society have been provocatively explored by Sarah B. Pomeroy in Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves (Schochen Books, 1975) and Philip E. Slater in The Glory of Hera (Beacon Press, 1968). Most recently, K. J. Dover has resolutely removed the issue of homosexuality in Greece from the closet in his Greek Homosexuality (Harvard, 1979). While all three of these works may be challenged on various points, they have laid the groundwork for future serious discussion.

Sound advances are also being made in the study of ancient Greek science and technology. See, for example, J. G. Landels, Engineering in the Ancient World (U. of California Press, 1978) and G. E. R. Lloyd, Early Greek Science: from Thales to Aristotle and Greek Science after Aristotle (Norton, 1970, 1973). Finally, to add something on the Bronze Age, those fascinated by the fall of Minoan Crete and question of a connection with the myth of Atlantis will profit from D. L. Page, The Santorini Volcano and the Desolation of Minoan Crete (Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies, 1970) and Edwin S. Ramage, Atlantis, Fact or Fiction? (Indiana U. Press, 1978).

Allen M. Ward  
University of Connecticut

#### ANCIENT ROME

We meet at an appropriate moment, for it was just 12 days and 215 years ago, on the 15th of October in 1764, in Rome, that Gibbon conceived his monumental undertaking. As he recollected in his Autobiography, it was "as I sat musing amidst the ruins of the Capitol, while the barefoot friars were singing Vespers in the Temple of Jupiter, that the idea of writing the decline and fall of the city first started to my mind."

Today, over 2000 articles are published each year on aspects of Roman history (classicists, textual critics, numismatists, archaeologists, art historians, historians--and, more recently, economists, sociologists, and systems analysts--all labor in the vineyards). One Festschrift alone, in honor of the German scholar Joseph Vogt, will, when complete, contain articles by more than 500 scholars, one of whom--Arnaldo Momigliano, whom no one field may claim--has more than 500 articles of his own. Indeed, Momigliano bids fair to best the personal bibliography of Mommsen, the 19th century historian who is the founding father of Roman history.

How, in the face of such an embarrassment of riches, does one summarize scholarship--news and views--in the field? I am afraid that one begins arbitrarily, proceeds ruthlessly, and leaves much unsaid. I will hope, in matters of simple fact, to emulate the Roman historians themselves, who often set the scene, but omitted much of the stage set, and left us with abiding curiosity as to the props. I will concentrate on "views" at the expense of "news," but should mention that archaeology continues to add specific details to our picture of life in both republic and empire--on matters as homely as the cultivation of cucumbers in Latium, and as significant as the date of the foundation of Rome itself. Any of you who attended the recent Pompeii exhibition will appreciate the bounty which archaeology brings to students of every aspect of ancient life. A bounty which, as it happens, is especially welcome, due to the scarcity of the literary sources for even our best documented periods. Let me give one brief example. The sources for the late republic show examples of violence: urban unrest, military revolt, street violence during electioneering--far in excess of what existed in the earlier republic--by which I mean, far in excess of what exists in our surviving sources for the earlier period. It is possible to argue that, were our sources for the early republic as full as they are for the later republic, we would discover a consistent incidence of violence. One simply can not say.

I would now like to look at several major issues: first, the uses and abuses of prosopography and second, the role of the emperor. But now--a backwards glance--and a hope that I do not thereby suffer the fate of Lot's wife.

Inevitably, one's glance is arrested by the monumental figure of Mommsen, of whom it has been said that he transformed every branch of Roman history that he did not personally invent. In just over 1500 publications, Mommsen touched on virtually every aspect of life under both republic and empire, and accomplished what the Romans themselves left undone: a written constitution. Mommsen (and his disciples) saw Roman politics in terms of distinct political parties, liberal and conservative.

A succeeding generation of scholars narrowed Mommsen's focus and concentrated (vis a vis the republic) on the imposing series of great military commanders, the military dynasts: Sulla and Marius, Pompey, Crassus and Caesar--and, finally, Caesar standing alone. This focus in turn gave way to what has been termed the Namierization of Roman history: the application of the prosopographical approach to the political history of the republic. Here the focus is not on "parties" or on "great men," but on the loose alliances among the ruling oligarchy--alliances based on mutuality of interests, and cemented by ties of marriage, kinship and political debts.

Now, Namier deduced from the copious sources for 18th century England that domestic politics and foreign policy were often determined not on the merits of the issues, but by considerations of family and factional loyalty, and by ties between patron and client. Similarly, the study of the patron-client relationship in Roman republican domestic politics and foreign policy has preoccupied scholars from F. Munzer to M. Gelzer, R. Syme, Lily Ross Taylor, T. R. S. Broughton, T. P. Wiseman, E. Badian, and E. S. Gruen. Only Arnaldo Momigliano has looked with

consistent envy and considerable approval at the golden age before the "invention" of prosopography. Many, however, would agree with Sir Ronald Syme's dictum in The Roman Revolution that "Roman history, Republican or Imperial, is the history of the governing class"--and, therefore, uniquely in need of the techniques of prosopography. Syme's study of the fall of the republic led him to conclude that "a democracy cannot rule an empire...neither can one man, though empire may appear to presuppose monarchy. There is always an oligarchy somewhere, open or concealed."

It was Momigliano himself, in his review of Syme's Roman Revolution in the Journal of Roman Studies, 30 (1940), who voiced objections to the prosopographical method which still stand, and addressed himself to a question still unanswered--and possibly unanswerable: if the clientships of the earlier republic had been the "strength of the senatorial aristocracy"...the clientships of the last century BC destroyed the senatorial government. Why? Force and violence (Syme's explanation) are not, Momigliano stated, a sufficient explanation. Momigliano objected to Syme's reliance on prosopography on another ground as well: "The spiritual interests of the people," he chided, "are considered much less than their marriages."

The charges which Momigliano leveled against Syme in 1940 have recently been brought by M. Crawford (Journal of Roman Studies, 66 (1976), 214-17) against Erich Gruen, whose The Last Generation of the Roman Republic (University of California Press, 1974) makes heavy use of the prosopographical method. In addition, Crawford locks horns with Gruen over a methodological issue which is currently occupying students of both republic and empire.

Gruen, like many scholars working in the field, seeks to work a corrective to retrospective interpretation--whether of 'fall' of republic or 'decline' of empire. Hindsight, Gruen warns, "deceives and distorts...and yields only a retrojected prophecy." "Cicero's contemporaries," he points out, "did not know what was in store. Nor should their every action be treated as if it conspired to determine the outcome."

This, I think, most scholars will grant. However, as one of Gruen's reviewers points out, hindsight is pernicious only if we assume that, in this instance, Cicero's contemporaries shared our prescience. Otherwise, of course, hindsight--that pejorative term--is better labeled historical perspective. Second even if one grants--and most historians would--that there was no conscious conspiracy to overthrow the republic, the republic did, in fact, fall. The distinction may only be between premeditated and unpremeditated murder. Finally, there is a danger that the prosopographer, assuming that ties of kinship and career imply shared political ideology, will posit that shared ideology on the evidence of kinship ties alone. There is, in short, the possibility that methodology may predetermine conclusions.

In any event, thanks in part to the advances brought about by prosopographical studies, historians of the late republic are increasingly less inclined to accept Syme's dictum that "Roman history, Republican or Imperial, is the history of the governing class."

Historians are turning their attention away from the governing class, away from Rome itself, and away from monolithic questions of decline and fall. What passes elsewhere as local history is burgeoning in Roman studies as well: graduate students are being given their marching orders, assigned a province to investigate and to document. Already the results of such research is appearing in journals such as the Journal of Roman Studies and, in time, will lead us to a better understanding (for example) of why individual provinces were drawn into the revolution of the governing class in 49.

Our picture of economic life of both republic and empire is also being fleshed out; a recent paper in Finley's Cambridge seminar on Roman property suggests that land did, indeed, go out of cultivation during the late Empire (one of the long-adduced causes for the 'fall' of the empire)--but primarily in Italy itself, far less in the provinces. In addition, Finley himself, in The Ancient Economy, addresses larger questions of economic realities in antiquity--and concludes, somewhat gloomily, that ancient governments had no economic policies as such--not altogether surprising in societies which had no way to gather reliable statistics. Much work being done on the ancient economy relies on such painstaking efforts as those of K. D. White, whose Roman Farming, Farm Equipment of the Roman World, and Agricultural Implements of the Roman World make it possible to speak with precision of methods of land cultivation, crops, production yields, etc.

Keith Hopkins, trained in both classics and sociology, brings to the study of ancient economic and social life a double perspective--which, as you will instantly suspect, causes him to be damned by both ancient historians and sociologists. Classicists especially regard Hopkins rather as the ancient Greeks regarded barbarian ambassadors, who came wearing peculiar garments, absurd pointed slippers, and spoke unintelligible nonsense. Perhaps only those working in women's studies meet with more suspicion; the English classicist Balsdon concluded his cursory review of Pomeroy's Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves by saying that he hoped that a book on Gods, Pimps, Rapists, Husbands, and Slaves would not ensue. Viking/Penguin, however, has just published selections from Justinian's Digest entitled Theft, Rapine, Damage, and Insult.

Nonetheless, social history is being written by Hopkins, Brunt, and Gabba, whose studies of the Roman professional army consider its uses as a vehicle for advancement by the rural proletariat and Italians. This last is a far cry from, for example, Syme's stated interest in the army; Syme saw the army as monolithic, interesting only insofar as it was an instrument of political power in the hands of the governing class. In addition, R. Macmullen, in a series of articles and books, attempts to look at how Romans in various periods perceived their world, and Peter Brown has brilliantly expounded that world in his Augustine of Hippo, The World of Late Antiquity, and The Making of Late Antiquity.

Indeed, the pendulum is beginning to swing so rapidly away from political history and towards social history that several recent biographies have been criticized--criticized, mind you--for being "good political biographies," and chided for neglecting not only social history but psychology. However, be



of good heart! those recent biographies which do attempt psychological interpretation of the subject have been faulted for just that (so that, for example, Barbara Levicks's biography of Tiberius is faulted for failing to probe the emperor's psyche and Seager's biography of the same figure is damned for an over-reliance on psychological interpretations). One should, perhaps, remember that Beloch once remarked that--due, of course to the limitations of our sources--"no biography can be written of any political figure in antiquity, except for Cicero, and perhaps Julian." A dictum more honored in the breach than the observance.

Still, the biographies of the Roman emperors continue to fascinate, and much good work on them has recently been accomplished. Fergus Millar laid the groundwork for his massive volume on The Emperor in the Roman World with a series of articles in the Journal of Roman Studies. Readers of Suetonius will miss the impish figures of emperors splashing in heated pools stocked with golden carp and pretty boys--and viewers of "I, Claudius" will mourn the absence of poison filled perfume vials--however, serious historians of the period will rejoice to find in Millar's book serious emperors. Millar is concerned both with the role of the emperor--what exactly did he do? what was his job?--and with what the empire expected of its leader. Millar sees the emperor as intimately involved both in decision making and in actual physical communication with his subjects: he wrote his own letters. What the emperor was, Millar says, was what he did. And yet--perhaps not surprisingly if the emperor did indeed personally see to his correspondence--the emperor was essentially passive: less an initiator of policy than a reactor to demands, pressures, and crises. A Cambridge ancient historian, J. A. Crook, characterized Millar's work as an "important sociological study."

One wonders whether it was this characterization by Crook which prompted Keith Hopkins to put on his sociologist's hat, and to spend almost 10 pages in his review of Millar documenting his conviction that The Emperor in the Roman World is "a model of how ancient history should not be written." "At best," Hopkins says, "it is good of its kind; but it is of the wrong kind, as though a sea-voyager had painfully constructed a Rolls-Royce motor car to cross the Atlantic Ocean," Journal of Roman Studies 68 (1978), 178-186.

More seriously, Hopkins titles his review "Rules of Evidence," and raises some points which are well worth our consideration. First, Hopkins accuses Millar of sharing the common fault of ancient historians in throwing all sources into a hopper and then extracting items at random, regardless of date. In fact, it is true that--due to the ghastly limitations of our sources--one often does use sources late and suspect to document even minute details of earlier centuries--simply because one has no other source. Second, Hopkins quarrels with Millar's stated aim in dealing with the sources, which is "to subordinate" himself to the evidence. Like Gruen, Millar is attempting to avoid the dangers of hindsight--and Millar, like Gruen, can be faulted for abandoning his role as interpreter of the past.

Finally, Hopkins quarrels with Millar's assumption that "what the emperor did was what he was reported to have done by the surviving sources." If a source

tells us that an emperor--Marcus Aurelius, for example--returned immediately to matters of business when he was not in the field fighting along the Danube, is this true; is it panegyric; is it, in fact, reported not because it was usual, but because it was highly abnormal? Millar would take such a citation as gospel; Hopkins, and others, are less certain. I would strongly recommend to you both Millar's book, and Hopkins' review, as an excellent example of the methodological controversies which are presently occupying historians of Rome.

And if many of you, not ancient historians, draw back at this suggestion, let me mention in conclusion that a recent book, The Grand System of the Roman Empire, is the work of Edward Luttwak, neither a classicist nor an historian, but a systems analyst! Ernst Badian, reviewing Luttwak in the New York Review of Books, 24 (June 23, 1977), 34ff, and if you are familiar with Badian's reviews there you know that they are always acute and seldom favorable, says of Luttwak that he teaches scholars in the field "how they ought to be doing their job." Luttwak thinks that the 'grand strategy' of the Roman Empire was a conscious defense strategy (in three clearly discernable phases), worked out to prevent and to protect against problems. Many--Badian himself--may remain skeptical that the plan (or the systems) were so conscious. Many will see simply ad hoc solutions to problems, some successful, others abortive. Still more might question Luttwak's belief that "the fundamentals of Roman strategy in the imperial age were rooted not in a technology now obsolete, but in a predicament that we share with the Romans."

At worst, Luttwak has conceived a more conscious strategy for the empire than the Romans did themselves. I suspect that, if he had his choice between reading Agatha Christie or Raymond Chandler, he would pick the former. For in Agatha Christie, of course, all the parts do fit, and--if you are clever enough--you can see the pattern and predict the outcome from the beginning. In Raymond Chandler, and perhaps in much of what we study, there are loose ends even when the tale is told, contradictory evidence, and the jury is often hung.

Sherry Marker  
University of California,  
Berkeley

COMMENT:

It is remarkable how much the study of Roman history during the last 40 or 50 years has been dominated by the historiographical debate surrounding the use of prosopography. Two excellent articles are available for those who wish to learn more about this methodology and its limitations: Lawrence Stone, "Prosopography," Daedalus 1971, pp. 107-140, also published as Historical Studies Today, ed. F. Gilbert and G. R. Graubard (W. W. Norton, 1972); T. F. Carney, "Prosopography: Payoffs and Pitfalls," Phoenix 27 (1973), pp. 156-179. One thing that prosopographical analysis has made clear is that politics during the Roman Republic cannot be interpreted along the lines of simplistic liberal/conservative, oligarchic/democratic, aristocrats/commoners dichotomies. If they ever thought abstractly about it at all, Roman aristocrats were solidly oligarchic. The main dynamic of Republican politics was the struggle within the Senatorial aristocracy for prominence and prestige by individuals backed by

numerous allies, supporters, and dependents. Too often, however, prosopographers, myself included, tried in the past to see groupings of individuals in rigid, long-lasting personal or family factions. It is generally recognized now, however, that such stable groupings are spurious and that the individual combinings and re-combinings within the oligarchy were often kaleidoscopic, based upon changing needs and issues of the moment.

Moreover, the charges that Roman historians have ignored the underlying conditions to which the Roman oligarchy had to react have been taken to heart by many: cf. Susan Treggiari, Roman Freedmen during the Late Republic (Oxford, 1969); P. A. Brunt, Italian Manpower 225 B.C. - A.D. 14 (Oxford, 1971); K. Hopkins, Conquerors and Slaves: Sociological Studies in Roman History, vol. 1 (Cambridge, 1978); and W. V. Harris, War and Imperialism in Republican Rome, 327 - 70 B.C. (Oxford, 1979). Two recent examples of works that try to study Roman Republican political figures in their general social and economic context are A. H. Bernstein's Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus: Tradition and Apostasy (Cornell U. Press, 1978), and T. N. Mitchell's Cicero: The Ascending Years (Yale U. Press, 1979).

In placing the political activity of the ruling elite against the background of the general social, economic, and even international problems with which the Roman government had to deal, one realizes a major reason for the Republic's collapse. Late Republican political leaders were never to a meaningful degree for any length of time able to subordinate their own internal political rivalries to the needs of the state in general. In the intense struggle for personal honor and advantage, proposals and programs to deal with serious foreign and domestic problems inevitably became politicized and foundered on the rocks of mutual jealousy, fear, and suspicion. These personal rivalries ultimately led to the civil wars that brought forth Caesar and Augustus, who carried oligarchic rivalries to their logical extreme, elimination of other competitors and the establishment of one-man rule.

Allen M. Ward

#### THE HISTORICAL PROFESSION IN NEW ENGLAND

In order to aid communication and develop professional camaraderie among members of the Association, the NEHA News will publish a list of the current research and teaching interests of historians in New England. For inclusion in this section, please complete the form on the last page of the newsletter.

Bernstein, Samuel, Church Rd., Cliff Island, ME 04019  
Research: 18th century philosophical materialism

Friedberg, Robert, Southeastern Massachusetts University,  
N. Dartmouth, MA  
Research: The Holocaust; Modern Diplomacy  
Teaching: Modern War and Diplomacy; Modern France

Gelenian, Ara Arthur, Bristol Community College, Fall River, MA  
Research: The moral and political dimensions in the modern world  
Teaching: Modern and pre-modern Europe

Harrington, Joseph, Framingham State College, Framingham, MA  
Research: Romanian-American Relations  
Teaching: 20th century European Diplomacy

Libby, Lester J., Jr., Massachusetts Commission for the Blind,  
116 Austin St., Hyde Park, MA 02136  
Research: Venetian politics and humanism in the early 16th century

Muirhead, George R., Central Connecticut State College, New Britain, CT  
Research: France of the early Third Republic  
Teaching: Modern Europe

Orens, John, Boston University, Boston, MA  
Research: The Christian Socialist Movement in England  
Teaching: European intellectual history; modern Britain

Reinerman, Alan J., Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA  
Research: Austria and the Papacy in the Age of Metternich  
Teaching: Modern Italy; European Diplomatic

ASSOCIATION BUSINESS: Business Meeting Minutes, Colby-Sawyer College, New London, NH, 27 October 1979

President Neil Stout convened the meeting after the luncheon address at Colby-Sawyer College. The minutes of the spring meeting were read and accepted.

The report of the Treasurer was distributed and accepted.

Richard Brown, for the Nominating Committee, presented the candidates for election to NEHA offices.

John Voll moved the adoption of the Statement of Purpose and Article IV, paragraphs 1 and 2, as contained in the Executive Committee Proposals published in NEHA News, vol. VI, no. 2. The motion carried, and these provisions will become part of the Association's Constitution.

Stout expressed the Association's thanks to Colby-Sawyer for their hospitality. He announced that Robert Imholt wishes to resign as editor of NEHA News and appointed Imholt to look for a successor. Imholt asked for volunteers.

Vice-President Fred Cazel asked for suggestions for papers for the spring meeting.

William Brayfield of the University of Hartford announced that a position was available for someone to work with local historical societies in

Connecticut. He mentioned that money is available to encourage people to look at history on National History Day. Several New England states, including Vermont, Maine, and Massachusetts, do not have programs related to this event.

Richard Brown announced the results of the elections and thanked the candidates. Elected were: Darrett Rutman (Univ. of New Hampshire), Vice-President; Armand Patrucco (Rhode Island College) and Catherine Prelinger (Franklin Papers, Yale), Executive Committee; Helen Mulvey (Connecticut College) and Deborah Clifford, Nominating Committee; and Joshua Stein (Roger Williams College), Treasurer. These people will take office after the spring meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan J. Liebowitz, Secretary

ASSOCIATION BUSINESS: Executive Committee Minutes, Colby-Sawyer College, New London, NH, 27 October 1979

President Neil Stout called the meeting to order following the afternoon session of the Fall Conference at Colby-Sawyer College. Present were Neil Stout, Ridgway Shinn, Fred Cazel, Ann Beck, Armand Patrucco, Alice McGinty, Jonathan J. Liebowitz, and Robert Imholt.

Sites for next year's meetings were discussed. Shinn said that Rhode Island College would be happy to have us, and Imholt said the same for Albertus Magnus.

Liebowitz proposed that NEHA participate in the "exhibit reception" at the AHA's annual meeting in New York on December 28. The Committee agreed to this and to the spending of \$10, which the AHA requires for preparation.

Imholt reported that he receives materials from the National Coordinating Committee for the Promotion of History and publishes what he thinks appropriate in the News.

Liebowitz suggested preparation of a set of "job descriptions" for NEHA officers. He said he would distribute an example of this at the next meeting. Patrucco suggested that each officer write a description of his own position. It was agreed that the subject would be discussed at the next meeting.

Other topics to be brought up at the next meeting are changing the type of our bank account (Patrucco) and the possibility of the Nominating Committee's meeting at the Spring meeting of NEHA, instead of later, as is the present practice (McGinty).

It was decided that the Executive Committee would meet on December 1, 1979 at Bentley College.

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan J. Liebowitz, Secretary

ASSOCIATION BUSINESS: Executive Committee Minutes, Bentley College, Waltham, MA, 1 December 1979

The meeting at Bentley College was called to order at 11 a.m. by President Stout. Present were members Neil Stout, Ridgway Shinn, Fred Cazel, Armand Patrucco, Sherrin Wyntjes, Miriam Chrisman, John Sutherland, and Jonathan J. Liebowitz. Also in attendance were newly elected members Darrett Rutman and Joshua Stein, and Alice McGinty of the Nominating Committee and Bentley.

The minutes of the October 27th meeting were read and accepted.

Job descriptions

The main subject of discussion was the job descriptions for NEHA offices prepared by Liebowitz and, for Treasurer, by Patrucco. After considerable discussion, these descriptions were completed, along with times for the completion of duties by the office holders. The accompanying document contains the descriptions as decided by the Executive Committee.

The following other matters were discussed at the same time as the job descriptions.

Dates of meetings

Dates of future NEHA meetings were set as follows:

Fall:	Oct. 25, 1980	Spring:	April 11, 1981
	Oct. 24, 1981		April 17, 1982
	Oct. 23, 1982		

The fall 1980 meeting will be held at Rhode Island College, and the spring 1981 meeting at Mt. Ida College. The fall 1981 and spring 1982 sites were set tentatively for southern Connecticut and the Boston area, respectively.

Institutional support

Patrucco and Liebowitz suggested seeking institutional support for NEHA. This support would involve secretarial and office help, etc.

Stout proposed that the Secretary and the Treasurer explore this possibility and present their findings to the next Executive Committee meeting.

Committee meetings

A motion was made and adopted to have the Nominating Committee meet the evening before the Spring meeting of NEHA.

It was also voted that the Executive Committee should meet once about December 1 each year and once the evening preceding the Spring meeting of the Association.

Treasury

Patrucco raised a question about the type of account in which to keep NEHA funds. Presently in a checking account, the balance never falls below \$1300-\$1400. The Treasurer suggested shifting some of the money to an interest-earning account, such as a money market fund.

A motion was made to instruct the Treasurer to invest \$1000 in a money market fund that invests in Federal debt instruments. The motion passed.

After a brief discussion, a motion was made to approve the Treasurer's use of stock dividends to purchase fractional shares of PPG Industries. The motion passed.

Other matters

Liebowitz reported that he would participate in activities at the AHA Convention in New York.

Cazel's suggestion of a dissertation session for the Spring 1980 meeting met with approval.

The next meeting of the Executive Committee will take place on April 18 at Sturbridge. The Committee will meet for dinner at 6 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at 4 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan J. Liebowitz, Secretary

JOB DESCRIPTIONS FOR NEHA OFFICERS

President

Chairs meetings of Executive Committee and Business Meetings at semi-annual conferences.

Represents NEHA to other groups, especially the AHA.

May give a presidential address at the Spring meeting.

Vice-President

Acts as program chair. Sets up program for Fall and Spring meetings, including usually morning and afternoon sessions and a luncheon address.

Works with local arrangements committees on meetings.

Sends information about the program to the Editor and Secretary 6 weeks after the date of the previous meeting.

Secretary

Takes minutes of Business and Executive Committee meetings. Sends copies to these to Editor by issue deadlines.

Maintains mailing list (computerized) and has labels printed for mailings. Also prints mailing list when requested by officers and members.

Arranges for printing and mailing of NEHA News, March 1 and September 1 each year.

Puts together meeting announcements, has them printed and mailed one month before meetings. Request for dues included in Spring mailing.

Sends notice of meeting date and location to AHA Newsletter.

Handles some aspects of correspondence and relations with AHA.

Prepares ballots for election of officers at Fall meeting.

Treasurer (Armand Patrucco has prepared a much more detailed description, which has been given to the incoming Treasurer and filed in the Association's permanent records.)

Maintains financial records.

Collects dues and pays bills.

Sends out dues mailing once a year.

Submits report to Business Meeting.

Handles registration at semi-annual meetings.

Keeps list of members and sends names and addresses of new members to Secretary.

Editor

Has the usual editorial responsibilities for the News.

Prepares News for offset printing in camera-ready form.

Sends this material to Secretary by February 15 and August 15, for Spring and Fall issues.

In March issue of News asks for nominations to fill upcoming vacancies among NEHA offices.

Chair of Nominating Committee

Calls meeting of Committee for evening before Spring meeting.

Submits names of members nominated (after informing nominees) to Editor for publication in Fall issue of News.

Prepares a standard vita form for nominees to complete in time for photocopying prior to Fall meeting.

After elections the President and the Chair of the Nominating Committee get together to inform nominees of their fates.

Local arrangements person or committee

Makes arrangements for the following at semi-annual meetings: parking, registration facilities rooms for a.m. and p.m. sessions, coffee at registration, lunch, and cocktails before lunch and after the p.m. session. Consults with the Vice-President and Treasurer on these matters.

Sends Secretary information on the site, especially the location of registration and cost of lunch. Also sends directions to site and a map if one is available. This material should be sent to the Secretary 6 weeks before the meeting.

Puts up sign directing people to conference.

At the Fall 1980 meeting of the New England Historical Association, elections will be held for the following offices: Vice-President (succeeds to presidency); Secretary; two members of the Executive Committee; and, two members of the Nominating Committee. All members of the Association are invited to submit nominees for the consideration of the Nominating Committee by completing the following and sending it to any member of the Nominating Committee listed on page 3 of the Newsletter.

NAME OF NOMINEE \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS OF NOMINEE \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

POSITION NOMINATED FOR \_\_\_\_\_

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF NOMINATION:

NOMINATED BY \_\_\_\_\_  
(optional)

ANNUAL DUES . . . . . \$4.00

STUDENT DUES . . . \$2.00

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

MAILING ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_

Home \_\_\_\_\_

Office \_\_\_\_\_ ZIP \_\_\_\_\_

AFFILIATION \_\_\_\_\_

Please make checks payable to the New England Historical Association and made to Armond Patrucco, Treasurer, New England Historical Association, 151 Borden Avenue, Johnston, Rhode Island 02919

In order to aid communication and develop professional camaraderie among members of the Association, the NEHA News would like to publish a list of the current research and teaching interests of historians in New England. Please complete the following form and forward to Professor Robert Imholt, Editor, NEHA News, Albertus Magnus College, New Haven, CT 06511.

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

AFFILIATION \_\_\_\_\_

RESEARCH INTEREST \_\_\_\_\_

Book \_\_\_\_\_

Article \_\_\_\_\_

Other \_\_\_\_\_

TEACHING INTEREST \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_