a Ph.D. in the history of science. The book also aims to address the social history of women in science, with sections on science and medieval education.

Sheffield's book does not skimp on resources. Over 100 pages of the book are given over to primary documents about women in science, giving students a chance to compare the text to the original works of women in science. The book also gives a bibliographic essay after each chapter, as well as a glossary, chronology, and complete bibliography.

This book would fit well into a history of women in science course, a women's studies course, or a history of science class. It is a rich book that might fit many niches. It would be ideal as a resource for teachers and professors to enrich their curriculum in this area. It would also be a good resource for programs that aim at gender equity in the sciences. No one reading Sheffield's work could close the book unconvinced of the breadth and depth of women's contributions to science, technology, and medicine.

Eastern Michigan University

Russell Olwell

Richard Holmes and Martin Marix Evans (eds.). *Battlefield: Decisive Conflicts in History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006. Pp. 376. Cloth, \$30.00; ISBN 0-19-280653-X.

Richard Holmes and Martin Evans are both good writers and scholars. Holmes's works such as The Little Field Marshall (1981), Riding the Retreat: Mons to the Marne (1995), The Western Front: Ordinary Soldiers and the Defining Battles of World War I (1999), and many others (he has published twenty) mark him as thoughtful and articulate as well as an able scholar. Evans's publications tend to be more popular in nature, but nonetheless he has made real contributions to military history. In the current volume, the two are updating and revising information about battles covered in The Oxford Companion to Military History, which Holmes edited. Battles that were not covered in the Oxford Companion have been added to the current volume, if, since the original publication, scholars have shown their significance to merit doing so. The contents of Battlefield have been organized in chapters that are in part chronological and in part regional. Hence the first chapter is "The Ancient World" and the last is "Africa." Battles are generally arranged chronologically within chapters. This arrangement works well. It allows readers to find battles of interest easily. It also allows the editor to provide introductions that provide background and context for the battles in the campaign. This is an improvement on The Oxford Companion that is more completely focused on battlefield events.

For teachers and students, *Battlefield* will be a valuable reference book. The convenience of being able easily and quickly to find an authoritative account of virtually any strategically significant battle at any time or place will be great. While the information might be available on the Internet, one would have to question the dependability of such electronic reference. The number of wrong turns and blind alleys

Teaching History 32(1). DOI: 10.33043/TH.32.1.48-49. ©2007 Fred R. van Hartesveldt

## **Book Reviews**

on the information superhighway is enormous. There is no reason, however, to think that Holmes and Evans did anything but get it right. The section introductions, setting battles in some context, will also be useful to those studying for exams and writing lectures. Those doing such work will be happy to have a copy of *Battlefield* on their desks.

Others, however, will find little use for this book. Holmes says on the first page of his Preface that he did not want to do a decisive battles book or "another dictionary of battles." While grouping the contents by a combination of chronology and geography and adding some introductory remarks when shifting from one place or campaign to another does add context and avoids a simple alphabetical listing, he has failed in his latter intention. This book is a dictionary of battles, a useful and well-done dictionary, but a dictionary nonetheless.

Fort Valley State University

## Fred R. van Hartesveldt

## Jeff Broadwater. *George Mason: Forgotten Founder*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006. Pp. 352. Cloth, \$34.95; ISBN 0-8078-3053-4.

In this biography, Jeff Broadwater makes the argument for adding Virginian George Mason to the pantheon of founders. Broadwater adds his voice to a recent trend of restoring men whom some scholars believe have been left behind in the history of the American Revolution and early republic, men such as John Jay, Charles Pinckney, and John Witherspoon. While these scholars have not necessarily argued Mason, Jay, Pinckney, or Witherspoon rose to the level of Washington or Jefferson, they want to make sure we get it right, that government policymakers in this important period get their due.

Broadwater has practice in biography. He previously published biographies of Dwight Eisenhower and Adlai Stevenson. Although he successfully, with this biography, moves back in time to the founding era, his book reads like a work by someone contextualizing from scholarly reading rather than a work by someone long immersed in the field. This is not a criticism, however. An argument can be made that scholars working this way can write accessible biographies and bring in new audiences. *George Mason* does not raise new insights about the American Revolution or early republic, but it can teach students and non-historians about the complexities of the late eighteenth century.

Broadwater begins by placing Mason in his eighteenth-century context, explaining Mason's political and religious beliefs and the juxtaposition of Mason's antislavery rhetoric with his slaveholding practices. These themes are highlighted throughout the book to make sure readers understand the differences between twenty-first and eighteenth-century ideologies. This contextualization is the strength of the biography. For students unfamiliar with the era, *George Mason* would bring to light some of the sticky issues historians have grappled with since the Revolution. What exactly did the founding generation mean by republicanism? How did they define civil liberties? How