

Lincoln Library of Buenos Aires, and the Chicago Historical Society. She acknowledges the assistance of her ambassador husband.

Nearly two-thirds of the volume is devoted to the despatches of two ministers: Thomas O. Osborn (1874-1885), key figure in the mediation of Argentina's limits controversy with Chile, and John R. G. Pitkin (1889-1893), Washington's representative during porteño financial and revolutionary crises. But in addition to matters of high government policy, Sra. de Espil has incorporated colorful personal sidelights of diplomatic careers: July 4th receptions, repetitious complaints about low salaries and inadequate quarters, and excursions into the provinces with Argentine presidents. In evaluating the perceptiveness of the American observers, she asserts that they were "certainly objective," though "almost always favorable" to Argentina. While there was no John Adams among them, she submits, all were "capable, industrious, worthy representatives" of their country.

In accomplishing the considerable task of translating the documents, Sra. de Espil strove "meticulously not to change a single word," but in at least a few instances she has failed to note ellipses. The scholar who uses the book must take this lapse into account, but it should not diminish in the slightest anyone's enjoyment of these imaginatively conceived vignettes.

State University of New York,
Buffalo

HAROLD F. PETERSON

Memorias. El sitio de Montevideo: 1846. By GENERAL TOMÁS DE IRIARTE. Buenos Aires, 1969. Editorial y Librería Goncourt. Pp. xxii, 559. Paper.

General Tomás de Iriarte was born in Buenos Aires and trained in the Colegio Militar de Segovia in Spain. Having fought in the war against Napoleon, he returned to America to join the Independence forces. In 1835 Rosas exiled him, and he began to write his memorias. He was in Montevideo when the siege began and the memorias became a diary. The editor, Enrique de Gandía, has titled the section of the diary for 1846, *El Sitio de Montevideo: 1846*. (It is Volume XI of Iriarte's memorias; Volume I, *La Independencia y la Anarquía*, appeared in 1944; and a final volume, *La Nueva Troya*, is still to be published.) On January 18, 1846, Iriarte noted ". . . nuestro plan es consignar en este diario cuanto circula, y hasta los raciocinios de los especuladores políticos, a fin de que se conozca con la mayor exactitud posible el modo que esta población ofrece desde el principio

del bloqueo" (p. 63). The editor, for his part, calls this volume "una mina histórica de valor incalculable" (p. xxi).

Such enthusiasm is uncalled for. By 1846, Iriarte had quarreled with Argentine General José María Paz and resigned as artillery chief of the defense of Montevideo in 1843; he had few friends or contacts. There is little inside information in the diary, and Iriarte did not fulfill his plan of describing "cuanto circula" by going out of his way to secure information on the besieged city. Much of his diary, written to pass the empty hours, consists of conjectures on whether news of developments elsewhere, especially in Corrientes, would prove correct. Nevertheless, particularly for readers already familiar with the siege and willing to dig through these pages, the diary repays reading.

The year opened with rumors that 5,000 English and 6,000 French troops would be landed in February or March. Iriarte was sure that this would finish off Rosas, but the troops never arrived. Instead England and France, through the mission of Thomas S. Hood, began the negotiations with Rosas that would lead to their withdrawal. The great internal event of the year was Fructuoso Rivera's return from exile and takeover of power. Iriarte had hoped that the Europeans would stay on after victory, "para que a su sombra y bajo su vigorosa protección podamos establecer bases sólidas de una organización social regular y duradera" (p. 114). At that point it seemed that the Europeans would leave and Rosas would stay on indefinitely. Yet there was still hope; new rumors spread that Brazil would come in against Rosas and that Urquiza's relations with *el tirano* were breaking.

Iriarte hated "corta cabezas" (Manuel Oribe, the Blanco leader), but he had little use for any of the major figures on his own side, except perhaps Guisepppe Garibaldi. He despised caudillos and was repelled by the politics and politicians of Montevideo. His descriptions of corruption and ineptitude are an antidote to the classic stories about "the glorious defense of Montevideo." As a professional army officer he was indignant at the slipshod way the defense was handled, even though the siege had been reduced to infrequent skirmishes. He worried about the hostility among Argentines, Orientales, Italians, French volunteers, Basques, and blacks, all defending Montevideo. As a Porteño, he was particularly fearful of a separate peace in Uruguay which, aside from its broader effects, might leave him stranded. His two attempts to get back into service during the year were, in part, attempts to protect his future.

In other times Iriarte could have expected a decorous career in the army or as a diplomat, like the British naval officers stationed in the Plata whom he so admired. Instead, along with many others in those times, he had been obliged to sell everything he owned, had two children die of scarlet fever, and could not support his family. When he sought reentrance into the service, so as to support them, he discovered that even though he carried the rank of general, his services were not particularly wanted. The last entry ends, “cargado de obligaciones como reo, mi situación es horrible; la muerte es preferible a tan larga agonía” (p. 559).

Brandeis University

MILTON I. VANGER

A pesquisa histórica no Brasil. 2nd ed. By JOSÉ HONÓRIO RODRIGUES. São Paulo, 1969. Companhia Editôra Nacional. Brasiliana. Notes. Appendices. Index. Pp. 283. Paper.

José Honório Rodriguez is unquestionably Brazil's leading historiographer and the man who by his writing has done the most to further the study of Brazilian history. Although the publication under review is presented as a revised second edition of an earlier work with the same title (1952), it is so much enlarged and changed that it is in reality a new book and as such a valuable history of and guide to research in Brazilian history.

Rodrigues divides the book into six sections. The first serves as an introduction to the nature of historical inquiry in which the author once again emphasizes the contemporary nature of history. In the next section he sets forth the history of the major missions of historical research carried out in Brazil and Europe. This section, much expanded from the previous edition, is an extremely informative account about the successes and failures of archival searches. Major and minor figures are present here, and Rodrigues has not hesitated to criticize their methods. For example, when he deals with the work of Jaime Cortesão in editing the Pedro de Angelis collection, Rodrigues not only attacks the failure to prepare a complete inventory and the use of outmoded techniques of transcription, but also points out that Father Bruxel, S.J. was already at work on the project before Cortesão's intervention. Mentioning the efforts of José Antônio Gonsalves de Mello to collect materials on the history of Pernambuco, Rodrigues praises the techniques, but feels that “the result did not correspond to the effort.” Such statements give this book a liveliness not common to the genre.

In Section III, “Instruments of Historical Study,” Rodrigues