BOOK REVIEWS


A nation formed from the fusion of various ethnic groups and having a composite culture can easily, in its unified maturity, forget or minimize the part played in its development by those groups which originally did not speak or write the common national language. Thus, in the United States, in spite of much local and group research, French, German, and Spanish historical documents have been only inadequately evaluated for interpreting American history to American citizens. And yet our libraries and archives are full of this source material. America needs to study it even more fully than before, not in order to amuse or alarm the public at large with pictures of the alleged nonconformity of non-English settlers and their descendants, but to evaluate their positive place in the complete American picture. And if the public at large and the general run of popular historians either will not or cannot use the available non-English source material, then the linguist-historian specialists must see to it that as much of it as possible or at any rate the most important documents are translated into the English of the monoglots. Until we make full use of this material for more than mere specialistic purpose, our picture of America is incomplete, indeed, even falsified.

Theodore G. Tappert and John W. Doberstein are, therefore, to be congratulated for translating, editing and making available to a larger public The Journals of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, the patriarch of the Lutheran Church in America. Muhlenberg, from his arrival in 1742 to his death in 1787, exerted a dynamic influence on American church affairs, American education and life. A true missionary bishop, he organized congregations, secured books, medicine and money from Europe, helped erect church buildings and called into being the powerful Lutheran school system which with that of the Reformed Church and the Moravians was in every way the equal of the much publicized New England school system. He founded a family which in the number of its outstanding men ranks favorably with any American dynasty and included prominent clergymen, scientists and statesmen. In spite of his busy life he found time to record his daily experiences in a series of journals, not only because he was moved by the eighteenth-century custom of ministers to keep a diary, but also because he needed to furnish his superiors in Halle with a record of his ministry and wished to be able to give at all times to congregation and state an accounting
of his affairs. "How necessary it is," the translators quote him, "to keep memoranda, originals and copies of all such and similar cases if one wishes to be in a position to preserve one's reputation as at least a half-honest man!"

The history of the translating project, together with an evaluation of Muhlenberg's work, is found in the introduction, in itself a model of excellent scholarship.

The style of the journals varies, of course, and much of the material is dull and trivial, but much is of flaming interest, as the account of the conversation between Muhlenberg and Count von Zinzendorf, the realistic description of the systems of slavery and redemptionism, and the report of German refugees fleeing from an inadequately protected border that was being ravaged by the Indians. Muhlenberg himself is seen in his journals as a true missionary spirit, zealous, outspoken and sincere, uncompromising in what he regarded as essentials, but eager for real reconciliation with those with whom he differed, somewhat lacking in humor, but having a truly warm heart. He would admonish profane tipplers, hypocrites and sinners in plain, castigating language, but would ride through flood and storm to administer communion to the dying or to preach the gospel. He reports numerous incidents from every-day life, *realia* from travel, farming, church affairs, business and folkways. His energy is beyond belief. He not only learned the necessary English but acquired a thorough knowledge of Dutch merely because he was called to preach for a short time to the trilingual Lutheran congregations of New York and New Jersey. It took real missionary zeal for a pastor to learn a language because part of the congregation spoke it, particularly since the excuse that English and German would have sufficed for mere understanding, would have been valid and anyway the Governor of New York himself was mildly impatient with anything which might impede the progress of English. But Muhlenberg considered any language which would reach the hearts and minds of his listeners as being a proper vehicle of expression. He even, on one occasion, penetrated the maze of a Negro slave's French-Spanish-English jargon to bring him words of comfort. As part of his mission he insisted on establishing schools, and even found time to be schoolmaster when an assistant was not available. His thorough knowledge of colonial law and practical command of medicine he regarded as instruments for furthering his service to his congregations and his people.

The English of the translations varies in style according to the German of the original. The translators have done an excellent job of translating into clear idiomatic English, adding just the proper amount of explanatory material and indicating by italics where Muhlenberg made use, according to good old German-American custom, of convenient English words. References to church members baptized, married and buried by Muhlenberg have been checked with the original church records. Very few translations on an incorrect stylistic level occur. The most irritating to me was the expression
repeated several times: "He threw it up to me that . . ." or "It was thrown up to me . . ." Also the word "stinker" bothered me. It is not on the same stylistic level as the German word "Stänker." Both expressions, to be sure, are from our vivid colloquial American vocabulary where non-English speech has had a greater influence than in our standard literary language.

The book has pedagogical possibilities. Selected portions, perhaps in the form of a separate volume, might be used for supplementary reading in high school and college classes in American history. Furthermore (and as a staunch Lutheran I ask for forgiveness for hinting at this in a secular review), portions might be made required reading for theological students of whatsoever denomination, to emphasize to them the fact that a truly great career is the result of unselfish, tireless service to an ideal. Writers of "History of Education," too, might make use of Muhlenberg's journals to keep from getting a one-sided impression of the development of education in the United States.

In short, the translation is an outstanding accomplishment in the study of American church history and American history in general.

Princeton, N. J. 

RALPH CHARLES WOOD


Within this little volume is compressed a constitutional argument of richness and distinction. Federalism in the United States, Professor Nichols remarks, "has always been much more than a system of government set forth in the Constitution. It has been and continues to be a pattern of living and thinking ingrained in the general behavior of the nation." As it has always been a critical issue of public law in America—one of those issues whose delineation defines the kind of freedom the citizens of this country have—so it is in this present year a live issue of international relations. Can America's federal experience constitute the precedent for an international federation such as those urged by Streit, Humber, and others? The question can be answered more surely and more fully by the readers of the intelligent essays here presented.

The extraordinary prestige of the contributors does not prevent significant conflicts from arising. Professor Coker takes vigorous exception to Professor McIlwain's attempt to show that medieval and renaissance federalism in Britain "must have influenced" the American statesmen of 1787. It is a stimulating exchange in which Professor Coker clearly has the better of the argument.

Dr. Nichols discusses with imagination and originality the place of the Civil War in American federalism. He describes the democracy of the North
opposing the federalism of the South. He illuminates the constitutional issue by a consideration of party politics and political localism that stimulated the passions of rebellion.

The essay by Dean Pound, "Law and Federal Government," is a restatement of the theory of constitutional democracy in federalistic terms, a learned and spirited attack on theories of absolute liberty and absolute power which have so much currency today. As always in his writings, we feel the poise, the wisdom, of the long view. To Dean Pound, federalism is no dead cause, passing with the declining vigor of the states. It is both theory and reality that challenge the creative realism of the twentieth century, that permit us to regard the values of civilized life as transcending both individual and state, and that, however logically and philosophically impossible, work well with Anglo-American peoples. Critics of contemporary policy, who have not the uncanny ability of Mr. Pound to sweep over ages past and present, who cannot cast an issue of policy in this long view, will take little satisfaction in his position. But the thoughtful reader who is struggling in his own mind with post-war peace problems and federative plans, will find both help and inspiration from one who speaks, after all, with as much authority as society could ask from any student of social affairs.

University of Delaware

J. H. Powell


For those who like to read of the heyday of the American Colonies in a nutshell, Dr. Wertenbaker's little book proves good reading. "Americans," he states, "have been slow to recognize the extent and importance of the culture of their ancestors of the colonial period," a culture that was important even though it produced neither a Shakespeare nor a Michelangelo. With the growth of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Annapolis, Williamsburg and Charleston—the six cities which form the subject of the book—intellectual and cultural interests developed on a large scale. Hitherto, too little emphasis has been laid upon "the excellent work in architecture, the artistic crafts, and the widespread appreciation of cultural things" in eighteenth-century America. After all, as the author fittingly points out, the task of the colonists was not to produce another Shakespeare, but to win a vast continent for a high civilization.

City by city, we learn of the commerce, education, literature, printing, cabinetmaking or painting being carried on in the New World. In New York, for instance, it is noted that only a few of the hordes of young people now attending Columbia University could have entered the first New York college, King's, because the first requirements were the ability to write a good legible hand and to read part of the Gospels in Greek.

William Penn's "planned civilization" next engages the attention of
Wertenbaker, who critically, but perhaps justly, suggests that the Quakers "saw no need for higher education." In truth, the Philadelphia region was a spot where "the life of the mind was not apt to flourish," and where architecture, music and the theatre were repressed. He mentions that it took a Franklin to found the University of Pennsylvania, for this "scientist of the first rank" had no sympathy with the Friends' suspicion of the Fine Arts. The "splendid record of scientific accomplishment" in Pennsylvania was equaled by none of the other colonies. Philadelphia is "the first Renaissance city in America," and in spite of its founding fathers, produced the "greatest colonial musician, Francis Hopkinson."

This is a well-rounded little work, replete with new ideas. Whether we read of the planter's life in Old Williamsburg, or of the punch-bowl citizens in Annapolis, good pictures of the "crucibles of culture," as the author calls them, are portrayed. It is a pity, though, that Savannah, a great colonial center, does not have a chapter. Also, Wertenbaker fails to mention among the painters of Charleston (p. 135) the name of Thomas Sully, who early studied painting there. On page 114, it is stated that "the seventeenth-century Virginia cottage is an East Anglian house," when, on the contrary, it is known that the early architecture of this Province was derived from nearly every part of England. But these are insignificant points in a book which should awaken much interest in "the richness of our colonial heritage."

*Wesleyan College*  
HENRY CHANDLEE FORMAN

*Mutiny in January. The Story of a Crisis in the Continental Army Now for the First Time Fully Told from Many Hitherto Unknown or Neglected Sources, both American and British.* By CARL VAN DOREN. (New York: The Viking Press, 1943. 288 p. $3.50.)

Mutiny is a hard word to apply to the case of eleven Pennsylvania regiments of the Continental Line who, in 1781, demonstrated against the careless, inefficient bureaucrats placed over them. Carl Van Doren has, of course, good precedent for thus describing the Morristown Affair, after all, Washington, Wayne and the entire Pennsylvania government thus considered the action of the soldiers. And it is undeniable that the men refused to obey the orders of their officers. Practically, however, despite an obvious effort to be fair-minded, the author has been swept away by the strength of eighteenth-century propaganda. Tolerance was at that time more honored in breach than in observance; that the soldiers had legitimate grievances was seldom recognized by their superiors. Public opinion ran against the men because the case was stacked against them from the start.

Anthony Wayne was the great exception at Morristown. Whether he realized that the soldiers had been deceived concerning the terms of their enlistments is doubtful, but he did know that his men were underfed, underclothed and sadly underpaid. He had himself hammered away at President
Reed and the Pennsylvania Assembly demanding redress for the troops and had received in return little except empty promises and polite requests to let Philadelphia attend to such affairs. The action of the fifteen hundred men in going on strike against distant overlords who had broken the terms of their contracts was no surprise to him; he had not only anticipated the mutiny, but he had definitely warned the politicians in advance, giving an exact date that was not too far removed from the actual time of the event.

All this story Van Doren tells with scrupulous carefulness. It is, to be sure, a bit astonishing to find a scholarly work that begins with a careful analysis of a letter that was never sent and that concludes with speculation as to what the mutineers told their grandchildren, especially as the body of the book is more pedestrian in style and more desiccated in content than is common in these days. The author has found ample new material, chiefly in the William L. Clements Library, where he found spy reports and other important data; he has corrected misconceptions that his predecessors (in one instance this reviewer) have slavishly accepted, but in all essentials the story of the Morristown Affair remains unchanged. Van Doren presents the incident anew but without novelty and without serious emendation.

No reviewer should pretend to read the mind of an author, but it does seem as though Mr. Van Doren began eagerly in the hope of revolutionizing the interpretation of the Morristown business and finding midway in his task that there was little to add, persisted doggedly and without too great inspiration to use the material he had so carefully collected. Scholarly history need not sparkle with sensation but neither need it drag as heavily as it does in Mutiny in January.

It is, one should add, a trifle difficult to trace Mr. Van Doren's sources. His list of references is chronologically arranged so that his first citation deals with chapter 8, his second with chapter 2, followed successively by references to chapters 8, 3, 8, 3, 11, 17, 3, 17, 3, 3, 17, etc. This odd system persists throughout the entire extent of his ten pages of double-columned references.

Valley Forge

Harry Emerson Wildes


Today, when American wings are spread effectively over all the world, it is pleasant to be reminded by Mr. Milbank that from 1783, when first man-bearing aerial attempts were made in France, Americans have kept up to the minute in their interest in and their contributions to the development of aviation. Franklin, Jefferson, Hopkinson, and many others were in touch with each latest development, and even suggested ingenious new possibilities of their own. It was an American, an expatriot to be sure, but an American, who accompanied Pierre Blanchard on the first aerial voyage
across the English Channel. And, justly in keeping with American popular tradition, it was probably a thirteen-year-old boy from Baltimore who in 1784 first looked down on American soil as an aerial passenger. In the mid-eighties and early nineties of the eighteenth century ballooning was all the rage in Philadelphia—and in New York and Boston and Charleston. The American Philosophical Society, the faculty at Yale, and at William and Mary, each busied itself with experimentation.

Then the story breaks, until the second decade of the nineteenth century, when balloonists, amateur and professional, began to appear in abundance, until by mid-century almost every travelling fair, Fourth of July celebration, or circus had its “professor” of aerostatics to thrill and amaze with his (or sometimes even her) daring exhibitions. Nor were lighter-than-air flights made only to entertain: by 1840 balloons were seriously considered by the United States Army for reconnaissance duty in the Seminole War; during the Civil War aerial observers were utilized by both sides. In the adventures of such pioneers in flight as James Allen, John Wise, John La Mountain, and T. S. C. Lowe are all the elements of inventiveness, courage, and dogged, even stubborn perseverance which we all like to believe today are characteristically American. The story of their trials, their disappointments, their failures, and their continued trials—together with the story of fantastic, but sometimes successful, attempts of later experimenters to develop heavier-than-air flying contraptions—makes one of the most fascinating and human chapters in the history of Yankee ingeniousness.

We are the more sorry, then, that Mr. Milbank has not written a longer and a more detailed book, a book equal in interest to the generous series of old illustrations with which he has supplied his present “Introductory Survey.” Here we can find many—not all—of the facts, but they are set down in a pedestrian manner unworthy of the high-soaring ambitions of the men who made them. Until Mr. Milbank fulfills the promise, implicit in his brief and admittedly introductory study, of a fuller and fairer testimony to the courageous experiments of air-minded American pioneers, students of the subject, both professional and amateur, will continue to find most rewarding reading in F. Stansbury Hayden’s narrower but more complete Aeronautics in the Union and Confederate Armies, with a Survey of Military Aeronautics prior to 1861, published two years ago by The Johns Hopkins Press in Baltimore.

Philadelphians who turn to Mr. Milbank’s survey will be proud to note that their ancestors witnessed not only the first lighter-than-air flight in America in 1793, but also in 1878 the first public exhibition of the first power-driven air-machine to fly in this country. They will be sure, however, that the bride and groom, who are pictured (opposite p. 151) making such a public exhibition of themselves by attempting a balloon ascension as part of their “matrimonial celebration,” could not possibly have come from their city.

_Duke University_  
LEWIS LEARY

The history of education in New Jersey is not very well known even to specialists in educational history, owing partly to the absence of any good single volume on the subject. The materials for such an undertaking have been available for years, but, as in the case of most other states, little has been forthcoming beyond the outdated series published by the Commissioner of Education half a century ago.

Dr. Burr's study, a part of the New Jersey history sponsored by the Princeton University Press, meets the requirements in several respects. The author has dug industriously among the church records, local histories and pamphlets, and set down a deserved tribute to the forgotten heroes whose efforts laid the necessary foundations for a school system. The story of the educational activities of each religious community is traced with care, if sometimes with overmuch detail, and relative influences weighed—too briefly—in the final chapter. For the story of James Parker all students will be indebted to Dr. Burr, and none will regret his reminders of the great role of Princeton under Presidents Witherspoon and McCosh—though that is not new material. Every institution from infant school to theological seminary is accorded some space.

For a book entitled, "Education in New Jersey," however, the study at hand is too institutional and legislative. Its major weakness is the failure to relate educational events to the social and political milieu in a consistent and thorough fashion. Only when interpreting the materials already presented in secondary works does Dr. Burr achieve something of a bird's-eye view. The pages devoted to minutiae become a blur of trees wherein the reader is hard put to it to see the forest. This may be ascribed partly to the author's many allusions to persons and events requiring more identification than he gives, partly to philosophical difficulties, and partly to apparent failure to consult some recent monographs that would have been useful.

The philosophical difficulties emanate from the writer's vague use of the term "democracy." The reader is told, without any regard for modern scholarship, concerning the splits within America's revolutionary movement against Great Britain, that they represented a surge toward "democracy." Had the trends within that movement been given some attention, Dr. Burr's treatment of the common school revival—disappointingly superficial—would have been greatly enriched. Accepting the old "humanitarian" version of conservative support for school reform, he dismisses as "naive" the motive of social insurance against the rise of the common man. The dismissal, unfortunately, is not supported with any evidence whatever.

Indeed, the author's historical method is occasionally heavy-handed. The "influence" of a pamphlet or newspaper is referred to, but there are no circulation figures adduced. Legislative reports and bills are taken to be evidence of "public" interest in the matter at issue, a nonsequitur all too common in educational history.
For more leverage in the department of facts the author would have done well to consult the studies of Klingberg and Purcell. For both facts and problems of interpretation he might profitably have used the well-known monograph on denominational colleges by Tewksbury, and the present reviewer's study of the common school revival.

Camp Crowder


When the numerous threads of the American slavery story are gathered together into a definitive opus the author will be indebted to Mrs. Nuernberger for her study of this minor theme which has altogether escaped the attention of historians or to which only passing allusion has been made.

This is an account of those conscientious objectors of the 1830's-1850's who were not content with the mere denunciation of slavery but who hoped to end slavery by making it economically unprofitable through boycott. They saw that the institution throve due to the consumption of slave-produced commodities, such as cotton, coffee, sugar and rice; to end the evil, and to be consistent in principle, they abstained from use of all goods into which slave labor had gone. Promoters of the boycott perforce had to secure these necessities from producers at home and abroad who guaranteed their production by free labor, and stores had to be established for their distribution to an anticipated widening market. From many scattered sources Mrs. Nuernberger has pieced together the history of the free produce movement, a little known phase of abolitionism, and one pre-dominantly under "liberal and radical" Quaker leadership centered in Philadelphia.

In the first of the six chapters into which the monograph is divided Mrs. Nuernberger traces the origin of the free produce principle to eighteenth-century Quaker leaders, such as John Woolman, Ralph Sandiford, Benjamin Lay and Warner Mifflin. In subsequent chapters she discusses the founding of societies to encourage the use of only free-made goods; the evolution of the movement in the 1840's into an enterprise conducted by Quakers who looked with disfavor upon the aggressive, indiscriminate activities of the main body of abolitionists; the search for free-made goods at home and abroad; the work of George W. Taylor, a Philadelphian who "bore the brunt of all the difficulties in obtaining goods, the complaints of customers, the delays, disappointments and the financial sacrifices involved"; and, finally, an estimate of the publicity given the movement and a summary of its effectiveness as a part of the attack on slavery are given.

Conscience yielded to the dollar, the author concludes, and "free produce failed because it made too heavy an economic demand on the individual."
To this fundamental weakness must be added that to all but the conscientious few it was a colorless, unexciting way of opposing slavery in an era when stirring, crusading programs were afoot. It was only one reform among many; those who might otherwise have labored in its behalf had their energy diverted into more appealing programs. Total membership in the free produce societies never exceeded fifteen hundred, and those who made some effort to purchase only free labor goods totalled about five or six thousand.

Mrs. Nuermberger’s study will be of value not only to the student of the American slavery question but in it will be found suggestive material for those interested in the general reform movement of the pre-Civil War generation. Students of Quakerism will note how differing opinions toward social questions have rent the Society of Friends. The observant will not fail to see the relationship between the quiet, earnest efforts of the Quakers in the free produce movement and later Quaker activity in aiding the freedmen, protecting the Indian, furthering education, and promoting peace. Philadelphians desirous of reassessing the role of their city in American history will discover in Mrs. Nuermberger’s treatment of this subject another instance of the Quaker City’s initiative and leadership.

Muhlenberg College

Norman B. Wilkinson

Benjamin Furly and Quakerism in Rotterdam. By William I. Hull. Swarthmore College Monographs in Quaker History, Number Five. (Swarthmore: Swarthmore College, 1941. xvii, 314 p. $3.50.)

Several of Professor Hull’s friends (among them Dr. Thomas K. Brown, editor of the Bulletin of the Friends Historical Association, and Professor Henry J. Cadbury of Harvard) have edited the manuscript of this book which was among the literary remains of Dr. Hull. Of this series of valuable volumes, five have now appeared in print, and four manuscripts more, in Dr. Hull’s writing, still survive. They are to appear at a later date.

Benjamin Furly (1636–1714) was one of the more important of the early Quakers, considered from the historical point of view. He was born in England, but moved to Holland at an early date, and the story of Quakerism on the Continent cannot be told without mention of Furly. Furly was an apologist of ability, a student of some of the more obscure seventeenth-century mystics, a leader in the Quaker Meeting in Holland, and, what is more important for Pennsylvania, he was the land agent who sold to the Hollanders and the Germans tracts of land in Penn’s American colony. And, like most of the early Quakers, he was a learned man, fully in touch with the intellectual currents of his age.

This book consists of two related parts: first, Benjamin Furly, and second, Quakerism in Holland. All the known facts about both aspects of the subject are presented in a sober, solid, and at times imaginative manner. For the background of the Continental migrations to Pennsylvania this
work provides an essential and necessary study of the original sources. The editors might have been more careful with several of the background facts: William III was not the son-in-law of Charles II, but of James II; and England was not in alliance with Louis XIV in the war against Holland.

Allentown

JOHN JOSEPH STOUDT


Two shibboleths dominate the international political thinking of most Americans. One is the Monroe Doctrine; the other is the presence of the long unfortified boundary between the United States and Canada. Yet, how many people in Philadelphia know that one of her sons, Richard Rush, inaugurated the conversations which led to the former, and concluded the negotiations consummating the latter? In fact, how many Philadelphians are familiar with the name of Richard Rush?

In the most satisfying of the fine series of “Pennsylvania Lives” yet published, Dr. John Powell has written a notable biography of one of the important secondary figures of the first half century of American political life. Richard Rush, son of the famous Dr. Benjamin Rush, was one of those early legal lights who gave the phrase “Philadelphia lawyer” its currency. He began his public career as Attorney General of Pennsylvania, then stepped on the national stage as Comptroller of the Treasury in 1811. In 1814 President Madison appointed him Attorney General of the United States, and in 1817 President Monroe made him Secretary of State. From 1817 to 1825 Rush served as minister to the Court of St. James, where he enjoyed measurable success in promoting Anglo-American accord in those difficult years after our second war with England. He returned to become Adams’ Secretary of the Treasury and to run unsuccessfully for vice president in 1828. Eight years later Rush went to England to arrange for the acceptance of the Smithson bequest which eventuated in the Smithsonian Institution. In 1847 he rounded out his public services as minister to France.

Richard Rush never became a popular figure. By temperament and training he was an aristocrat; only intellectually was he democratic. It followed, therefore, that his services to the democracy of Jefferson and Jackson had to be performed in appointive rather than elective offices. His facile pen also was devoted to his party’s cause in many anonymous political writings. Richard Rush suffers by comparison with his distinguished father. The fire, verve and popularity of the Doctor, who boasted that his patients came from the poorer classes, contrast oddly with the solid, sedate qualities of his patrician son.

The life of Richard Rush presents an intriguing and challenging case history of what may be termed the decline of public personnel in Philadelphia after 1800. Rush and his contemporaries—Dallas, Girard, Ingersoll,
etc.—lacked the stature of their immediate revolutionary predecessors, such as Franklin, Dr. Rush and Rittenhouse, who had made their city one of the great political and cultural centers of the world. When New England, Virginia and the West furnished new ideas and powerful and dynamic leaders to the nation, Philadelphia and Pennsylvania seemed lacking in new views and apparently produced public men of charm and taste who failed to sense the new winds of politics and culture. The reasons for this state of affairs would bear careful historical investigation.

Mr. Powell is to be commended for the soundness of his scholarship, his judicious estimate of his subject, and especially for his graceful style. He possesses a fine concept of biography which we hope to see exhibited again in his projected life of John Dickinson.

Fort Schuyler, New York

Carl Bridenbaugh

The Ira D. Sankey Centenary; Proceedings of the Centenary Celebration of the Birth of Ira D. Sankey, together with some hitherto unpublished Sankey Correspondence. (New Castle, Pennsylvania, 1941. 109 pages.)

Happy is that nation that occasionally finds its horizon of experience brightened by a personality that has caught the glow of Christian living and has the facility of expressing it in hymn singing and also has the faculty of imparting that enthusiasm on a high level among the general run of Christians. A man of such capacity was Ira D. Sankey, whose contribution to the religious life of our nation was commemorated last year. The result is the centenary volume under review.

This little volume, too limited for an adequate appraisal of this man's work, contains addresses in honor of Ira D. Sankey, and an interesting collection of letters by him and from others who knew him. The biographical addresses reveal that his ancestors were active in the pioneer life of America, in its defense, and in its commercial growth. Ira's father served in the legislative halls of his state and is regarded as the originator of the movement for the creation of Lawrence County, in which Edenburg, where Sankey was born on August 28, 1840, is located. At the time of his birth Edenburg was still in Mercer County, Pennsylvania.

The meeting, at an early morning prayer meeting in Indianapolis in 1870, of Dwight L. Moody and Ira D. Sankey opened the way for a friendship and workmanship unique in the history of our country. This meeting which, humanly speaking, may have seemed casual, in the light of the results appears to have been purposeful according to the divine order. Thereafter "Moody went forth to preach his message and Sankey went forth to sing."

The letters reveal much of the human side in Ira D. Sankey's life. They portray the hardships, climaxed by his own blindness, which was borne with fortitude and grace, under which Sankey labored. The incidental but important happenings that run through his life find attention in this work.
The story of the poem, "The Ninety and Nine," which he read one day in a newspaper, and which he set to music one night when Moody asked for a hymn to illustrate his sermon, "The Good Shepherd," is one of the most striking of these incidents. His sense of humor served him through many trying and wearisome labors, as revealed in the following: "Now if Jeff will not work so hard and fish more, May will not be a widow for a long time. I hope you are catching fish. We are catching men." From the royalties of his "Gospel Hymn" he gave East Hall to Northfield Seminary, Recitation Hall to Mount Hermon, and provided New Castle with its first Y. M. C. A. building and the ground for the First Methodist Church.

The success of the labors of both Moody and Sankey was voiced by the latter as follows: "I have been around the world almost and have found no new way to heaven; nor have I found a preacher with a particle of power to lead men away from their sins to the living God, who teaches any other than the old Gospel." The Gospel was the passion and power of their labors.

Presbyterian Historical Society

GUY S. KLETT


Mr. Bond has intelligently interpreted "drama" to include such theatrical forms as the minstrel show and the musical comedy, and such phenomena related to the strictly histrionic arts as the dance and song. He deals not only with dramas (in this enlarged sense) by Negroes, but also in dramas about Negroes, and with Negro actors, dancers, and musicians. He has periodized his account neatly and usefully. How completely he has covered the ground it is impossible for any but a specialist to say; on the one hand some very minor figures and events are dealt with, while on the other Wittke's work on the minstrel show does not appear in the bibliography.

The book is not very interesting reading. It is uncritical, and inclined to accept "rave notices" at their face value. One gathers that the author is not himself a student and critic of the literary arts, but rather a neophyte in the social sciences. Had he chosen to deal with his topic in a simple calendar-chronology, he could have produced a useful reference book. Having elected, however, to cast it into the form of historico-literary criticism, he has rendered it less useful for reference purposes, without the compensatory advantages of distinction of style and clarity of viewpoint such as are proper to the form.

The National Archives

PAUL LEWINSON
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

SIR:

Miss Edna Vosper, reviewing my *Lafayette and the Close of the American Revolution* in the April number of your magazine, contends that I have depended exclusively on “Lafayette’s letters and memoirs” for the evaluation of Lafayette’s services without using “the evidence of other participants.” If you will consult the entries under “Archives” (pp. 435-36), “Bibliothèque” (p. 437), “Library” (p. 447), and “Society, historical” (p. 454), as well as under the several names of the owners of private collections, you will find there references to all of the libraries your reviewer mentions—and a number of others. You will also find that my footnotes refer not only to Lafayette’s letters, but also to those of others to him and of third persons about him.

Miss Vosper approves of my use of the Sparks collections in the Harvard Library. The only other one of the libraries Miss Vosper named whose collections I did not examine in person for materials by, to and on Lafayette was the Clements Library, where I was obliged to depend upon others, including the librarian and his staff, who saw to it that I got notes and photostats. The paucity of my references to the Clements Library, however, does not indicate the extent of my use of that library, for (to avoid unnecessary pedantry, which your reviewer implies she would have preferred) I cited only the best printed sources whenever I was convinced of their accuracy. If I did not use the Clements Library’s collections on the peace negotiations, as Miss Vosper laments, it is for exactly the reason that I do not expect my plumber to make all the tools he uses, no matter how fine a toolmaker he may be, when there are effective tools already at hand. If Miss Vosper, however, can point to documents bearing on Lafayette’s part in those negotiations or any other episodes narrated in this volume that have escaped me, or can cite instances where I have quoted documents falsely because I depended upon inferior sources although the originals exist, I shall be grateful for a note from her to that effect. But if she can do neither of those things or can do them only in isolated instances, then I think her final sentence to the effect that “the failure to utilize the untapped manuscript sources . . . means that the research student can never rely on this book . . .” is entirely unjustified.

Miss Vosper also says my bibliographical notes evince “failure to discuss primary sources, particularly the manuscript collections.” I refer you to the bibliographical notes on pp. 20-21, 55, 93, 120, 141-42, 245, 271-72, 306 and 328 for discussions of manuscript sources (which are, however, more copiously mentioned in the footnotes, since I made a deliberate effort to avoid references to secondary material except in the bibliographical notes).

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS GOTTSCHALK
SIR:

I have read with considerable care Mr. Gottschalk's objections to my review and have not only checked his references, but reread both his book and my review.

I believe my review refutes most of Mr. Gottschalk's points. I did not express disappointment at his failure to utilize "material by, to or on Lafayette," but at the apparent failure to study the great manuscript collections made available within the last thirty years for a truer understanding of the broad course of events in which Lafayette participated. Only in this way can one gain a fair appraisal of Lafayette's achievements in relation to the whole, and it means studying those materials apparently having no bearing on Lafayette as an individual. Mr. Gottschalk does not say that he has done this.

Nor do I find on checking that the bibliographical notes contain what I consider a discussion of manuscript sources—their scope, value, provenance, and proportion that has found its way into print. On one page only, page 245, is there a semblance of such a discussion; the other references he gives me are only citations, references to collections, or textual notes. On page 245 what is said bears out my contention. Mr. Gottschalk there states that the Wayne Papers are in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania and that much of the correspondence was published in a periodical called The casket or flowers of literature, wit, and sentiment. To any one who has surveyed the Wayne Papers this is surprising. On the same page he says that the best sources for the Virginia campaign are Tarleton's, and Simcoe's books and the Clinton-Cornwallis correspondence, printed in various editions, but best edited by Stevens. These are good, but the "best sources" are the Clinton and Cornwallis letters and letters of other officers in the Public Record Office and in the Germain and Clinton Papers in the William L. Clements Library. While Mr. Gottschalk refers the reader to the Clinton-Cornwallis correspondence, he refers only to an incomplete, printed book.

It is exceedingly regrettable to me that Mr. Gottschalk is displeased by my review, for he has done much excellent work. All historians are so deeply indebted to him for the Lafayette data he has assembled and for the skill with which he has presented it, that to emphasize in this way what has not been done seems very ungrateful. We owe him much, and I sincerely hope that Mr. Gottschalk believes me when I assure him that I am not unmindful of it.

EDNA VOSPER

SIR:

In his petulant and supercilious review of Johann Conrad Beissel, Mr. Stoudt has employed three age-old devices for discrediting an author. He begins by misapprehending, or feigning to misapprehend, my purpose,
which was not to "popularize" Beissel's "worth" (I don't know how I should go about doing that), but to paint a portrait of him that would be neither erudite nor superficial. The book, one of a series, was expected to follow certain prescriptions: I was desired to make it accurate and yet, if possible, diverting; scholarly and yet artistic. I did not labor under the illusion that I could write a conclusive life of Beissel. I doubt whether anybody could; the data are ambiguous, and the things we most want to know are of such a nature that only Beissel or God could make a decisive pronouncement concerning them. I said this—I trust, with becoming modesty—at the beginning of the Bibliographical Note, and, for that matter, elsewhere. Is it too much to ask that Klein's achievement be judged according to Klein’s goal?

Mr. Stoudt has another way of placing me in an unfavorable light. When he addresses himself to specific questions, he states my conclusions with misleading disingenuousness, at times conceding my point in the very act of ascribing to me something I neither meant nor said. In spite of the care I took, on page 1, to defend Beissel against those who might be disposed to regard him as a "mere crackpot," Mr. Stoudt takes me to task for portraying Beissel as "a scoundrel of admitted fascination, a religious crackpot able to command the loyal devotion of men far more able than he." He omits to observe that I trace Beissel's Sabbatarianism not solely to Böhme, but also to colonial Sabbatarians. Beissel "shares the good and the evil of mysticism; he was certainly no saint." Capital! What is the difference between my position and this? My answers are all wrong, and Mr. Stoudt has the right answers, but he makes a secret of them. Scholars will welcome his solutions of the complex problems of Beissel’s life and work, if they prove to be solutions. If, like his lilies, they merely grow and grow without getting anywhere, we shall be disappointed.

These two forms of attack would mar any serious review, but Mr. Stoudt, it would seem, has resolved not to spare me any strictures. He becomes unnecessarily personal. I am not "a Boehme expert." I fail "to integrate Beissel with his background," because I have not a competent knowledge of mysticism. I have studied it and practised it for the last twenty years. In my twenties, I served three years as a novice and four years as junior professed in a society of mission priests. I have had intimate conversation with religious of all sorts. Naturally, this experience has taught me something. Because men are invincibly human, the religious life displays the same essential features at all times and in all places. If Mr. Stoudt thinks that his knowledge of Böhmism is greater than mine, I think that my knowledge of religious communities is greater than his. Yet only Mr. Stoudt's unfortunate review would have goaded me into saying so.

WALTER C. KLEIN
SIR:

I have given the matter deep thought and have come to the decision that I shall not reply to Dr. Klein's letter to the editor, not wishing to be drawn into controversy at this time. Personally I am sorry that my review of his book hurt Dr. Klein's feelings. My opinion of the book is not changed—and I have reread it—and were I to review it again I would probably be stricter than previously.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. STOUDT