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G. P. A. Healy’s “The Peace Makers” shows (left to right) Sherman conferring with Grant, Lincoln, and Admiral Porter on board the steamer River Queen at City Point, Virginia, late in March, 1865.
The immediate purpose of General Grant’s operations in the Western theater of war, beginning early in 1862, was to bring as much of Confederate Tennessee under Union control as possible, while the more general objective (achieved at Vicksburg in mid-1863) was control of the entire Mississippi. The Battle of Shiloh, or Pittsburg Landing, fought April 6 and 7 following Grant’s February capture of Forts Henry and Donelson on the Tennessee and Cumberland rivers, successfully culminated the first phase of this effort.

The Union victory at Shiloh was gained at a high price. That battle was the first major engagement in the West; it was also one of the bloodiest of the entire Civil War. Grant’s Army of the Tennessee, whose leading division was commanded by William T. Sherman, was all but routed on the 6th, though discipline was to some extent restored by evening. The following day the Union forces, strengthened by Lew Wallace’s fresh division and by the arrival of the Army of the Ohio under Don Carlos Buell, were able to rally and drive the Confederates from the field. The enemy, whose preparatory movements had been largely screened by the rough wooded terrain along the Tennessee River, had struck before expected on the morning of the 6th. The troops that were camped on the west bank around Pittsburg Landing had had plenty of time to entrench but had not done so; Grant
Eric L. McKitrick

was breakfasting at a headquarters nine miles down the river on
the other side when the fighting began; not many who saw the
first day’s butchery ever succeeded in describing it with detach-
ment. For a good part of the day the Union forces were an ill-
controlled mob, crazed with panic, surging back and forth over
their own comrades’ corpses. Few of the commanders had much
idea where the others were or what they were doing. There were
13,000 casualties out of about 63,000 engaged, and on the Con-
federate side, the loss was 11,000 out of 40,000. The Confederates
lost their commander, Albert Sidney Johnston, one of the South’s
ablest generals.

The experience of Shiloh, despite its victorious outcome, was a
traumatic shock to all who had participated in it. For many years
afterward there would be bitterness and recrimination between
Grant’s command, whose chief spokesman was Sherman (Grant
himself remaining aloof), and that of General Buell. The con-
troversy over just how the blame for the first day’s errors should
be assigned, and where the credit for the second day’s recovery
should be awarded, is by its very nature such that nobody can
ever quite settle it. It was carried on, both at service reunions and
in print, for as long as any of the participants remained alive.

Generally speaking, the dispute revolves about the following
points: (1) The degree to which carelessness on Grant’s and
Sherman’s part permitted them to be caught on the morning of
the 6th; (2) the slowness of Buell in arriving; and (3) the extent
to which Buell contributed to the victory. Buell arrived by boat
during the first afternoon, and the first thing he saw was the mill-
ing chaos of stragglers fleeing from the lines. He was shocked, and
said so. Sherman, doubtless touchy over the multiple implications
of this, never gave Buell the credit which the latter thought he
should have had for the battle’s outcome, and actually objected
when he thought Buell’s work of the 7th was praised too highly.
Buell, for his part, was not inclined to be charitable toward what
he thought were slovenly preparations.
General Buell's Version of Shiloh

Such a situation, as we may see, can make for endless wrangling. Buell, a conscientious and able soldier, had a case; so, for that matter, had Sherman, even though Shiloh was not by any means his or Grant's finest hour. Though we cannot go into the merits of the case here, it is worth saying that there was no charlatanry on either side. It was an honest — and extremely bitter — difference of viewpoint.

The following document, one of several bearing on the argument, is being published for the first time. It was written as a letter to the editor of the United States Service Magazine, Henry Coppée, some time in 1865 as a rejoinder to one that Sherman had published in the January number of the same journal. Shortly after this time the magazine went out of existence and Buell's letter was never printed. The original of the letter was discovered about twenty years ago by Allan Nevins, now DeWitt Clinton Professor Emeritus of American History, in the possession of a rare book dealer in Baltimore. Professor Nevins purchased the letter and has recently given it to the Columbia Libraries. The text is here given in full.
This picture of Southern boys in camp indicates the youthfulness of many of the troops. This factor, which was present with Union troops as well, led both to heroism and on occasion to panic and rout.
The Battle of Shiloh,
or Pittsburg Landing.

DON CARLOS BUell

To
Professor Henry Coppée [Editor],
United States Service Magazine,

Major General Sherman is apprehensive that the sketch of Lieutenant General Grant published in the June number of the United States Service Magazine, is “likely to perpetuate an error, which General Grant may not deem of sufficient importance to correct”. He reminds you that his “life is liable to cease at any moment” — says that he “happens to be a witness to certain truths which are now beginning to pass out of memory, and from what is called history” — a result which it appears he does not like; and on these grounds, he asks you to excuse a “long letter”, which he informs you “is very unusual” for him, and which I have only seen in the papers of this city, under the caption of “A Vindication of General Grant”

General Sherman tells you that “as General Taylor is said in his latter days to have doubted whether he was at the battle of Buenavista at all, on account of the many things having transpired there, according to the historians, which he did not see, so he (General Sherman) begins to doubt whether he was at the battle of Pittsburg Landing of modern description”; but he omits to mention, by way of perfecting the comparison that General Taylor was the Commander-in-Chief at the battle of Buenavista, and that his doubt had allusion to the pretensions of an ambitious subordinate, whose position was, perhaps, more analagous to
The siege-battery, above the Landing, that was a part of the “last line” in the first day’s battle when the Confederate advance was finally halted.

General Sherman’s than was General Sherman’s to General Taylor’s. However that may be, if General Sherman will turn to the published accounts of the battle of Shiloh given at the time by eye witnesses from his own camps, he will be better satisfied with the “modern descriptions”.

If General Sherman really desired to vindicate General Grant, he has in some respects executed his purpose very poorly; and if on the contrary he only yielded to an inordinate egotism and itching for fame, by inviting more than the liberal praise which has already been bestowed on him, and above all by gratuitously disparaging the services of others, then he has fallen short of a deportment suited to his official honors.*

The passage in your article to which he takes exception —

*This paragraph was crossed out in pencil on the manuscript, possibly by someone other than the author. The latter’s corrections were made in ink.

— EDITOR
leaving out some complimentary allusion to myself — is in words that, "but for the immediate and timely arrival of General Buell’s forces, and the conduct of that officer, the disaster of the first day (at the battle of Shiloh) might not have been retrieved"; and by way of vindicating General Grant from such an aspersion, he goes on to say a great deal about himself and less about General Grant. He tells you that “General Grant visited his division about 10 o’clock a.m.” during the first day’s fight, and “after some general conversation, remarked that he (Sherman) was doing right in stubbornly opposing the progress of the enemy; and in answer to his (Sherman’s) inquiry as to cartridges, told him that he (Grant) had anticipated their want”, etc., and “then said his (Grant’s) presence was more needed over at the left”. He tells you that General Grant visited him again “about 5 o’clock, before sunset”; and after they had explained to each other the condition of affairs, and “agreed that the enemy had expended the furore of his attack, they estimated their losses, and approximated their then strength”. He tells you that General Grant then ordered him, (the commander of a division,) [*] to get all things ready and assume the offensive next morning”. This he says “was before General Buell had arrived”; leaving it to be inferred that General Grant had not made known to him the fact that he had seen General Buell, that his troops were then actually arriving at the river, and that support was certainly to be expected from that source; but that without reference to such support he had determined to assume the offensive with the remnant of his force. As if doubtful whether even his own troops who were present at that battle would credit such a representation of the case, he reiterates that he “knows he had orders from General Grant to assume the offensive, before he (Sherman) knew Buell was on the west bank of the Tennessee”; and that “the troops in the front line had at 4 o’clock p.m., checked the enemy, and were preparing the next

*Except for a few editorial additions, in brackets, Buell’s article is reproduced exactly as he wrote it.
Wounded men and stragglers coming back to the landing, while ammunition wagons go towards the front.
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day to assume the offensive ["]. He remembers ["] the fact the better from General Grant’s anecdote of his Donelson battle, which he told him then for the first time — that at a certain period of the battle, he saw that either side was ready to give way if the other showed a bold front, and that he determined to do that very thing, to advance on the enemy, when, as he prognosticated, the enemy surrendered”. You are thus given to understand, according to General Sherman, that at a certain period of the battle at Donelson, General Grant’s thirty or thirty five thousand men were ready to give way if his adversary ten or twelve thousand strong, with an impassable river in his rear, had shown a bold front, and that Grant triumphed by bravado. You are told that at 4 o’clock, p.m. on the 6th of April,—by which time the camps of his army, with 4000 prisoners and half of his artillery, were in the hands of the enemy; 6,000 of his men killed or wounded; 20,000 routed and demoralized and swarming down the river for miles, with longing eyes turned to the opposite shore, or crouching beneath the bank in a paralysis of fear; and with probably not more than 10,000 men in ranks on the field of battle — you are told that under these circumstances General Grant “thought the appearances the same, (as at the battle of Donelson,) and he judged with Lew Wallace’s fresh division, and such of our startled troops as had gained their equilibrium, he would be justified in dropping the defensive and assuming the offensive in the morning”!

And General Sherman reiterates again, as if to insist that this determination was formed without regard to the succor which was at hand, that he “received such orders before he knew General Buell’s troops were at the river”. He assures you also that “there was no

1 Sherman’s letter states at this point: “I never was disposed, nor am I now, to question any thing done by General Buell and his army, and know that approaching our field of battle from the rear, he encountered that sickening crowd of laggards and fugitives that excited his contempt, and that of his army, who never gave full credit to those in the front line, who did fight hard, and who had, at four P.M., checked the enemy, and were preparing the next day to assume the offensive.” United States Service Magazine, Vol. III, no. 1, January 1865, page 2.
mistake” in debarking that army on the west bank of the river — that “it was not then a question of military skill and strategy, but of courage and pluck”, with much more such matter which it would be wearisome to repeat. But even the merit of committing no error in that particular, according to General Sherman, was not General Grant’s but General Charles F. Smith’s, by whom the selection of the ground 2 and all the dispositions of the troops were made, before General Grant succeeded to the command.

These are remarkable declarations, as regards the facts, opinions and assumptions which they set forth. They relieve General Grant justly of much responsibility that was supposed to rest upon him: they transfer, justly or unjustly, to General Charles F. Smith who is in his grave, the responsibility of landing the Army of the Tennessee on the west bank of the river, and, by inference, of whatever misfortune resulted from that act; which at the same time they undertake to justify on the absurd plea that it was necessary in that way “to test the manhood” 3 of the troops: they virtually deny that the Army of the Tennessee was reduced to very straightened circumstances on the 6th of April; and they make

2 Sherman wrote that the battle-field “was chosen by that veteran soldier, Major-General Charles F. Smith, who ordered my division to disembark there, and strike for the Charleston Railroad. This order was subsequently modified, by his ordering Hurlbut’s Division to disembark there, and mine higher up the Tennessee, to the mouth of Yellow Creek, to strike the railroad at Burnsville. But floods prevented our reaching the railroad, when General Smith ordered me in person also to disembark at Pittsburg Landing, and take post well out, so as to make plenty of room, with Snake and Lick Creeks the flanks of a camp for the grand army of invasion. It was General Smith who selected that field of battle, and it was well chosen. On any other we surely would have been overwhelmed, as both Lick and Snake Creeks forced the enemy to confine his movement to a direct front attack, which new troops are better qualified to resist than where the flanks are exposed to a real or chimerical danger.” Ibid, pages 3-4.

3 Sherman’s statement was as follows: “It was necessary that a combat, fierce and bitter, to test the manhood of the two armies, should come off, and that was as good a place as any. It was not then a question of military skill and strategy, but of courage and pluck, and I am convinced that every life lost that day to us was necessary, for otherwise at Corinth, at Memphis, at Vicksburg, we would have found harder resistance, had we not shown our enemies that, rude and un-tutored as we then were, we could fight as well as they.” Ibid, page 4.
General Sherman the dominant figure in the scenes which they depict. Such declarations are not all to be taken on faith. If they are satisfactory so far as General Grant's responsibility for the debarkation of the army on the west bank of the Tennessee is concerned, they are not conclusive in regard to the propriety of that act, or General Smith's responsibility for it; nor above all are they satisfactory in regard to the surprise and neglects which occasioned a loss of 13,000 men to that army, and drove it to the very verge of ruin. The tide of popular favor has given too much weight to General Sherman's expressions to make it a gratuitous labor to expose his falacies [sic], and I shall state some facts affecting these two points. They are not to be set down to the score of crimination or recrimination, for they concern the history of those events, and have an important bearing on the representation which General Sherman has made of my connection with them.

First: The army of General Grant was not, for the particular movement up the Tennessee, an independent force sent to occupy a certain point threatened by the enemy, but was one of two separate armies which were ordered to form a junction and make what General Sherman calls a "grand army of invasion", the objective point of which was expected to be Corinth, where it was understood the enemy was concentrating. To place the two portions of that combined army on opposite sides of a formidable river — one of them within twenty miles of a greatly superior force, as that of the enemy was supposed to be — when no precise time had been fixed for the junction — when in fact the other portion was not prepared to move, and had one hundred and forty miles to march, at a season of the year when unavoidable delays were to be expected — is so repugnant to common sense, that it is unnecessary to say what military rules it violated, or what, if any, it did not violate. The responsibility of that error cannot be made to rest on the memory of General Smith until it is shown what instructions he acted under and what confirmation his acts received. General Sherman does not mitigate the error, to whom-
sover it may attach, by stating in one place that floods prevented him from striking for the rail road at Burnsville, with one division, say 8,000 men, within fourteen miles of “the concentrated armies of Johnston, Beauregard, and Bragg”; to operate against which he admits in another place that a “grand army of invasion” — in fact, more than one hundred thousand men — was forming under General Halleck. His declaration that the question was not one of “military skill and strategy, but of courage and pluck”, may answer the purpose of a claptrap, but does not befit a man who aspires to the direction of armies.

Second: A greater mistake than that of false position, was the neglect of all proper measures against the danger with which he says that force was threatened in that faulty position; and probably no person was more justly blamable for that mistake than General Sherman himself. General Grant as the Commander was of course to be regarded as responsible for the acts of his subordinates, and he has not that I have heard attempted to evade the responsibility; but General Sherman states that the disposition of the troops was made before Grants [sic] arrival; General Smith was to my knowledge on his death-bed at Savanna; and if General Grant’s presence was necessary at that place, General Sherman, though the second in rank was the only high officer of military education and experience with the troops; his division formed the first line, or advanced guard, and it was natural that General Grant should rely on an officer of his intelligence in such a position for all proper precautions against sudden peril.

At all events, to whomsoever that duty belonged, no condition of things could more have disappointed such an expectation. The troops were distributed in convenient camping places, and so as “to make plenty of room for the grand army of invasion”; no line or plan of battle, or coherency of action, was prescribed and made familiar to the various commands; no entrenchments or other defensive works were prepared; unguarded ravines penetrated the camps and, used by the enemy, prevented direct communication
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between some of the corps; the crossings of Lick Creek, three miles distant, which the enemy passed to make the attack, were undefended and unguarded; and a few pickets thrown out half a mile from some of the camps, formed the only safeguard against the sudden onset of an enemy. The consequence was that, so far as preparation for battle is concerned, no army could well have been taken more by surprise than was the Army of the Tennessee on the 6th of April. It was not such a surprise as might result from the fancied absence of an enemy — for the confederate cavalry had actually hovered about the army for two days — but it was the more culpable surprise resulting from a total want of suitable preparation. The enemy deliberately formed his line of battle within one mile of the camps, and in some instances the first indication of his presence in any force, was the appearance of his skirmishes in the camps while the soldiers were leisurely getting out of their beds, or preparing their breakfast by the campfires. When suddenly assailed and enveloped — separated in many cases more than half a mile by dense woods from their comrades of neighboring commands, and of whose fate or condition they could know nothing — what wonder that disorder and confusion prevented them from offering any effectual resistance? It is a scandal to assert that the battle of the 6th was any fair “test of the manhood” of the troops who were routed or captured, though it was indeed a severe test of their discipline. Nor will it do to ascribe the disaster of that day to the rawness of the troops, or the numerical superiority of the enemy. Many of the troops had been months in the service under Grant, C. F. Smith, and Sherman, had taken part in the campaign against Donelson, and seen other service. I myself contributed twelve regiments to that force early in February, and four of them were comparatively old regiments. If part of the force was quite new, that was equally the case with the Army of the Ohio, and perhaps every other then in the field. General Grant’s army was not inferior in numbers to its assailant. It is now known that the latter did not much if at all exceed forty thousand
men while the former must have been nearer fifty thousand strong.

Public opinion at home and abroad has adjudged, justly, that the debarkation of General Grants [sic] army on the west bank of the river was an error, seeing that it was considered to be in the presence of a superior adversary; it has also adjudged that the battle of the 6th was ushered upon the Army of the Tennessee under the auspices of grave neglects; and I have a very poor opinion of the intelligence or candor of those who may undertake to deny that that army was rescued from a destruction which had already virtually overtaken it, by the timely presence and valor of the Army of Ohio. The first fault was in the violation of a military principle, but it would not probably have been attended with disastrous consequences had it not been for the second fault; because, contrary to the previous supposition, the Army of the Tennessee was not numerically inferior to the attacking army, and might at least have been made secure in a strong position. It is the part of true manliness and honesty in those concerned, to frankly admit these facts, and repose on the sturdy efforts which they made to retrieve their error. Faults are not so rare in war, however skillful the officer, as not to be viewed with a generous forbearance when they are balanced by important services and gallant deportment; unless, indeed, they are impudently denied, or attempted to be screened by disparagements or imputations on the labors of others.

I do not know when General Grant visited General Sherman on the 6th, or what order he gave him; but in examining the ground in front of his line, I visited him myself a little after dark. He said nothing to me of any orders that he had received, or of what he proposed to do; but either in answer to his inquiry or at my own volition, I told him that I was going to attack the enemy at day light in the morning, and he expressed gratification that such was to be the plan of action. This so far as I was concerned was not the result of any orders of General Grant, nor was the question discussed between us. I presume that neither of us thought there was
any thing else to do. In his official report General Sherman says nothing about having received orders on the evening of the 6th to advance, or “assume the offensive”, on the following morning; but he does say that he received such orders at daylight on the morning of the 7th, and that he then dispatched staff officers “to hurry up all the men [sic] they could find, and especially” a brigade which had been separated from him during the battle. By that time my troops were actually in motion. General Sherman tells you that he “understood General Grant’s forces were to advance on the right of the Corinth road, and Buell’s on the left”. I know nothing of any such understanding, and certainly I did not pretend to conform to it. I must confess that I did not expect much assistance from General Grant’s troops, but I could by no means say now that they did not contribute materially to the success on the 7th. I put Nelson’s division in front of their left after dark on the night of the 6th, and Crittenden’s remained in the road to take position in the morning according to what I should discover of the ground and the position of the enemy. These divisions advanced about daylight the next morning. Nelson’s very soon became engaged, and continued so without any material intermission until the enemy was driven from the field in the afternoon. Crittenden followed Nelson and took position on his right, and McCook, who came up very soon after took position on Crittenden’s right. My belief is that McCook was advancing to attack by 10 o’clock, and this is confirmed by General Sherman’s official report, although his letter tells you that he waited for me until 12 o’clock. I do not know when General Sherman became engaged. If he waited for me, which certainly would have been very proper, I did not find him. In the course of the day my divisions passed through and drove the enemy from all of the advanced camps, except on the extreme right; a service which at that time General Sherman and the mass of that army did not hesitate to acknowledge in warmer terms than that they were merely glad we were
there. I do not know how General Sherman found the fighting on the 7th — no doubt much easier than on the 6th. I have quite as little doubt that the enemy found it just the reverse. The fighting which is attended with victory always seems easier than that which is marked by defeat and disaster.

General Sherman tells you that “General Buell’s troops took no essential part in the first days fight”. If he studied his words I do not agree with him; but if he means that they took no protracted part in the first days[sic]struggle he is correct. The leading brigade of Nelson’s division reached the west bank of the river about sunset, and, with a battery which was standing in park near the landing, was put into position, and repelled an attack which the enemy made with artillery and infantry at that moment at the landing. A member of General Grant’s staff on escort farther to the rear was killed in that attack, and the enemy’s projectiles fell into the river beyond the transports. It is impossible to tell what force the enemy brought to this attack, for the ground was screened by woods and ravines; but those who witnessed the condition of things about the landing before my troops arrived, will admit that there was very little prospect of resisting even a small force, and will hesitate to affirm that the action of my troops on that occasion was not decidedly an essential circumstance.

General Sherman thinks that “Criminations (such as he gives authenticity to in his letter) ought to be frowned down”; and he is, himself, the first official that I know of who has made the imputations contained in the following sentence which appears in his letter: “Our Army of the Tennessee have indulged in severe criti-

4 Buell refers to the following sentence of Sherman’s: “I admit that I was glad Buell was there, because I knew his troops were older than ours, and better systematized and drilled, and his arrival made that certain, which before was uncertain.” Ibid., page 3.

5 Sherman’s sentence continued as follows: “... and Grant’s army, though collected together hastily, green as militia, some regiments arriving without cartridges even, and nearly all hearing the dread sound of battle for the first time, had successfully withstood and repelled the first day’s terrific onset of a superior enemy, well commanded and well handled.” Ibid., page 2.
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cisms at the slow approach of that army, (the Army of the Ohio,) which knew the danger that threatened us from the concentrated armies of Johnston, Beauregard, and Bragg that lay at Corinth”. I will give you the facts to show that these imputations are unwarranted. The evidence to establish what I shall relate, is of record, but would too much encumber this letter, already longer than I could wish.

This map shows the movement of Union and Confederate troops leading up to the Battle of Shiloh.

First: The cooperation between the Army of the Ohio and the Army of the Tennessee for a campaign against the enemy’s forces in the neighborhood of Corinth, was concerted between General Halleck and myself while we were yet independent commanders
— he commanding the Department of Missouri, and I the Department of the Ohio — and while my army was concentrating at Nashville. His troops moved by water up the Tennessee, that being the most convenient, and in fact the only practicable route for them. I deemed it best that mine should march through by land, because such a movement would clear middle Tennessee of the enemy, and facilitate the occupation of the Memphis and Charleston rail road through north Alabama, to which I had assigned General Mitchel. I believed also that I could effect the movement almost as promptly that way as by water, and I knew that it would bring my army upon the field of future operations in better condition. I commenced my march from Nashville on the 15th of March with a rapid movement of cavalry, followed by McCook's division, to seize the bridges which were yet in the possession of the enemy. The latter, however, succeeded in destroying the bridge over Duck river, at Columbia, forty miles distant, and another a few miles further north. At that time our armies were not provided with ponton trains, and rivers had to be crossed with such means as we could make. The streams were out of their banks, Duck river was a formidable barrier, and it was not until the 31st that the army was able to cross. I state that the work of bridging was under intelligent officers whom I continually urged to complete it as soon as possible, and that it was prosecuted with energy and diligence; and no man is at liberty to throw doubt upon the fact without evidence to the contrary. In the meantime I had been placed by the War Department under the orders of General Halleck, and he designated Savanna on the east bank of the Tennessee as the place for our junction. The distance from Columbia is ninety miles and was marched at the rate of fifteen miles a day without a halt. The distance from Nashville is one hundred and thirty miles, and was marched in nine marching days; and twelve days were occupied in bridging streams. The rear divisions, in consequence of the battle made forced marches. The urgency was widely greater, but did General Sherman move more
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rapidly in going to the succor of Rosecran’s army which had been defeated at Chicamauga [sic] and was then sorely beleaguered at Chattanooga? I have not the data from which to draw the comparison exactly, but I should like it to be drawn with that, or any other march that General Sherman has ever made under similar circumstances; though I do not pretend that that would decide whether my movement was rapid or slow.

Second: The assertion that I knew that General Grant was in jeopardy has no foundation in truth, and I shall show that General Halleck and General Grant themselves could not have believed that such was the case. I have already stated that the original object of my movement was not to succor General Grant’s army, but to form a junction with it for an ulterior offensive campaign.
Savanna on the opposite side of the river from the enemy had been designated for the junction, and I supposed that the force I was to join was there, until within a few days of my arrival, when I casually learned otherwise; and then I was told that it was secure in the natural strength of the position. To make sure of what it was, in fact, unreasonable to doubt, I had previously, on the 18th, telegraphed to General Halleck: “I understand that General Grant is on the east side of the river; is it not so?”; and the reply did not inform me to the contrary. I was in communication with General Halleck by telegraph, as was also General Grant by telegraph and steamers; and I was in communication with General Grant by courriers [sic]. At no time did either of those officers inform me of Grant’s actual position or that he was thought to be in danger. But, furthermore, on the 3rd of April, as I approached Waynesboro, thirty miles from Savanna, I advised General Halleck by telegraph that at that place the road forked to strike the river at several points, one of them being Hamburg, which it appeared to me might be a more suitable point for me to cross than at Savanna, nine miles lower down. In reply, General Halleck approved of my suggestion, and directed me to halt at Waynesboro, saying that he could not leave St. Louis before the 7th to join us; but as his dispatch did not reach me before I arrived at Waynesboro, I made no halt, but continued my march to Savanna. And further yet: the day before his arrival at Savanna, General Nelson, who commanded my leading division, advised General Grant by courier [sic] of his approach, and was informed in reply that it was unnecessary to hasten his march, as he could not at any rate cross the river before the following tuesday [sic]. Nevertheless that division, and myself, arrived at Savanna Saturday, as I had directed. The next morning General Grant was attacked at Pittsburg Landing. And in spite of the declaration which General Sherman now makes, the presumption is irresistible [sic] — from a careful consideration of his letter, from the facts which I have related, and from the weight which his experience and his official position in
that army gave him with General Halleck and General Grant — that he must have shared in their feeling of security. I believe that direct evidence can be adduced of the fact, to doubt which, indeed, would be more unreasonable than even to suppose that his opinion misled their judgment.

To return to the question with which General Sherman opens his letter, I have no doubt that you formed your opinion concerning the battle of Shiloh from a careful study of the subject; and I am even more confident that an accumulation of evidence will sustain you in the conviction expressed in your article, that “but for the immediate and timely arrival of General Buell’s forces, the disaster of the first day might not have been retrieved”. General Sherman’s official report is better than his later memories. He may since have been dazzled by the map of the battle issued from General Halleck’s Head Quarters, on which are arrayed four magnificent divisions of the Army of the Tennessee, leaving of course but a small cover for the Army of the Ohio. Yet one of what had been the divisions of that army acted under my direction in the battle of the 7th, as did other scattered regiments. Its position was at first in reserve, and later in the day it served at various points between McCook and Nelson. It numbered possibly fifteen hundred men, was commanded by Colonel Tuttle, of Iowa, and did good service. There is another significant fact: my regiments did not wander from the control of their division commanders; yet I find one of them, the 32nd Indiana, Colonel, now General Willick, credited in the official report of General Lew Wallace, with coming to the support of a portion of his division, which occupied the extreme right, and between which and mine are represented, on the map referred to, three full spaced divisions of General Grant’s army. I do not mean by this that General Grant had no other troops besides Wallace’s division there or that they did less than their duty, but I mean that the Army of the Ohio fought victoriously upon three fourths of the front of that battle field.
I have taken up General Sherman’s letter with no pleasure, but it was due to the army which I commanded that I should write what I have written.

Bibliographical Note:

The reader interested in a further look at this problem — in considerable measure a problem in emphasis — may find all the evidence he needs in the Columbia Library. There are, for instance, the reports of Sherman and Buell in *War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies*, Ser. I, Vol. X, 248-54, 291-96; Buell’s “Shiloh Reviewed”, *Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*, I, 487-536; Grant’s “Battle of Shiloh”, in *ibid.*, I, 465-86; Sherman’s *Memoirs*, I, 252-75; and Grant’s *Personal Memoirs*, I, 330-70. Two good modern accounts, whose viewpoints differ somewhat with regard to the principals, are Kenneth P. Williams, *Lincoln Finds a General*, III, 345-95; Allan Nevins, *The War for the Union*, II, 65-87, 541-43.

— Eric L. McKitrick

Pittsburg Landing a few days after the battle, showing some of the transports which brought Buell’s army and the steamer (second from the right) which was General Grant’s headquarters during the battle of Shiloh.
The Plimpton Library

FRANCIS T. P. PLIMPTON

In the November, 1960, issue of the Columns, Mr. Plimpton set forth a brief biographical sketch of his father, the late George A. Plimpton, who presented his marvellous library of the “tools of learning” to Columbia University in May, 1936, just a few months before his death. In the following article our contributor discusses the collection itself, delineates the motives and objectives which prompted its collector, and points out a few of the highlights in a library which must stand for all time as one of the principal treasures now available to scholars at Columbia University.

— Editor

My father was fond of describing his Library in terms of the “Tower of Knowledge”, a five-story structure that is pictured with its learned inhabitants in one of his favorite books, the Margarita Philosophica (Freiburg, 1503), an important encyclopedia written at the close of the fifteenth century by the Carthusian Gregorius (or George) Reisch, confessor to Maximilian I, teacher of Eck and Waldseemüller and assistant to Erasmus.

The woodcut plate in the Margarita reveals a somewhat apprehensive child being presented with a hornbook (to learn his letters) by a stern medieval lady teacher, designated Nicostratae (the mother of Evander, from whom he received the gift of letters), who is unlocking the Tower with a large key marked congruitas (the way to wisdom). Picture-windows on the first two floors disclose benched pupils (triclinium philosophie, the banquet of philosophy) listening to Donatus (ca. 333), grammarian and teacher of St. Jerome, and, above, Priscian (ca. 500), called by Gibbon “the last of the Old Romans whom Cato or Tully could have acknowledged for their countryman.” From windows in the three
The Tower of Knowledge (from Margarita Philosophica by Gregorius Reisch, Freiburg, 1503) showing the various stages in medieval education.
upper floors gaze the stolid visages of logician Aristotle, rhetorician Cicero ("Tully"), arithmetician Boethius, musician Pythagoras, geometrician Euclid, astronomer Ptolemy, natural philosopher Pliny, and moral philosopher Seneca — all of whom personify the trivium and quadrivium of the medieval educational discipline. Peering over the crenellated battlements of the topmost turret is theologian and metaphysician Peter Lombard, who died ca. 1160. He alone among these eleven master teachers had lived within a thousand years of the time the woodcut was designed, and by that fact the conservatism of medieval education can be judged.

The Plimpton Library fully illustrates the laborious climb of the child from his first grasp of the hornbook to his eventual communion with Peter Lombard on the theological heights. Indeed, any description of my father’s library must inevitably begin with mention of the exceptional collection of some forty hornbooks which he managed to bring together. “Hornbooks” is the generic term, because they were most often small slabs of wood, fashioned to be held by tiny thumb and fingers, with the letters, numbers, and moral precepts protected by transparent horn; some of the Plimpton specimens, however, were cast or engraved in metal or carved in ivory. My father’s personal bookplate and that of the Library that is now at Columbia is in the form of a hornbook; as the Amherst Trustees said in their memorial of him:

His book-plate is an engraved reproduction of the lettered and numbered face of an ancient hornbook — letters and numbers, the first things put into a child’s hand on the road to learning and, when combined together by the mind, the last thing a man has to say at the journey’s end.

From these handy (in the literal sense of the word) alphabet-teachers developed the primers; the Library has notable examples, beginning with a manuscript Primer of Chaucer’s time (circa 1400), containing the alphabet, the Exorcism, Lord’s Prayer,
Creed, Ten Commandments, Seven Deadly Sins, etc.; of the last the author says (miscounting):

Pride wrathe & enuy ben synnes of the fend. Couetice and auarice ben synnes of the world. Gloteny slowthe & lecheri ben synnes of the flessh. & thes ben the large weyes to helle & many passen therbi to helle for thei will not bysi them to knowe gods comaundéments.

One of the most distinguished primers in the Library is Henry VIII's *The Primer, in Englishe and Latyn* (1545). This copy had once been owned by Thomas Thirlby, Bishop of Westminster under Henry VIII, who commissioned him, together with the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Duke of Suffolk, and the Earl of Southampton, to examine Catherine Howard, Henry's fifth queen; they obtained the confession of her "light living" that led her to the scaffold in 1542. (Thirlby, be it noted, was later deposed by Queen Elizabeth for his refusal to take the Oath of Supremacy and was sent to the Tower himself.)

Having learned his letters and numbers, a child must then learn how to fashion them himself, to write. The Plimpton Library's collection of books on the techniques of writing is among the greatest ever formed. The copybooks range from the earliest manuals of manuscript calligraphers to later exquisite examples printed from wood and copper plates. Included is the only recorded copy of the first English edition (1570) of *A Booke Containing Divers Sortes of hands...* by John de Beau Chesne and John Baildon, which contains no less than thirty-seven styles of writing — among them the "texte hand", the "bastard secretary", the "small bastard secretary", the "secretary", a "secretary hande, written withe the lefte hand" (which must be read with a mirror), and others. The year of publication of this volume was most probably the one in which Shakespeare entered school, and his signature most closely follows the "secretary" style. The various hands are illustrated with texts that are all quite noble and pious:

If thow haddest the wisdome of Salomon, the bewtie of Absolon, the puissance of Sampson, the long lyfe of Enoch, the richesse of
Mould for making clay or gingerbread hornbooks, 18th century. Matthew Prior (1664-1721) is said to have written:

To Master John the English Maid
A hornbook gives of ginger bread
And that the child may learn the better
All he can name he eats the letter.
Cresus, the power of Octavian; what can all this avayle the, whan the body is dead.

As to grammar, the next basic ingredient of a child’s education, the Library has a 13th-century Italian manuscript thought to be by Donatus, and two 15th-century Italian manuscripts that are definitely his, and, more importantly from the viewpoint of rarity, a leaf from a 30-line Donatus grammar printed by Gutenberg before the Gutenberg Bible was completed. Other early grammarians are represented by two 15th-century Italian manuscripts on vellum of Priscian’s Grammatica; a 14th-century Flemish manuscript of Ebrardus’Græcismus; a Latin grammar of the same period, Summa Doctrina, by an Augustinian monk; a 15th-century German manuscript of Wilhelm Wert’s Lilium Grammaticae. Two distinguished printed grammars — among a multitude — are Philip Melancthon’s Grammatica Latina (Paris, 1528) and an otherwise unrecorded edition of William Lily’s Rudimenta in English (London, ca. 1525), which begins with the admonition:

Whan I have an englishe to be tourned into latyn, I shall reherse it twyes or thryes and loke out ye verbe.

Lily’sRudimenta was a forerunner of his complete Latin grammar which he compiled somewhat later, and which dominated English education for centuries, despite a petition brought against it in the House of Lords in 1768.

Among the rhetorics in the Library are a fine 15th-century Italian manuscript in neat miniscules, of Cicero’sRhetorica; an 11th-century commentary on Cicero by Marius Fabius Victorinus; and a German commentary, possibly by Hieronymus Mehner, of the early 1500’s. There are two fine early 15th-century manuscripts of Cicero’sTusculane, one of which contains, inside an illuminated initial letter, a rather lugubrious imaginary portrait of the great rhetorician. Sir Thomas Wilson’s famous Arte of Rhetorique is represented by the scarce first edition, 1553, and by many of the later editions. In discussing composition faults, Sir Thomas says:
Some will set the carte before the horse, as thus. My mother and my father are both at home, even as though the good man of the house ware no breaches, or that the graye Mare were the better Horse.

The standard texts for logic were Aristotle’s *Topica* and *Analytica*, manuscripts of both being in the Plimpton Library. The Library also contains a manuscript of Aristotle’s *Ethica Nichomachea*, written in 1393, and possibly representing Walter Burley’s Latin translation. It contains a fanciful portrait of Aristotle, in the first illuminated initial, in the form of a bearded Renaissance scholar.

The Library is particularly strong in arithmetics. *Rara Arithmetica*, by the late Professor David Eugene Smith of Teachers College, published in 1908, called the Library the largest collection of pre-1600 printed arithmetics ever gathered together, and between 1908 and 1936 the collection was greatly strengthened. It contains the very rare Treviso arithmetic of 1478 (*Arte dell’ Abbaco*) and the first English arithmetic (in Latin), *De Arte suppetandi* by Tunstall (1522) with a Holbein title page. But before the printed books come the manuscripts: two beautifully illuminated 13th-century copies of Boethius’ *Arithmetica*; a 14th-century manuscript of the Florentine Paolo Dagomari’s *Trattato d’Abbaco*, and many others. Algebra is represented by a Latin manuscript, dated 1456, of Mohammed ibn Musa al-Khowarizmi, writer of the first book bearing the title “Algebra”.

Geometry means Euclid, and the Library includes many Euclid manuscripts. The earliest is in Latin on vellum, of about 1260, containing Campanus’ commentary on the *Elementa*, and is believed to be the actual copy presented by Campanus to Pope Urban IV while the latter was Jacques Pantaleon, Patriarch of Jerusalem. There are also the first printed edition, published by Ratdolt in Venice, 1482; the even rarer Vicenza reprint of 1491; the first printed edition of Euclid in Greek (Basle, 1533); the first transla-
tion into a modern tongue, Italian (Venice, 1543); and the first edition in English (London, 1570).

The geographies are of special interest. The *Cosmographia* of Pomponius Mela is present in the Venice, 1477, edition. Caius Julius Solinus, third-century Roman, is represented by a vellum manuscript (ca. 1480) of his *De Situ Orbis*, by the first printed edition (Venice, Jenson, 1473), and the Vienna edition of 1520, edited by Joannes Camers, and containing one of the earliest maps of "America", with open water between the two continents and the northern one called "terra incognita". Villanovanus' edition of Ptolemy's geography, published at Lyons in 1535 (rare because John Calvin ordered all copies burned, together with the editor, Servetus), protests against the New World's being called "America". The engraved maps of the world in the Library's first Italian edition of Ptolemy (Venice, 1548) show North America as a part of Asia, and South America as a peninsula. Isidore of Seville's *Etymologiae* (the Encyclopedia Britannica of the Middle Ages), which contains a "map" of the world after the ancient Greek conception—a circle surrounded by Oceanum Mare containing three quadrants allotted to the sons of Noah: Europe to Japheth, Africa to Ham, and all the rest, Asia and the Orient, to Shem — is present in a beautiful 13th-century manuscript and in the second printed edition (Strassburg, 1473). Another early encyclopedia of the greatest significance is the beautiful 14th-century manuscript of the English translation of the *De Proprietatibus Rerum* of Bartholomæus Anglicus.

Construing geography to include travel, the Library contains several noteworthy items — a 15th-century manuscript in Latin of the travels of Marco Polo and another (1456) of the somewhat more imaginary travels of Sir John Mandeville, written by Sibertus Herkenbosch de Sittart in the Monastery of Good Boys at Liège.

In astronomy the Library has a 15th-century vellum manuscript of *De Sphaera Mundi* of Johannes de Sacrobosco (John Holy-
wood), and a printed version from the press of Johannes Santriter (Venice, 1488), as well as several anonymous astronomical manuscripts of the 14th, 15th and 16th centuries.

More important, but comparatively unknown, is a contemporary manuscript (late 1300’s) of Chaucer’s *Treatise on the Astrolabe* formerly in the library of the Earl of Ashburnham and before that the property of Sir Kenelm Digby, and containing his signature. The treatise is addressed by Chaucer to his son Lewis. Allied are a 13th-century astronomical manuscript by Alcantarus, and a 13th-century manuscript commentary on the Lord’s Prayer, which annotates “Who are in Heaven” with a panegyric to that locality and some of the road distances — e.g., earth to the moon 15,635 miles, from Venus to the sun 12,436 miles and three halves (sic). Also included is a 15th-century English manuscript on prognostication, astrology, divination, and the like, which may be a paraphrase of Ptolemy.

Music is represented by Boethius, already mentioned, who treats it entirely from the mathematical viewpoint, and by a magnificent leather bound Italian antiphonal, written at Perugia about 1480, and with an especially ornate opening page.

Seneca’s moral philosophy is exemplified by a beautifully illuminated manuscript of his *Declamationes*, dated 10 May 1392, and Boethius’ *De Consolatione Philosophiae* (translated first by Alfred the Great and later by Chaucer) by a 14th-century manuscript with a rather sardonic portrait of the author in an opening illuminated initial. The Boethius is bound with the illuminated Aristotle mentioned earlier.

Early books on education are well represented, e.g., *The Governor*, 1557, by Sir Thomas Elyot and *The Scholemaster*, 1570, by Roger Ascham, who taught Queen Elizabeth and Lady Jane Grey, and who upraided Englishmen generally because they could not equal his queenly pupil, of whom he wrote,

Yea I beleve, that beside her perfit readines, in Latin, Italian, French, & Spanish, she readeth here now at Windsore more Greekè every day
than some Prebendarie of this Chirch doth read Latin in a whole weeke.

The Library has, incidentally, Ascham's own copy, with his autograph, of the 1555 Abridgement of the Boke of Assises... newlye imprinted...

A French manuscript of 1390, written on a vellum strip some fifteen feet long, sets down the history of the Popes, the Roman Empire, France and England, from Julius Caesar to King Charles II. The author does not treat the Popes tenderly:

Benedict of Toulouse [Benedict XII, 1334] was a Bernadine; his life was given up to simony, luxury, and he feared no man.

Clement of Limousin [Clement VI, 1342] made his friends rich and loved follies. The end of his life was filled with fornication, rapines, lies, deceits, covetousness, ... pride and treason, and he ruled among the wealthy and oppressed the poor. During his reign he did two great and good things: he changed the penances of seven years into indulgences of forty years, and did many good deeds for the afflicted during the time of the mortality [the Black Death of 1348].

The Library is rich in manuscripts and early editions of all the classical authors whose works were the very stuff of medieval and Renaissance education. A 15th-century manuscript of Virgil's Aeneid contains a fanciful portrait of the laurel-wreathed author, wide-eyed and small-faced, while another 15th-century manuscript, containing his Bucolics and Georgics, displays a very different conception — laurel-wreathed, but complacent and heavily jowled. There are 12th and 13th century manuscripts (fragments) of Thebais by Statius, a 14th-century manuscript of Horace's Ars Pætica, and 15th-century manuscripts of Livy's Macedonian War and Sallust's Catiline, Jugurtha.

In a different category are two 15th-century manuscript fragments of the Roman de la Rose, and two magnificent 15th-century English manuscripts of Chaucer's contemporaries, John Gower's Confessio Amantis (ca. 1400) and John Lydgate's adaptation of
Boccaccio's *Fall of Princes* (ca. 1470). Noteworthy, also, are seven vellum leaves of a Coptic manuscript of the late 9th century, a gift to the donor from one of his business partners who found them on an expedition up the Nile. Scholars pronounced them a Coptic translation of a discourse ascribed to St. Cyril of Jerusalem, the missing concluding portion of Morgan Library Coptic manuscript 594. Mr. Plimpton suggested to the elder Morgan that all the leaves should be brought together, and pointed out that he could not properly part with a gift; the hint was never taken.

Selecting these few items for special mention has not been easy. There are more than 13,000 separate works in the Plimpton Library, including more than 300 medieval and renaissance manuscripts, nearly a hundred 15th-century printed books, many works written or published in England in the 16th and early 17th centuries, and textbooks of every sort that served the teaching process into the middle 1800's. It took my father more than sixty years to assemble the Library; it now stands as his living memorial to Columbia University, and Columbia's living memorial to him.
The King’s College Room

EDMUND ASTLEY PRENTIS

"KING’S COLLEGE, founded in the Province of New York by Royal Charter in the Reign of George II..." are the first words inscribed on the facade of the Low Memorial Library. Further, there are two flagpoles in front of it; one, the American, is surmounted by an eagle and the other, the Columbia one, is surmounted by a King's crown, while the light blue and white Columbia flag itself has a white King's crown. In addition, one of the principal undergraduate organizations is named the “King’s Crown”, as is one of the undergraduate honor awards. It is obvious how highly cherished are Columbia’s history and traditions.

It seemed only natural that a functional room should be constructed in the Low Library furnished in the style of the mid-eighteenth century, such a room as King’s College might have had, and about which Columbia’s own history could crystalize; a place to display portraits of distinguished members connected with the College in the 18th century and some of the University’s priceless memorabilia. My sister, Mrs. Katharine Prentis Murphy, my wife and I proposed to give such a room and, with Dr. Kirk’s approval and the approval of the Columbiana Committee, it has been constructed at 210 Low Library.

It is a warm and attractive room, we hope, with its soft colors and its furniture, two-thirds of which is period and the remainder especially made in the 1760 style. Perhaps the most important piece is the ball-and-claw mahogany desk at the west wall. It is a fine example of Early American cabinet work. On it is a standish (an inkwell holder), another good example of the work produced in that distant day and somewhat hard to find now-a-days. Over the fireplace is a British coat-of-arms — an item my father had
Edmund Astley Prentis

Mr. Prentis (left) and Dean Van Derpool looking at the model of King’s College. Above the model is a portrait of Bishop Benjamin Moore, the third President of Columbia College.
more than 80 years ago, before I was born. All the candlesticks, sconces, chests, some of the chairs, and the two gateleg tables are mid-eighteenth century pieces or older, as are practically all the accessories. On a late 17th century American chest stands a model of King’s College — how old it is we do not know but it was in a partly dilapidated condition when we first saw it in the Columbian Room. We felt it should be exhibited. This led to our final suggestion of the King’s College Room, a room devoted not only to the exhibition of historical items but also for committee meetings, tea parties, etc.

Only one color, a subdued but rich crimson, has been used in the upholstery of the sofa, chairs, table covers and curtains, and even at the back of the lighted memorabilia cabinets. The intention was to create a harmonious and comfortable atmosphere. There is a rather dramatic contrast between the red upholstery and the large black and white chequer pattern of the tiled floor. The ochre of the walls, the wood-grain of the panelling and the furniture, and the unobtrusive hues of the portraits — with soft reds again predominating — complete the color scheme.

The portraits in the room, nine in all, were already in the possession of the University. One of them, of Myles Cooper, the second President of King’s College, was painted by John Singleton Copley. It is hung just to the left of the fireplace. On the right side is a copy of a portrait (now in the Verplanck Room in the Metropolitan Museum of Art) by the same artist of Samuel Verplanck, the first student to enter King’s College. Other portraits are of William Samuel Johnson, the first President of Columbia College; Gouverneur Morris, Class of 1768; DeWitt Clinton, Class of 1786; and Egbert Benson, Class of 1765, who was a revolutionary patriot and the first President of the New-York Historical Society. Over the couch is a fine portrait of George III, who ascended the throne in 1760 when King’s College was only six years old; it was painted by Sir William Beechey, a celebrated artist of his day. There is also a portrait of John Stevens, Class of 1768,
Part of the south wall of the room, showing the fireplace and two portraits painted by John Singleton Copley (Myles Cooper, at the left, and Samuel Verplanck, at the right).
The northwest corner of the room showing portraits (left to right) of William Samuel Johnson, Gouverneur Morris, and DeWitt Clinton.
Edmund Astley Prentis

after whom Stevens Institute is named, and of Benjamin Moore, Class of 1768, President of King’s College in 1776 and again in 1801. He was the father of Clement Clarke Moore of the Class of 1798 who wrote the famous poem “A Visit From St. Nicholas.” Last, but not least, is a portrait of Alexander Hamilton.

In the illuminated cabinets there is an unequalled display of Columbiana, rarely or never on exhibit before. There is a collection of books from the original library of King’s College. There are two copies of *Noetica*, a textbook written by Samuel Johnson, first President of King’s College, printed by Benjamin Franklin. One of them was used by John Jay of the Class of 1764, while he was a student, the other being President Johnson’s own copy. One of the irreplaceable items is the original matriculation book of King’s College showing Samuel Verplanck’s name as the first student to enter in 1754. In 1776, in this book, there is a notation to the effect that there was no public commencement because of the confusion and trouble prevalent in the country — the tumult of the Revolution.

An example of the interesting items on display is the only one not owned by Columbia but on semi-permanent loan from the New-York Historical Society. It is the diploma of Gulian Verplanck of the Class of 1768. He was a younger brother of Samuel Verplanck and the uncle of Gulian Crommelin Verplanck of the Class of 1801 who, at the age of 14, was the youngest person ever to graduate from Columbia. He was a gentleman who acquitted himself with ability in many stations of trust and distinction. He was, for instance, the President of the Bank of New York, and a speaker of the House of Assembly of the State. In addition to this, he was a man of literary taste and a graceful poet. It was in the form of poetry that he made in the year 1775, a prophecy of extraordinary accuracy. It is as follows:

Hail happy Britain! Freedom’s blest retreat
Great is thy power, thy wealth, thy glory great
The room was constructed under the supervision of my sister, Mrs. Katharine Prentis Murphy, and the furniture and colors were selected by her with the assistance of Mrs. Kirk. The historical items in the cabinets were selected and arranged by Miss Bonnell who is presently in charge of Columbiana. The portraits and the prints were selected and arranged by Dean Van Derpool and me.

The Architect was the University Architect, Mr. Frederick Woodbridge. The Columbiana Committee was Mrs. Grayson Kirk, Mr. Richmond Williams, Mr. Charles G. Proffitt, Dean James Van Derpool, Mr. Ward Melville, my sister and I. Mrs. Murphy was Chairman.

Any member of the Friends of the Libraries will always be welcome to visit the room, which is open five days a week.
Kingston 23 Augt. 1777

Dear Sir

Mr. Deane in a Letter of the 28 May last, after recommending an attack on the Greenland fishery & Hudsons Bay Trade, desired me to communicate the following Plan to Congress viz: “To send three Frigates loaded with Tobacco to Nantz or Bordeaux, equipped in the best manner and on their arrival hide the chief of their guns and appear as Cruizers. Intelligence may be had every week what the station of the British Fleet is, and how the Coast is defended, and a sudden Blow may be struck which will alarm & shake Great Britain to the Center. This Plan will appear bold & extravagant—so much the more likely to succeed as it will be unexpected, & the plundering and burning of Liverpool & Glasgow would be a most glorious Revenge. And believe me it is very easily effected—I dare put my Life on the Issue of it, if left to my management, and I can get good Men to execute.”

This was a favourite Plan of Mr. Dean before he left Philadelphia, and I confess I wish the Experiment may be tried. The greatest Difficulty I fear would be to get the Frigates well manned & safe to France.

I am Sir

Very sincerely yours &c.

John Jay

Letter from John Jay to Robert Morris. (Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Alfred C. Berol)
Our Growing Collections

ROLAND BAUGHMAN

Bancroft gift. Professor Margaret Bancroft (A.M., 1913) has presented several items of memorabilia of Rachel Anne Kelly (later Mrs. John Otis Given). The items are well-placed at Columbia, because a substantial collection of Given papers relating to sea commerce in the period 1845-1870 is in Special Collections.

Barzun gift. Dean Jacques Barzun (A.B., 1927; A.M., 1928; Ph.D., 1932) has added significantly to the collection which he has established at Columbia of writings by and about Hector Berlioz. The present gift consists of seventy-eight published works (eighty-five volumes) and a series of six 16-inch acetate discs of recordings of Berlioz music.

As a separate gift, Dean Barzun has begun the establishment of the “H. M. Barzun Collection”, in honor of his father. So far received are forty-five volumes of works on modern art and literature, and forty-five issues of five serial publications.

Berol gift. Mr. and Mrs. Alfred C. Berol have presented a group of fifteen letters and documents relating to the American Revolution. The items are of such distinction, of such historical importance, that mere listing cannot do them justice. It must suffice to say that once again we are indebted to Mr. and Mrs. Berol for a gift that must stand among the finest that we have ever received, as any reader of the following summary will readily agree.

A letter from John Jay to Robert Morris, transmitting a plan suggested by Silas Deane for “plundering and burning Liverpool and Glasgow”, effecting “a most glorious revenge” on Great Britain, August 23, 1777.
A pathetic letter from Elisha Boudinot to the physician-general of the Continental Army, Dr. Benjamin Rush, February 27 or 28, 1781, regarding the imminent death of Richard Stockton and the serious illness of the latter's sister.

A letter from Edmund Burke to a relative, Garret Nagle, on the character of Lord Shelburne, who also was a supporter of the American colonies, August 2, 1776.

An enrollment form of the Pennsylvania Militia filled out for one Thomas Shanks, April 2, 1776.

A letter from Benjamin Franklin to his nephew, Jonathan Williams, regarding prize money due to an American privateer, November 30, 1777.

A remarkable letter from General Thomas Gage to Sir William Johnson, the British Superintendent for Indian Affairs, regarding military support for traders, June 30, 1765.

A letter from John Hancock, then President of Congress, to the Assembly of Virginia urging the recruitment of troops for the Continental Army, November 20, 1776.

A letter from Patrick Henry, Governor of Virginia, to Thomas Johnson, Governor of Maryland, regarding the defense of Chesapeake Bay against the British, March 12, 1777.

An autograph letter from the “father of the United States Navy”, Commodore John Barry, to Thomas Barclay, an American agent in France, November 28, 1783, urging the dispatch of prize money due to the officers and crew of the “Alliance”.

A letter from the “Swamp Fox”, Francis Marion, reporting his preparations for an expected attack by the British, January 28, 1779. The addressee is unnamed; he was formerly thought to have been Washington, but Benjamin Lincoln, who was in command in the South, is a more likely recipient.

A letter to Col. Jeremiah Wadsworth from one of his deputies, George Morgan, regarding the difficulties of providing food and supplies for the Continental Army, March 3, 1779.

A letter from Thomas Penn to Richard Peters, announcing the
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A letter from General Philip Schuyler to his successor, General Charles Lee, regarding steps necessary for the support of the invasion of Canada, February 29, 1776.

A letter from Charles Townshend, M.P., to his fellow member, William Dowdeswell, regarding Virginia’s resolutions against taxation, August 6, 1764.

A letter from George Whitefield, founder of Methodism in the American colonies, to an old friend, James Habersham, September 26, 1763.

In addition to the American historical papers, Mr. and Mrs. Berol have also presented, for inclusion in their Rackham Collection, the scarce German edition of Wagner’s Der Ring des Nibelungen, Frankfurt, 1910-11, 2 volumes.

Brown gift. Mr. Perc S. Brown of Orinda, California, has presented a unique document. It is a printed promissory note, signed in the text by Benjamin Franklin, and dated August 15, 1781. The note was printed by Franklin at his press at Passy, and announces the indebtedness of the United States to France in the amount of 750,000 livres. It represents the indentured half of a double form, the half retained by Franklin.

Burgess gift. Mrs. Elisha Payne Jewett Burgess (A.B., 1918 B) has continued her work of establishing at Columbia the “John W. Burgess Family Collection”. Her latest gifts include a prized correspondence between Professor Burgess and various members of his family.

Columbia University Club Foundation gift. Through the good offices of Mr. Edmund A. Prentis (E.M., 1906), the Columbia University Club Foundation, Inc., has presented funds for the purchase of two items of special interest to this University. One
is John Jay’s own autographed copy of Samuel Johnson’s *Elementa Philosophica...Noetica*, 1752; the other is the only recorded separate printing of Rev. Myles Cooper’s *Stanzas written on the evening of the 10th of May, 1776, by an exile from America*.

The two pieces are on exhibit in the new “King’s College Room” which was recently presented by Mr. Prentis and his sister, Mrs. Katherine Prentis Murphy, and which is described more fully elsewhere in this issue of the *Columns*.

*De Lima gift.* Miss Agnes De Lima (A.M., 1909) has presented a letter written by John Erskine to Randolph Bourne, 24 February 1915. Miss De Lima has also presented a number of volumes from Bourne’s library, some with his ownership mark and his marginal markings.

*Donovan gift.* Mrs. William J. Donovan has generously presented part of the results of the remarkable study carried on by her husband, the late General Donovan, of the Intelligence Service during the American Revolution. Of primary usefulness to scholars, the material is carefully organized and fully documented. It draws together information gleaned from various archives in England, France, Canada, and the Vatican.

*Drury gift.* Mr. Newton B. Drury of Berkeley, California, has presented the papers of his brother, the late Aubrey Drury. The materials presented relate to the campaign conducted by Aubrey Drury for official world-wide adoption of the metric system of weights and measures.

*Frick gift.* Professor Bertha M. Frick has presented a number of volumes from her personal library, including two exceptionally handsome works: *De quattuor evangelistis*, printed at the Anvil Press in Lexington, Kentucky, 1955; and Goethe’s *Die Leiden des
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Jungen Werthers, with woodcuts by V. K. Jonynas, Freiburg, [1948?]

Friedman gift. Mr. Harry G. Friedman (Ph.D., 1908) has presented a number of interesting and valuable items, including a letter from Richard Cobden to William Bird, 1 May 1860; a fine series of fourteen indentures and similar legal instruments, all manuscripts on vellum and dating from 1744 to 1883; and a complete run of the Neuer Bauernkalender, 1805-1853.

Hammert gift. Mrs. Louis P. Hammett has presented the papers of her distinguished brother, the late James Theodore Marriner, whose diplomatic career was cut short by an assassin in Beirut in 1937. The collection contains Mr. Marriner's official correspondence which reveals interesting sidelights on European diplomatic life. The most significant single item, however, is his diary, maintained throughout his career — i.e., from 1918 until his death.

Hofe gift. Knowing of Columbia’s fine collection of the works of Lyman Frank Baum, author of the “Wizard of Oz” books, Mr. George Douglas Hofe (B.S., 1914 TC; A.M., 1915 TC) has presented a series of twelve pen-and-ink drawings by Baum’s illustrator, W. W. Denslow. They are of exceptional interest, for they represent Denslow’s work after he and Baum had come to the parting of the ways.

Japanese Centennial Goodwill Mission gift. The East Asiatic Library has received 500 volumes of Japanese-language books as a gift of the Japanese Centennial Goodwill Mission which, headed by former Prime Minister Shigeru Yoshida (LL.D. Hon. 1954), visited the Columbia campus on its tour commemorating the First Japanese Embassy to the United States in 1860. As in the case of Dr. Yoshida’s personal gift of 600 volumes in 1958 (Columns, November 1958), the Centennial gift comprises titles specifically re-
quested by the Library. Mr. Mitsuo Tanaka, Japanese Consul General of New York and a member of the Friends of the Libraries who has on numerous other occasions shown his interest in the East Asiatic Library, arranged for the transmittal of both lists of desiderata and was instrumental as well in the collecting and shipping of the books.

*Jay gift.* Miss Frances Jay (A.M., 1953) has presented a 39-page manuscript written by her distinguished ancestor, John Jay. This is a dramatic version of the Bible story of Jacob and Esau which was written on May 9, 1814, for the edification of his children.

*Lada-Mocarski gift.* Mr. and Mrs. Valerien Lada-Mocarski have presented the rare and valuable La Haye, 1736-37, edition of Father Du Halde’s *Description géographique, historique, chronologique, politique, et physique de la Chine.* The work comprises four volumes of text and an atlas, all in excellently preserved contemporary bindings.

*Lamont gift.* Dr. Corliss Lamont (Ph.D., 1932) has performed a signal service in presenting English translations of fifty-six letters in Spanish written to George Santayana by his father, Augustin Santayana.

*Leigh gift.* Dean Robert D. Leigh (A.M., 1915 TC; Ph.D., 1927) has presented his personal file of the minutes, staff reports, special studies, records of testimony, and other papers gathered for use by the Commission on the Freedom of the Press during its period of activity, 1944-1948. Dr. Leigh died in January, 1961. Access to the collection may be had only with express written permission of Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, who was also a member of the Commission.

*Longwell gift.* Mr. Daniel Longwell (1922 C) keeps a close watch for new additions to the Churchill Collection which he has estab-
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lished at Columbia. Most recently he has presented The Memoirs of General the Lord Ismay ... London, 1960.

Luquer Family gift. Mr. Evelyn P. Luquer (LL.B., 1926), Mr. Lea S. Luquer (A.B., 1921; A.M., 1922), and Mr. Thatcher P. Luquer have joined with their sister, Mrs. T. L. Purdy, in presenting eight volumes of the manuscript diaries of John Howard Payne, 1808-1844, and sixty-three letters written to Payne by Washington Irving, 1809-1830.

These materials are of the utmost importance to scholars concerned with American cultural history of the 19th century. The diaries are the most nearly complete series known, and the letters of Irving to Payne offer valuable documentation of the close friendship of these two literary figures. The materials are from the much larger collection of John Howard Payne's papers that was formed by the late Thatcher T. P. Luquer (C.E., 1889; E.E., 1892), and which is now on deposit in Special Collections.

Macy gift. During the year 1960, Mrs. George Macy has faithfully seen to it that each new Limited Editions Club book takes its place beside its beautiful companions in the “George Macy Memorial Collection.” The “Collection” thus contains every volume that has so far appeared under the L.E.C. ægis from 1929 to 1961.

Moses gift. Mr. and Mrs. Henry L. Moses (LL.B., 1903) have presented three scarce Italian works issued at Rome and Florence in 1733 and 1750. The volumes are useful and welcome additions, not alone for their texts, but also because of their handsome typography and fine contemporary bindings. We regret to record Mr. Moses' death on February 18.

Nevins gift. Over the past several months, Dr. Allan Nevins has added significantly to the collection of his papers which he has placed at Columbia. The present gifts comprise chiefly his profes-
sional correspondence of the 1940's and 1950's; but special notice must be taken of the five large packets of Dr. Nevins' notes for his Civil War books. These represent an enormous amount of research in libraries all over the country, and contain unpublished material of the utmost value to all students of the period.

Olcott Family gift. One of the most important gifts made during the year 1960 was that presented by Mr. Douglas W. Olcott; his sisters, Mrs. Louise Olcott McClure and Mrs. Emily Olcott Garrison; his cousins, Mrs. Grace Rathbone Adkins, and Mrs. Anna Rathbone Johnson; and the Directors of the Mechanics and Farmers' Bank of Albany. The gift comprises the personal, financial, and business papers of Thomas W. Olcott (1795-1880), who was connected with the above-mentioned Bank from the day it opened its doors in 1811, and who served as its president from 1836 until his death.

The importance of this collection cannot be exaggerated. It contains much original material relating to political-financial matters, especially during the Jacksonian period. The motives of the Albany Regency in relation to the destruction of the Second National Bank of the United States, the operations of the American Land Company, and the financial involvements of the Regency with the Olcott Bank are but a few of the topics represented in the collection. In addition there is much relating to the opening of the western lands, to early railroad financing, and, in general, to the leading financial activities and developments from 1825 through the Civil War.

The gift was made in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the founding of the Mechanics and Farmers' Bank of Albany, to be celebrated in the Spring of 1961.

Saffron gift. Dr. Morris H. Saffron (A.B., 1925) has presented a letter written by Nicholas Murray Butler to Miss Suzanne Modemann, 9 October 1923.
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Stolper gift. Professor B. J. R. Stolper (A.M., 1930 TC) has presented three letters written to him by E. W. McCready in January, 1934, which tell a most absorbing story of Stephen Crane in his “Commodore” days, and comprise a documentary account of those experiences.

Suhr gift. Dr. Heinrich P. Suhr has presented the books, manuscripts, and notes gathered by the late Dr. Nicholas Koenig (A.B., 1903; A.M., 1904; Ph.D., 1908), relating to the ancient languages of the Near East.

Tannenbaum gift. Professor Frank Tannenbaum (A.B., 1921) has presented a series of letters, documents, and papers comprising his personal file relating to the origin and development of the Farm Security Program, in which he participated during the Roosevelt Administration, 1934-1937.

Westervelt gift. Mrs. Leonidas Westervelt has presented a valuable collection of books, manuscripts, and memorabilia of Brander Matthews and other personalities of the theater. The materials are from the collection founded by her late husband (1903 C).
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Annual Meeting. The Annual Meeting of the Friends of the Columbia Libraries was held in Wollman Auditorium of Ferris Booth Hall at 8:30 p.m. on Wednesday, January 18, 1961. Mr. C. Waller Barrett, the Chairman of our association, presided.

As the first item of the short business session, Mr. Barrett called on Mr. Lester D. Egbert, Chairman of the Committee on Revision of the Constitution and By-laws, for a report. Mr. Egbert said that the proposed new wording of Articles IV and VIII of the Constitution and Articles III and VI of the By-laws had been mailed to all members of the association. The intent of these changes, he explained, is to increase the number of Council memberships from fifteen to eighteen and to simplify certain aspects of our operations. On behalf of the committee, he moved that the changes be adopted. The membership present so voted.

Acting upon nominations presented by the Nominating Committee, of which Mrs. Franz T. Stone is Chairman, the members re-elected to membership on the Council those whose terms were to expire at this meeting (Mr. C. Waller Barrett, Mr. Henry Rogers Benjamin, Mr. Alfred C. Berol, Mrs. Arthur C. Holden, and Mr. Francis T. P. Plimpton) and elected to fill two of the three new Council memberships Mr. Hugh J. Kelly, Executive Vice President of the McGraw-Hill Publishing Company, and Dr. John A. Krout, Vice President of the University. Council memberships are for three-year terms.

Mr. Barrett said that the officers of the association are elected by the Council and that he took pleasure in announcing that the following members of the association had been elected to serve two-year terms which would begin at the close of the Annual Meeting: Dr. John Krout as Chairman and Mr. Francis T. P. Plimpton as Vice Chairman.
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Mr. Barrett then introduced the speaker of the evening, Dr. Schuyler C. Wallace, who has been Director of the School of International Affairs at Columbia since its inception and who directly administers some of its component units: the Near and Middle East Institute and the Centers of Iranian, Pakistan, and Turkish Studies. Dr. Wallace said that he had returned earlier this month from a trip to the Middle East, which he had made at the invitation of the three American colleges there: Robert College in Turkey, the American University of Cairo, and the American University of Beirut. Although each of these schools started as a missionary institution, they have in succeeding years become secular and have become relatively strong and influential. The changed governments in Turkey, Egypt, and Lebanon have, within the past few years, altered the economic and political milieu in which the schools operate. He concluded the main part of his address by saying that these three American colleges had performed an important function by providing windows from the Middle East to the West and from the West to the Middle East.

He added that while he was there he had the opportunity to carry on two other activities, which would benefit Columbia. He made arrangements for two or three of the faculty members there to come to Columbia to teach, and he gave some assistance to negotiations which are at present underway by which the Columbia Libraries hope to acquire an important Persian collection.

At the conclusion of the program, Dr. Logsdon spoke with warm appreciation of the leadership of Mr. Barrett during his two terms in office and of the accomplishments of the Friends during that period. The audience concurred with a round of applause.

During the social-hour of the evening, the Friends and their guests viewed a special exhibit arranged by Mr. Roland Baughman, Head of Special Collections, which contained selections from the books and manuscripts that had been presented by our members during 1960.
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Bancroft Awards Dinner. Members may wish to note on their calendars that the Bancroft Awards Dinner will be held this year on Wednesday, April 19, with Gilbert Highet as speaker. Invitations will be mailed in March.

PICTURE CREDITS

Civil War pictures: "The Peace Makers," the portrait of Major General Buell, and the map are reproduced from The American Heritage Picture History of the Civil War (N.Y., American Heritage Publishing Co., Inc., 1960), with the permission of the publisher. The picture of Southern boys in camp is from The Photographic History of the Civil War, vol. 1 (N.Y., The Review of Reviews Co., 1911), and the drawings of the stragglers returning from the front, the siege-battery, and the steamers at Pittsburg Landing are from Battles and Leaders of the Civil War, vol. 1 (N.Y., The Century Co., 1887).
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