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General Mercer at the Battle of Princeton
as Painted by James Peale,
Charles Willson Peale, and William Mercer

by Donald Drew Egbert '24

Mr. Dean Mathey '12 has recently presented to the Princeton University Library a picture of the Battle of Princeton (Fig. 1) believed to have been painted by James Peale, and based at least in part on sketches of the battlefield made by his more famous brother, Charles Willson Peale, who himself fought at Princeton. It is possible that James Peale, too, took part in the Battle of Princeton because he is known to have been an officer in the Continental army immediately before and after the battle. He had participated in the victory at Trenton only a little over a week earlier, but, strangely enough, the only known record of his war experiences—a list compiled by his brother, Charles Willson Peale—does not mention the Battle of Princeton. In any case, however, there is every reason for believing that James Peale painted the picture, and that he did so at Philadelphia in the studio of his brother, whose chief assistant he was.

The main evidence indicating that this picture was executed in Charles Willson Peale's studio is the fact that there exists an apparent copy of it (Fig. 2), now in the Historical Society of Penn-

1 The painting, which is in oil on canvas and measures 35 x 44 inches, now hangs in the New Jersey Room of the Firestone Library. On the back of the canvas, which is unsigned, is written in black with a brush, "Battle of Princeton."

2 See Charles Coleman Sellers, Charles Willson Peale, Philadelphia, 1947, I, 197. Mr. Sellers, a direct descendant of Charles Willson Peale, has generously given the present writer much authoritative help with this article.
sylvania at Philadelphia, which is known on documentary evidence to have been made by C. W. Peale’s deaf-mute apprentice, William Mercer, from a picture in Peale’s painting-room. Furthermore, some of the buildings represented in the background of both paintings—a farmhouse and two barns—are almost exactly repeated in an otherwise different picture of “Washington at the Battle of Princeton” (Fig. 4). This painting, which is now in the Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum at Winterthur, Delaware, is signed and dated “J. Peale, 1804,” and thus without any doubt was painted by James Peale. Nor is the painting at Winterthur the only one by James Peale which recalls the Princeton picture: there are several of his works which stylistically are very similar to it.¹

William Mercer, the apprentice of C. W. Peale who painted the picture owned by the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, is himself of particular interest to Princetonians because he was the third child of General Hugh Mercer, who was mortally wounded in the Battle of Princeton and who is shown lying on the field of battle in

¹ Princetonesians will be interested to know that in 1847 William Mercer’s version was in turn copied, by order of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, and the copy presented by the Society to the aircraft carrier “Pioneer.”
² The picture at Winterthur (in oil on canvas, and measuring 27 x 36 inches) was presented by James Peale’s nephew, Rembrandt Peale, to the granddaughter of the owner from whom Mr. H. F. du Pont acquired it. The similarity of buildings in the background of this picture to those in the picture presented to Princeton University by Mr. MacEvoy was called to the attention of the writer by Professor T. J. Westenbaker. The history of the painting at Winterthur was supplied through the courtesy of Mr. du Pont himself and of Mr. Henry Skonorowich, and a photograph of it was made available through the kindness of Mr. Charles Montgomery, Associate Curator of the Winterthur Museum.
³ Mr. Charles Coleman Sellers and Dr. J. Hall Pleasants have both kindly pointed out to the writer the similarity of style between the Princeton painting and works of James Peale such as “The Fight between Capt. Allan McLane and the British Dragoons at Frankford, Pennsylvania.” Two examples of this exist and are owned respectively by Mr. Gordon Abbott, of Manchester, Mass., and Mr. Charles L. McLane, Jr., of Baltimore. From a letter of C. W. Peale to Captain McLane himself, James Peale is known to have painted a picture of this subject in 1801. Mr. Sellers and Dr. Pleasants have noted that in both versions there are awkwardly drawn horses much like those of the Princeton picture. Dr. Pleasants adds that similarly distorted horses also occur in two paintings in the Maryland Historical Society at Baltimore—a picture of General Horatio Gates and a “View of Yorktown after the Surrender”—both of which have previously been attributed to James Peale by Dr. Pleasants and others. The “View of Yorktown after the Surrender” is almost identical with a painting signed “York Painted by James Peale 1806,” which was exhibited by a French descendant of Lafayette at the World’s Fair of 1893 at Chicago. In 1908 this picture was still in the possession of a descendant of Lafayette residing in Turin, Italy, but its present location is unknown.
his son's painting as well as in those at Princeton and Winterthur. Moreover, the only sure likeness of William Mercer as a young man has been preserved in Princeton since the eighteenth century, for he it was who served as the model for the representation of his dying father in Charles Willson Peale's great painting of "Washington at the Battle of Princeton" in Nassau Hall (Fig. 4). Which was commissioned by the trustees of the College in 1788. And it should be noted that the pose of the wounded General in this picture was closely copied by James Peale twenty-one years later when he painted the picture of "Washington at the Battle of Princeton" now in the collection at Winterthur (Fig. 3).

Although William Mercer's own painting of the Battle of Princeton (Fig. 4) is not signed, there is little doubt that he painted it. The picture was presented to the Historical Society of Pennsylvania in 1887 by his niece, and she referred to it as "... the Battle of Princeton, representing the death of my G[rand] Father, Mercer Street in Princeton and Mercer County, of course, both named for General Mercer. In addition to New Jersey no less than three other states—Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and Virginia—named counties in his honor.

On the authority of Charles Coleman Sellers, it should be added that Peale was not the only painter to execute a posthumous portrait of General Mercer from a son of the General. Trumbull, in "The Battle of Princeton" which he had begun under Benjamin West at London in 1786, based his likeness of General Mercer on pencil studies of Mercer's eldest son, John, as well as on what may be a study of one of the three younger sons: William, George, or Hugh. These studies were made at Fredericksburg, Va., in April, 1771: see Theodore Sizer, The Works of Colonel John Trumbull, New Haven, 1909, p. 40; also his article, "Trumbull's "The Battle of Princeton."
The Princeton University Library Chronicle, XII, No. 1 (Autumn, 1907), 4. A portrait of William Mercer in old age, which, according to the Frick Art Reference Library, is attributed to the hand of Bernard Francis (active 1819-1868), is owned by Washington and Lee University, at Lexington, Va.

The picture was apparently paid for with a gift of money made by Washington to the College of New Jersey (as Princeton University was then known) when he attended commencement in September, 1785. See D. D. Egbert, Princeton Portraits, Princeton, 1947, pp. 328, 387-388.

See William Sawitsky, Catalogue . . . of the Paintings and Miniatures in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, 1910, pp. 125 and 46. Mercer's painting, reproduced in the present article through the courtesy of the Historical Society, differs slightly in size from the one at Princeton (Fig. 1) since it measures 45½ x 35½ inches, and thus is over an inch higher and some five inches longer. And technically it is more naive than the Princeton picture, as is to be expected of the work of a young apprentice like William Mercer, even though he undoubtedly received a good deal of help, doubtless from James Peale himself. For example, in Mercer's picture note the highly unconvincing cotton-wood clouds and gun barrels, and also his exaggeration of the already defective drawing of the horses in the Princeton painting—especially the wounded horse of General Mercer, which is rolling on the ground in the center of the picture.
Gen[eral] Hugh Mercer, painted by my uncle, Wm. Mercer, a pupil of Peale's.11

As for the painting of the Battle of Princeton now in the Princeton University Library (Fig. 1), from which William Mercer is believed to have made his copy in Philadelphia, little is known of its history. About 1921 the owner, a resident of Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, whose name has been forgotten, discovered the picture in the attic of his deceased father's old house at the neighboring town of Holmdel. Knowing nothing about it, he showed it to the late Charles O. Cornelius '15, who had been associate curator of the American Wing at the Metropolitan Museum of Art. Mr. Cornelius mentioned the painting to Mr. Mathey, and he in turn brought it to the attention of B. Franklin Bunn '07, then manager of the Princeton University Store, who purchased it with the idea of having reproductions made to sell in the store.21 This plan fell through, and about 1940 the picture was bought from Mr. Bunn by Mr. Mathey, in whose Princeton residence it hung until he presented it to the University Library in 1951. While still in Mr. Mathey's possession its resemblance to William Mercer's painting in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania (Fig. 2) was first pointed out by Mr. Julian P. Boyd, Librarian of Princeton University and formerly Librarian of the Historical Society.13

Thus all four of the paintings of the Battle of Princeton discussed and illustrated in this article are closely interrelated. Not only can all four of them be traced in one way or another to the studio of Charles Willson Peale, but it should be noted that these four paintings are the only ones known to be connected with Peale, his brother James, or William Mercer, in which the wounded General Mercer is depicted. And in three of them—C. W. Peale's "Washington" in Nassau Hall being the only exception—General Mercer is shown lying in front of a farmhouse which is represented in almost exactly the same way. There can be no doubt whatever that the farmhouse is intended to be the same one in each case, for with it are two identical outbuildings. And at the corner of the nearer and larger of these is an unmistakable and unusual feature—a haystack shelter of Dutch type, consisting of a rapped roof resting on four posts.

Since Charles Willson Peale took part in the Battle of Princeton, and, as will be shown, later returned to refresh his memory of it by making sketches of the battlefield, there is good reason for believing that all three of these paintings are to some degree based on his sketches, and that therefore the farmhouse and its barn actually existed. Thus, with due allowance for artistic license, it is highly probable that the paintings represent the events and setting of the Battle of Princeton with relative accuracy, a fact which gives them unusual historical importance.

General Hugh Mercer (b. ca. 1725), who is depicted in all four pictures, was the son of the Reverend William Mercer, a Presbyterian minister of Pitiligo, Aberdeneshire, Scotland, for whom the General's son, Peale's future apprentice, was named. At the age of nineteen, Hugh Mercer—then a medical student in Scotland—left school to serve as an assistant surgeon in the army of Bonnie Prince Charlie. Forced to go into hiding two years later after the defeat of Prince Charles at Culloden in 1746, Mercer managed to escape from Scotland early in 1747 on a ship bound for Philadelphia, and then, for greater safety from arrest, made his way far out on the Pennsylvania frontier. There he settled near the site of the town now called Mercersburg in his memory, and set up practice as a physician and surgeon. A few years later he served with distinction in the colonial forces during the French and Indian War; by the end of the war he had achieved the rank of colonel and was made the first commandant of Fort Pitt, the former French Fort Duquesne.

At some time in the course of the war, perhaps during the ill-fated Braddock campaign, Hugh Mercer had become acquainted with George Washington and thereby had established a friendship which was to last until his death at Princeton. Indeed, it was apparently at Washington's suggestion that Mercer left Pennsylvania after the war ended, and established himself at Fredericksburg, Virginia, his home for the rest of his life. There he made his living as a physician and surgeon, and—according to a custom of those days—as an apothecary. His office and shop, which he shared with

11 Ibid., p. 88. At the same time that William Mercer's niece, Mrs. John Leyburn, presented this picture to the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, she also gave the Society a portrait of her great-grandmother, Mrs. John Gordon, who was William Mercer's grandmother. Sawicky believed that this portrait may also have been painted by William Mercer, and he assigned the same date, ca. 1780-90, to both pictures: see ibid., pp. 47-48, 103.
12 Glued to the back of the frame is a paper label on which is written in ink, "B. Franklin Bunn, Princeton, N.J."
13 As close as the resemblance between the two paintings that the Princeton picture was published as work by Mercer in Marshall B. Davidson, Life in America, Boston, 1951, 1, 145.
another physician, are still preserved. Soon after he settled in Fredericksburg, Mercer married Miss Isabella Gordon, daughter of an innkeeper of that town, and in Fredericksburg their third child, William, was born about 1779.13

After the American Revolution broke out, Hugh Mercer was soon elected a colonel of Minute Men because of his military experience. He was in command of the Third Virginia Regiment on June 5, 1776, when, at Washington's personal insistence, Congress appointed him "Brigadier-General in the Armies of the United Colonies," which was his rank at the time of the Battle of Princeton seven months later.

General Mercer and his regulars participated in the great victory at Trenton on Christmas night, 1776, and were with Washington on the night of January 2-3, 1777, when he slipped away from Cornwallis' main army and marched toward Princeton by a back route, most of which no longer exists. In the morning of January 3 Mercer with 350 men was sent across on Quaker Road toward the main highway from Princeton to Trenton—the Princeton end of which is now Stockton Street—to destroy a wooden bridge over Stony Brook by Worth's mill (see Fig. 5). As he was nearing his objective, the American army was seen by Lieutenant-Colonel Mawhood of the British Seventeenth Infantry, which happened to be making an early morning march from Princeton to join Cornwallis outside of Trenton and was then climbing the hill on the far side of the bridge. Hastily retracing their steps and recrossing the bridge, Mawhood's men raced Mercer's troops toward higher ground, some five hundred yards away to the northeast near the present Mercer Road. Mercer's force arrived first, but broke before the British bayonets in the ensuing clash, and while General Mercer was trying to rally his fleeing soldiers a bullet shattered his horse's foreleg. Surrounded by the enemy, who mistook him for Washington, the dismounted General was half-stunned by a blow from a British musket. Nevertheless, when called upon to surrender, Mercer, sword in hand, sought to lunge at his foes from the ground only to be pierced by seven British bayonets and left for dead. Meanwhile reinforcements came up from the American army.

13For the genealogy of the Mercer family see John T. Goodrich, The Life of General Hugh Mercer, New York and Washington, 1906, pp. 105-106, which, however, gives no date for the birth or death of William Mercer. Saviisky, op.cit., p. 177, simply states that Mercer was born ca. 1779, a date probably derived from Manly Fielding's Dictionary of American Painters, Sculptors and Engravers, Philadelphia [1909], which says that Mercer "founded in 1779-1850."
which was marching toward Princeton on a lane, now non-existent, that ran from the Quaker meetinghouse at Stony Brook to about the present site of "Prospect." Under the fury of the British attack, these reinforcements—mostly Pennsylvania militiamen commanded by General Cadwalader—also gave way, but were rallied by Washington, who galloped up in the nick of time and succeeded in turning the tide.

In the course of the battle General Mercer was found by his aide, alive but unconscious, and was carried to the recently erected farmhouse of Thomas Clarke (or Clark), which still stands on the battlefield (Fig. 6). There, with other wounded, he was captured by the British when Cornwallis at last came up in hot pursuit of Washington’s army. Nine days later, in spite of the best available medical attention, which included the services of Cornwallis’ own physician and of Dr. Benjamin Rush (a member of the Class of 1766), General Mercer died of his wounds and was taken to Philadelphia for burial.

As already noted, three of the paintings illustrated in this article (Figs. 1, 2, and 6) show the mortally wounded General in the middle distance lying between the opposing battle lines beside his fallen horse. The farmhouse behind him presumably represents the Thomas Clarke house, where he died, while the building to the right of the farmhouse in the Princeton and Philadelphia pictures (Figs. 1 and 6) is probably intended to be the Quaker meetinghouse at Stony Brook.14

14 Professor T. J. Wertenbaker, however, has suggested that the farmhouse with two outbuildings which appears in all three paintings may be intended to represent not the Thomas Clarke house but that of William Clarke, which then stood to the north of the Thomas Clarke house. It thus stood nearer to Princeton and to the present Mercer Road (which at that time did not exist). Although this house is not shown on Fig. 5, it stood near the trees marked “W. Clark’s orchard.” Mr. Wertenbaker thus believes that as one faces the paintings the house of Thomas Clarke would be behind the observer, and that the building at the observer’s right—which the present writer has called the Quaker meetinghouse—actually represents Nassau Hall. Mr. Wertenbaker points out that in B. J. Lossing’s drawing of the battlefield (Fig. 6), made on the spot in 1859 and published in the various editions of Lossing’s The Pictorial Field-Book of the Revolution (e.g., 1850 ed., II, 92), the William Clarke house can be seen in the distance. And it has two outbuildings to the observer’s left as does the farmhouse in the paintings. It seems to the writer, however, that this hypothesis fails to account for several facts. For one thing, the building which Mr. Wertenbaker calls Nassau Hall lacks the projecting central bay which appears in all the Peale’s other representations of Nassau Hall. Nor does his hypothesis account for the resemblance of the barn and house in the paintings to the existing Thomas Clarke house and its outbuildings (despite differences pointed out later in this article). It is a resemblance ap-

Not only does the Thomas Clarke house itself, in spite of later alterations, still resemble the house represented in the paintings, but on a visit to the grounds the writer has found that the smaller outbuilding to the left is still standing. This building, still identifiable by the peculiar double slope of its roof, is of wood cladboarded, and was probably a stable and cattle shed. Although the colonnaded sheds on each side of this building as represented in the paintings have since been boarded over,14 the original clapboarded walls behind the columns still exist—now inside and forming a covered passage leading to the house. On the interior the original roughhewn supports and beams are preserved, fastened together with crude wooden pegs. As for the large barn, only the lower parts of the ruined stone walls remain today, but they are of the same relative dimensions as in the painting and stand in exactly the proper relation to the other two buildings.

However, although it seems clear that the house and outbuildings shown in the three pictures have been copied from a sketch of the Thomas Clarke house made on the site, surprisingly enough they have been shown from the wrong side—that is, from what was then the front (now actually the back) of the house, rather than from the opposite side to the north where the wounding of Mercer took place. Perhaps, when the first painting—the one now in the Princeton University Library (Fig. 1)—was executed, the artist did not have available a sketch showing what was then the rear façade. Possibly he did not remember what the orientation of the building was; or he may simply have liked this view better and thought it made a better composition. Or perhaps, indeed, the apparently not shared by the William Clarke house as depicted, at tiny scale, in Lossing’s engraving (Fig. 6). Furthermore, as will be seen later in this article, there is documentary evidence that the painters of these two pictures regarded them as representing the death of General Mercer. Since he actually died in the Thomas Clarke house, there was thus every reason for including it in the pictures. And, last, what seems to the writer the conclusive bit of evidence is the fact that James Peale’s painting now at Winterthur (Fig. 9) clearly shows Nassau Hall, only identifiable by its central projecting bay and cupola, at the observer’s left. And this suggests that the building at the extreme left in the other paintings is not intended to represent Nassau Hall, but presumably the Quaker meetinghouse.

15 This alteration was made before 1849 because a boarded-over corner of the barn can be seen in the drawing of the Clarke house and battlefield made by Lossing in that year (Fig. 6). Lossing’s plan of the battlefield (on p. 88 of his book cited in note 14) was prepared from a map still preserved in the Princeton University Library and drawn by W. A. Dod and S. D. Alexander, both of the Class of 1856, from surveys made by Professor A. B. Dod, the member of the Class of 1856 for whom Dod Hall is named.
been taken with the events of the battle itself, presumably for compositional purposes.

In all three paintings Mercer himself lies wounded in approximately the proper place with reference to the farmhouse where he later died, although the slope of the ground up to the house seems to have been somewhat reduced. In the Princeton and Philadelphia examples (Figs. 1 and 2) the red-coated British of Mawhood's command are drawn up behind a rail fence at the observer's right with part of them extending in a line parallel with the house, that is to say, toward Lawrenceville. We know that the main British line did in fact run roughly parallel with the house and slightly to the northeast of it (Fig. 5), though it had artillery, not shown in the picture, on the flank toward Lawrenceville. We know also that after their defeat most of Mawhood's men fled to the main road and then in the direction of Lawrenceville. In the picture, however, several horsemen—presumably officers, since the few dragoons in Mawhood's command were apparently not mounted—can be seen galloping off to the left in what seems to be the opposite direction, toward Nassau Hall.

At the left of these two paintings are shown the American troops who had come to Mercer's support from the back road on the far side of the farmhouse. In the foreground Washington, mounted, has rallied the American army and is addressing a hatless American officer behind whom a field-piece is being fired by its crew. The hatless officer is probably intended to represent Captain Joseph Moulder, whose battery, on the American right flank as shown, helped to save the day for the Americans. Although contemporary accounts of the battle are somewhat confused, the actual American line is believed to have extended in a long arc more nearly between the British and the farmhouse, and extending beyond the British flanks (Fig. 5). In all three paintings the artists have moved it around somewhat to the observer's left, probably in order to bring Washington more directly into the foreground.

The comparative accuracy of the three representations of the Thomas Clarke house and its barns can best be explained by assuming, as we have suggested, that they are based on a sketch or sketches made by Charles Willson Peale, and there is good evidence that such is the case. As already mentioned, Peale had taken part in the Battle of Princeton; he served as a lieutenant in the American forces under General Cadwalader, and in characteristically in-
Fig. 6. "View of the Battle-ground near Princeton" showing the Thomas Clarke house in 1849 (from Benson J. Lossing, The Pictorial Field-Book of the Revolution, New York, 1859, II, 29).

discrepancy may be due to the fact that the painter of the picture, James Peale, did not know the house at firsthand but was following a sketch of the house made by his brother, Charles Willson Peale. Nevertheless, on the whole, the setting does seem surprisingly accurate, even though some artistic license has evidently been taken with the events of the battle itself, presumably for compositional purposes.

In all three paintings Mercer himself lies wounded in approximately the proper place with reference to the farmhouse where he later died, although the slope of the ground up to the house seems to have been somewhat reduced. In the Princeton and Philadelphia examples (Figs. 1 and 2) the red-coated British of Mawhood's command are drawn up behind a rail fence at the observer's right with part of them extending in a line parallel with the house, that is to say, toward Lawrenceville. We know that the main British line did in fact run roughly parallel with the house and slightly to the northeast of it (Fig. 5), though it had artillery, not shown in the picture, on the flank toward Lawrenceville. We know also that after their defeat most of Mawhood's men fled to the main road and then in the direction of Lawrenceville. In the picture, however, several horsemen—presumably officers, since the few dragoons in Mawhood's command were apparently not mounted—can be seen galloping off to the left in what seems to be the opposite direction, toward Nassau Hall.

At the left of these two paintings are shown the American troops who had come to Mercer's support from the back road on the far side of the farmhouse. In the foreground Washington, mounted, has rallied the American army and is addressing a hatless American officer behind whom a fieldpiece is being fired by its crew. The hatless officer is probably intended to represent Captain Joseph Moulden, whose battery, on the American right flank as shown, helped to save the day for the Americans. Although contemporary accounts of the battle are somewhat confused, the actual American line is believed to have extended in a long arc more nearly between the British and the farmhouse, and extending beyond the British flanks (Fig. 5). In all three paintings the artists have moved it around somewhat to the observer's left, probably in order to bring Washington more directly into the foreground.

The comparative accuracy of the three representations of the Thomas Clarke house and its barn can best be explained by assuming, as we have suggested, that they are based on a sketch or sketches made by Charles Willson Peale, and there is good evidence that such is the case. As already mentioned, Peale had taken part in the Battle of Princeton: he served as a lieutenant in the American forces under General Cadwalader, and in characteristically in-
defatigable fashion he wrote an account of the battle in his diary.\textsuperscript{17} Furthermore, we know that early in 1779 Peale had refreshed his memory of the battlefields of Trenton and Princeton by making a special trip to sketch them, because under the date of February 22, 1779, he recorded in his diary: \textsuperscript{18} “Set out on a journey to take perspective Views of Trent & Prince Towns.” Peale noted that his stay at Princeton cost him £1, and that the expenses of the whole trip came to £8 13 6. In his diary he also jotted down two rough pencil sketches of fieldpieces—his only surviving drawings of the battlefields of Princeton and Trenton.

The specific reason which led Peale to make this trip was the fact that on January 18, 1779 the Executive Council of Pennsylvania had requested Washington to pose for a portrait by Peale, and Washington had agreed to do so. This portrait, believed to be the one now in the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts, shows Washington, right hand on hip, standing with his left hand resting on the barrel of a fieldpiece beside which are battle flags captured at Trenton and Princeton. In the distant background is Nassau Hall, where the British had formally surrendered, and before it are marching British prisoners. The picture thus symbolizes the victorious outcome of Washington’s whole Trenton-Princeton campaign.

The portrait proved to be so popular that the artist sold many copies of it, occasionally varying some details and the background, though usually showing Nassau Hall.\textsuperscript{19} One of the finest examples of this series of paintings—known as the Wilson-Munn portrait from former owners—was presented to Princeton University in 1924 and now hangs in the anteroom of Procter Hall at the Graduate College.\textsuperscript{20}

The view of Nassau Hall which so often appears in the backgrounds of this series of Washington portraits was used again by Charles Willson Peale in 1789. For in that year he was commissioned by the trustees of the College of New Jersey to paint the large picture of “Washington at the Battle of Princeton” in which Billy Mercer posed for the figure of his dying father (Fig. 4). This Nassau Hall portrait is unique among C. W. Peale’s portraits of Washington not only in including the wounded General Mercer but also in representing Washington as brandishing his sword.\textsuperscript{21}

Thus, in the years just before and at the beginning of Billy Mercer’s apprenticeship with Charles Willson Peale, the latter was busy with a considerable number of Washington portraits in which that part of the Princeton battlefield around Nassau Hall appears. In only one of them, the portrait in Nassau Hall, is the wounded General Mercer depicted, and since this portrait was painted while Billy Mercer was Peale’s apprentice, it is probable that the idea of including General Mercer was suggested to Peale by the presence of Mercer’s son in his own household. However, in none of these pictures did Peale represent the setting of that part of the Battle of Princeton in which General Mercer was actually wounded. That was left for James Peale to do in the painting recently acquired by Princeton University (Fig. 1) and copied by William Mercer (Fig. 2). Years later much of the same setting was again depicted by James Peale in the painting now at Winterthur (Fig. 5).

\textsuperscript{17} The Nassau Hall portrait is important also because it is one of the relatively few portraits of Washington for which the General actually posed, in this case at Philadelphia. The evidence for this is Peale’s copy of his note to Washington arranging for a sitting; a note preserved in his previously-mentioned letterbook at the American Philosophical Society. The note reads: “Mr. Chas. W. Peale’s most respectful compliments to his Excellency Genl. Washington and requests to know at what hour tomorrow will be most convenient to favor Mr. Peale with a Setting. Tuesday Evening.” Although undated, the note is between two letters dated respectively November 8 and December 10, 1783. As Washington was in Philadelphia only from December 8 to 13, it was presumably written on Tuesday, December 9.

\textsuperscript{18} We know from the same letterbook that Peale’s painting was completed in time for the next commencement of the College at Princeton, which was held at the end of September, 1784, and which Peale attended. The minutes of the board of trustees of the College for September 9, 1784 read: “Mr. C. W. Peale having executed a portrait of his Excellency Genl. Washington, according to the order of the board—Ordered, that it be hung in the college Hall agreeably to a former resolution.”

\textsuperscript{19} A letter, written October 19, 1784 to a friend in Charleston, Peale reported: “I painted a picture of Genl. Washington for Prince Town Collidge and was at the Commencement, much entertained. The Dear [i.e., President Witherspoon] looks exceedingly well since his return to America [from a futile money-raising trip abroad]. Doctor [Samuel Stanhope] Smith [professor of philosophy at the College] and Mr. Smith [who was Witherspoon’s daughter Ann] pretty well only complaining of a little cold she had got…”

\textsuperscript{20} For this picture, see Egbert, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 286 and Fig. 218.
The interest of the Princeton picture and of the copy made by William Mercer is still further enhanced by the fact that both of them are apparently mentioned by Charles Willson Peale in the correspondence which he carried on between 1783 and 1785 with young Mercer’s uncle and guardian, General George Weedon, of Fredericksburg. Peale’s copies of some ten of his letters to Weedon are preserved in the letterbook now at the American Philosophical Society, which also contains a copy of an important letter from Peale to Billy Mercer himself expounding Peale’s ideas on teaching art to the young. As these letters, nearly all of which have never been published, also constitute the chief source of our knowledge of William Mercer—and therefore of one of the paintings in question—they will be quoted here at some length. In an effort to retain the flavor of the originals, Peale’s casual eighteenth-century spelling, punctuation, and capitalization have as far as possible been retained, even though for the sake of clarity a few additions, enclosed in square brackets, have been made by the present writer.

In general the letters reveal that William Mercer was a nervous, rather timid lad, naturally cheerful in spite of the immense handicap of being deaf and dumb, and on the whole eager to learn the profession which had been chosen for him. The boy is believed to have been only ten or eleven years old when his apprenticeship began. His first task was to aid Peale and his assistants in making a temporary triumphal arch commissioned as part of Philadelphia’s official “demonstration of joy” to celebrate the successful ending of the Revolution. The arch, brightly lighted with eleven hundred lamps and decorated with transparent illuminated paintings (including a portrait of Washington as Cincinnatus for which the General had granted a special sitting) was to be displayed at night to the accompaniment of elaborate fireworks. On January 10, 1784, one week before the peace celebration began and over two months after the beginning of Billy Mercer’s apprenticeship, Peale wrote a letter to Mercer’s guardian. In it he told how the arch had been painted under difficulties in the building today known as Independence Hall, and in a room so exceedingly cold that Billy’s heel was frostbitten in the course of the work. Wrote Peale: “... my pupil is every thing I can desire of him being blest with the most happy disposition I ever meet with. When I began the public work [on the arch] ... I was obliged to paint in a Room in the Stadt House and Mr. Mercer got one of his heels frostd which been a troublesome sore but it is now quite well having skinned over.”

The illuminated arch, over which so much trouble had been taken, turned out to be an utter and tragic fiasco, for in the evening, shortly before the celebration, while Peale was still on top of the forty-foot structure giving the final touches to the lighting arrangements, a rocket went off prematurely and set the whole flimsy arch on fire. Peale himself was badly burned and severely bruised as he hastily scrambled down to the ground, barely escaping with his life. In a postscript added on February 10, 1784 to his letter of January 20, which he had failed to send off to Weedon, Peale excused himself for not sending the letter earlier by telling how “one or two persons were killed and many hurt by a great number of Rockets taking fire,” and how the rockets had burned his hand, set his clothes on fire, and “drove me from my bolt [on the arch] and I fell & received a considerable contusion on my side. My hurts has been so bad that I have not been able to leave my room until yesterday. These misfortunes will account for my long silence—Mr. Mercer is perfectly well and does not want for any thing that I know of. ... please to make my respects to Mrs. Mercer [Billy’s mother] and your Lady.”

Poor Billy Mercer’s adventures at the time the arch went up in smoke were later recorded by Peale’s son Rembrandt. Wrote Rembrandt: “The crowd of spectators [when the arch burned] was immense and various robberies were committed in the vicinity. We were somewhat amused, at a late hour, to see my father’s pupil, Wm. Mercer, a deaf and dumb son of General Mercer, come home, wild with terror, being divested [by thieves] of his watch, and gold sleeve and knee buckles, and so much afraid of further injury, that we could not persuade him to go to his bed, as he thought he would be more safely hidden in the stable.”
Charles Willson Peale's next letter relating to William Mercer is dated February 21, 1784, and is addressed to the boy himself. For some reason Billy had refused to help Peale with a proposed (but never executed) rebuilding of the ill-fated arch, and the letter was an effort to persuade the lad to aid in the work. Because this document casts so much light on the character of the kindly Peale and on his ideas of apprenticeship and education, it is given here in full.

Feb r. 21st 1784

Mr. Mercer

my reason for desiring you to assist me in painting the transparent painting at the State House [i.e., Independence Hall], was to give you the practice of the Brush, the working at such large works, gives a Freedom of all [sic] Handling very advantagous to Young Artists, and to this that I might have a small help in a considerable work. I know not your reason for refusing to do this business. You do not complain of being unwell. I do not know whether you think that kind of painting degrading the Character of an Artist or for what other cause you can refuse, but this I know, and is the line which I am determined invariably to persevere, Viz: to use my utmost abilities to to [sic] serve you, by directing your studies in a manner that will perfect you in the art of painting in the speediest & best way I am able, to endeavour to show you the advantage of doing well, and the disadva[n]ta[g]e[s] of doing otherwise. (This I hope in myself to give an example off [sic] relying on your good sense to see, and know, and to act in such a manner as will ensure you happiness, and give the greatest pleasure to your Friends and Relations. my opinion is that all youth should be enticed, persuaded, commended to do good, (seasonable commendation have a most wonderfull effect) those that do good through fear of Corporal punishments are cowards indeed. I am fully sensible that much judgement, a very steady and even temper is necessary to form such a Tutor who can throw a side all coercive means to make their pupils do well, yet from the experience I have had, I think those who use stripes or any other kind of severities, are lazy, base and unworthy of any kind of Guardianship and I hope that none will find in me such a Tyrant. Dear Billy I give you this to weigh, and consider well, and would have you to believe that you have found a real Friend in

Chas W. Peale

To his own copy of the letter Peale added the following postscript: "This letter I wrote to my pupil (son of Genl. Mercer) in hopes that some of his acquaintance will explain my full meaning to him as expressed in the above lines, that he might be convinced that I had not asked of him any service which ought to offend his delicacy, or what could do me more service than he would have advantage in doing, that I have not asked him to carry out a Business which I would be unwilling to do myself." Evidently the artist and his apprentice were soon reconciled, for Peale's next letter to General Weedon reports most favorably on young Mercer's progress.29 I wrote Peale: "...I can with pleasure inform you that my pupil is now very diligent and in a fair way of becoming very clever. I have got him at painting in several manners; in miniature as well as in Oil, he grinds paints and washes the Brushes and seems quite contented in his employment. You wish to have specimens of his improvement[,] this shall be complied with as soon as possible, and when opportunity serves of conveyance, you must expect a rude ness in his first Essays with the brush. however he is daily getting his difficulties of the Art.

"He enjoys at present a good state off health, and I do not know that he is in want of any thing..."

In the fall of 1784 General Weedon evidently wrote from Fredericksburg to request that the boy be sent home for a visit of several months, for on November 24 Peale replied as follows: "We have received your Letter and Billy seems much pleased at knowing that he is to pay you a Visit, he applies as close to his Study as I should wish him and improves by his practice in painting in Oil as well as miniature painting. he seems to be perfectly contented with his situation and enjoys a very good share of health. I have some doubts that his stay [at Fredericksburg] so long as you mention may be a disadvantage to him. he is now in so good a way that I hope he will soon get over some principal difficulties (which at]ways attend the first practice of the brush) and that when this is accomplished, he must have an amazing fund of amusement in finding it easy to execute with freedom the copying any kind of

29 An undated letter on p. 35 of the letterbook.
paintings he may choose, and even make the portraits of whatever
is presented to his view. I do not mean to oppose his stay until the
Spring with you but only to hint that by an interrupt[ion] of his
practice he will have to go over the same rough ground [again],
perhaps a few weeks [at home] will satisfy himself as well as his
relations. You will wish Mr. Mercer to judge of this—and I shall
be obliged to you for your determination [of the matter].

"I will be much obliged to you for the price of his board for the
first year and in the first instant. I have made an additional build-
ing for my paintings. This added to the time I have employed at a
new kind of painting [i.e., a kind of transparent moving pictures
invented three years before in London] puts me under the necessity
of making this request, which I hope will be convenient and
perfectly agreeable for you to assist me.

"The pieces [of painting] which Billy sent you is not equal to
some that he has done. I desired him to paint a miniature of Gen-
eral Washington for you, which he has expired from the large
painting. If I hear of an opportunity [I] will desire him to send it
to you..."

It is possible that the large painting of Washington from which
Billy Mercer painted a miniature at Peale's request, was the great
portrait which hangs in Nassau Hall and which had been taken
from Peale's studio to Princeton only about two months before the
date of this letter. But more likely it was the portrait commissioned
by the Assembly of Maryland and still in Peale's possession at the
time of his letter.

Peale apparently did not write again to General Weedon until
the following summer, on July 13, 1785. William Mercer had by
that time made his visit home and had duly returned to Philadel-
phia. Part of Peale's bill for the boy's expenses had evidently been
paid but in depreciated funds, because Peale complained: "... I
received of the Loan Officer Seventy two Dollars but nothing of
the depreciation which is due from the last payment." He went on
to report his pupil's steady progress, and also remarked half-
humorously on the recent exhibition of his "perspective views" or
"moving pictures" referred to above. "Billy is painting in the
larger way very diligently, he improves fast and enjoys a very good
share of health, he seems contented and happy. My Exhibition is
not so profitable as I expected, it pleases well but there is not
bustle enough to make the People run mad to see it..."

Evidently Billy Mercer's family asked friends visiting Philadel-
phia to check on the boy's progress as a painter. Evidently also,
General Weedon was extremely slow in paying his ward's board
bill. For on December 18, 1785 Peale wrote to Weedon: "I hope
the family will have full satisfaction with the accounts given of
Mr. Mercer's improvement by Col. Gordon[?] and other gentlemen
of your country who have lately seen his labours.

"Billy is a very delicate young man & promises to be a comfort
to his family. It must be a comfort to his mother to hear that he
is clear of any kind of vice, and is contented and happy, and
enjoys a good share of health.

"You will now I hope excuse me for what follows, as I have said
everything you could wish to hear of your nephew. I never was in
greater want of Money. I have had very poor returns for the time &
money I spent on my Exhibition, it barely pays for the trouble and
expense of Exhibiting... I have not received any further from the
Loan Office & can I at present tell what prospect there is of
a further payment of interest. Two Years Board of Mr. Mercer is
now due[,] the monies [I have] laid [out] for him in paint etc I
believe amounts to as much as I have received of you, of which I
will render you an account off some other opportunity. Your pay-
ment of the amount of his boarding for two years, at this time will
be rendering me an essential Service and [will] greatly oblige
D(ear) Sir / your humble servant."

Soon afterward, an acquaintance of William Mercer's family—
a Mr. Lewis—came to Philadelphia, saw the boy, and reported
back unfavorably on Peale's treatment of his young assistant.
Peale, hurt, nevertheless refused to take such criticism lying down,
and on February 21, 1786 he wrote the boy's guardian with some
sharpness as follows: "[I] am at a loss to know what Mr. Lewis could
say respecting our treatment of Mr. Mercer. I believe Mr. Lewis was
not at my House but I suppose was the person who sent for Mr. Mercer
to a tavern, saying he wanted to see him as he was going to
see Mr. Mercer's friends. As far as false reports respecting myself
I entirely disregard them, I hold it much better that my actions
should convince the World that I deserve otherwise. My resolution
has long been to do the best I can with all men and not to fear the
opinion of any. Mr. Mercer is treated as our Son, and Mr. Peale
never Cuts an Apple or Orange without giving him a part of it.
I trust he will love us as long as life lasts. You will be much pleased
with his improvement in the art [of painting] since his return from
[his visit to] Virginia—I have also received yours with a Bill of Exchange for £39. 16 Virginia Currency. 

In spite of this remittance, Peale still had trouble collecting all the money he believed was due him, because on March 7, 1786 we find him writing Weedon, "I now beg you to transmit me the Remainder of the 2 years board before the last of this month. . . . I have spent all my money on my Exhibition. . . ." And then he went on to report that "... my Pupil is in good health and happy, attending close to his improvement. . . .

However, with the lack of financial acumen so characteristic of many artists, Peale had demanded payment while forgetting even to render a statement of the account. General Weedon evidently reproved him for this, and also informed Peale that a friend of the family would pick up young Mercer at Philadelphia in May to take him home for another visit—a visit of which Peale did not entirely approve and of which he felt Billy Mercer did not approve either. Weedon had also apparently hinted that Billy might never return to Peale; at any rate, the artist wrote on April 3, 1786: "Yours . . . come safe to hand which showed me my error in expecting payment[,] however harping my calls [for money] might be[,] before I had informed you how the account stood. I will now do it at the bottom of the Letter.

"I acquainted Mr. Mercer that he was to go with Mr. Mortimore in May to see his friends, he shewed me that he thought it was going backward and forward. I did not inform him further. I told you to do when you have seen what improvements he has attained in the art [of painting], he has [to] much for the time [he has spent], but he has yet much to learn. I will give him every necessary nib of instruction in order to make his labour easy before we part[,] at least as far as my abilities does enable me to do so[,] after which I must refer him to dame Nature the Mistress of all great Painters. Mr. Mercer lent a miniature portrait of which he copied from my late Portrait of Doct[or] Franklin to a M[rs] Fitzhugh [i.e., Fitzhugh] of your State which was never returned. Mr. Mercer might have sold it, but I was anxious for him to keep it to show to his friends. Mr. Mercer shall immediately begin the picture you desire, he is in good health and diligent in his studies. . . ." Peale then went on to itemize his bill for "M. Mersers board washing and lodging from 2d Oct 1784—April 28th 1786 being 2 years"—thereby exaggerating by about six months the length of time covered by the bill. The total amount came to £120. 18. 9 with a balance due of £76. 15. 0. The statement also included the notation that "Mrs Peale makes no charge for mending but my Niece has mended 6 shirts at 1/6 each."

The painting to which Peale referred in this letter when he said, "Mr. Mercer shall immediately begin the picture you desire," was a picture of the fatal wounding of General Mercer at Princeton, as the next letter of the series indicates. In it, on April 29, 1786, Peale wrote to General Weedon as follows:

"Immediately after I received your letter I set Mr. Mercer to Copying the Picture where the Death of his father is introduced, and he has done very well as far as it is finished but Mr. Mortimore going so soon it was impossible for him to complete it. I find by your letter that you are fully sensible that he is but opening into the field of improvement, yet his labours will convince his friends that he has done well for the short time spent with me. and if his friends do not incline to part with him again he must by his application to painting portraits get forward, what he has seen and knows of the managements of Colours will enable him to go on a daily improvement. Should he return or if chance bring us together I shall be happy in giving him every assistance in my power. . . . I got Colours for Billy as you will see by the Bill he carries. Some of his things are left which shall be taken care of & sent when ordered. . . ."

After William Mercer had been at home for some five months, General Weedon evidently proposed that the lad return to Peale and continue his training as a painter. Peale warmly agreed with the suggestion in a letter of September 25, 1786, but at the same time pointed out that a difficulty had arisen. Wrote Peale:

"I am glad to hear that Mr. Mercer's friends have consented to his return here, as I am sure it will be of service to him. He left me at the time his powers were beginning to unfold, and after some more practice he would begin to feel himself stronger in the execution with the Brush. In some of my letters I mentioned his Conduct being most unexceptionable, free from any kind of Vice. This I hoped would have comforted his friends to induce them to bear his necessary absence.

"When Mr. Mercer was with us he and my son lodged together, since that time I have had an increase of Family" and that room and bed is Ingaged, this puts me in a difficulty with respect to

36 Peale's daughter, who rejoiced in the name of Sophoniba Angucita, was born April 24, 1786.
his lodging, but I suppose it will be equally agreeable to you to lodge with Mr. Gibbons who still lives in Spruce Street so near as to make it no ways inconvenient[,] it will be rather better for his health to take a walk of that distance a few times every Day, and that family always appeared to me very fond of him. Last evening I called at Mr. Gibbons with the Intention of conversing with her on that subject but did not find her at home, if I have time before this letter is called for I will go again.

"I have not received my Interest on your Certificate . . ."

I have now entirely laid aside my Exhibition of Transparent pictures . . . my love to Billy and best respects to Mr. Weedon & Mr. Mercer. I am with esteem, [Dear Sir] your very H[umble] Serva[n]t / C W Peale.

With this letter the correspondence ends. Billy Mercer never returned to continue his apprenticeship under Peale; it well may be that his family did not like the idea of having the young deafmute live away from Peale’s own house in a large city like Philadelphia.

For our purposes, of course, the most important letter in the whole series is that of April 23, 1786, which tells us that at that time, shortly before leaving Peale’s painting-room for good, William Mercer had started work on “Coppying the Picture where the Death of his father is introduced.” This clearly suggests that “The Battle of Princeton” in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania (Fig. 2), known to have been painted by William Mercer, is the picture begun by him in which William B. possibly with considerable help. And the fact that it was copied from another picture in the studio suggests in turn that “The Battle of Princeton” now owned by Princeton University (Fig. 1), which is identical in composition and which on stylistic grounds can be attributed to James Peale, is the painting young Mercer copied. This picture too would therefore have not been executed later than 1786. Nor would it be earlier than 1779, the year in which Charles Willson Peale made his sketches of the Princeton battlefield. And the fact that the Nassau Hall portrait of Washington (Fig. 4), which includes the death of General Mercer, was not completed by Peale until nearly a year after Billy Mercer became his apprentice in November, 1788, suggests that “The Battle of Princeton” in the Firestone Library (Fig. 1), in which General Mercer is also represented, may likewise have been painted after that date. Indeed, it is even possible that James Peale executed this painting primarily for the purpose of furnishing Billy Mercer with a picture of the death of his father to copy.

At all events, after the ending of Charles Willson Peale’s correspondence with General Weeden little is known of Billy Mercer other than the simple facts that he never married and that he is said to have lived on until about 1850. 8 Although “The Battle of Princeton” in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania (Fig. 2) is the one painting surely known to be by his hand, 9 William Mercer evidently went on painting for many years, because Rembrandt Peale, the son of his teacher, wrote in 1855: “. . . Mr. Mercer, under my father’s tuition, became an excellent portrait painter, and continued in his profession till his death, a few years ago.” Thus Billy Mercer evidently carried out the advice given by Charles Willson Peale in his letter to General Weeden of April 23, 1786, in which Peale said that if Mercer did not return to him for more training, “. . . he must by his application to painting portraits get forward.”

Careful investigation, especially in the neighborhood of Frederickburg, might well result in unearthing some of these portraits. Mr. Charles Coleman Sellers has told the author that in the course of his long study of the Peale family and their works he has occasionally seen pictures executed—rather naively—in the manner of Charles Willson Peale but which he was unable to attribute to any of Peale’s family or followers. He suggests that further study might indicate that some of these other paintings are by William Mercer. But the absence of any record of such research, however, “The Battle of Princeton” owned by the Historical Society of Pennsylvania (Fig. 2) remains the only work surely painted by him.

As such it is a work of considerable historical interest. Moreover, this painting—combined with information contained in Charles Willson Peale’s diary and letters—has greatly aided in identifying “The Battle of Princeton” now in the possession of Princeton University (Fig. 1) as one executed in Peale’s own studio by his brother James. As a result, we now know how the

9 As far as the author knows, only two other paintings have been attributed to William Mercer. One of these is a miniature of Edmund Pendleton signed “W. M.” for which see Alexander W. Weddell, Virginia Historical Portraiture, Richmond, 1906, pp. 7, 18, and 231, illustration oppp. p. 280. The other is the portrait of William Mercer’s grandmother, Mrs. John Gordon, already cited in note 2 above, which Savitsky has tentatively attributed to Mercer with a date of ca. 1786-90.
earlier phases of the Battle of Princeton were visualized by the Peale brothers. Not only is there a possibility that James Peale himself participated in that great American victory, but Charles Willson Peale certainly did so. Since no other competent artist is known to have taken part in the battle, it can be said with assurance that James Peale’s two paintings of the earlier events of that struggle (Figs. 1 and 3), are more closely based on firsthand experience than any other known painting. And since there is every reason for believing that the picture now in the Firestone Library (Fig. 1) is the earlier of the two and was painted within ten years after the battle, it is of particular historical importance.

An Early Poem by Dean Gauss

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY GEORGE S. HELLMAN

IN NOVEMBER, 1899, there appeared the first number of East & West, “A Monthly Magazine of Letters,” edited and published by William Aspinwall Bradley and myself while we were still at Columbia University taking the courses leading to the degree of master of arts. The prospectus had recorded our belief that there was “a public for a magazine that shall be entirely literary, containing well-written stories, good verse, both serious and light, and essays of contemporaneous interest.” The prospectus stated also that “a special endeavor will be made to interest the younger writers in the present venture, and also to bring before the public the work of those who, as undergraduates, have done most to raise college literature to the grade of excellence it has attained of late years.”

To name but a few of such youthful contributors, later to become distinguished in the field of letters, there were John Erskine, Percy MacKay, Alice Duer, Joel Elias Spingarn, and Hans Zinser. Among our poets George Edward Woodberry was, of course, the most important; but no piece of verse is of more interest, in retrospect, than the long poem which accompanied the following undated letter written in 1900:

209 W. Liberty St.
Ann Arbor, Mich.

Messrs. Bradley & Hellman
Editors “The East and West”

Gentlemen:

I would submit to your consideration a very modern poem, or more specifically a Masque “In Bohemia.”

By way of introduction: I am a Michigan man (98), received the Michiganian prize for the best poem of the year in ’96-97 and ’97-98 (Class Poet, ’98). You will remember me, perhaps, as Editor of the Islander (U. of M.) ’98-99.

The masque was written in Paris during the past summer. However [sic]. It will doubtless be intelligible to your clientele. I enclose further, a little lyric, Love’s Burial.
With hopes for the further success of your praiseworthy venture, I am,

Most sincerely yours,
Christian Frederick Gauss
(Sebastian de L'Isle)

The letter, with its nom de plume, and the poem itself, with its dedication to André Ibel's, lead to interesting conjectures regarding the young Michigan fellow who during the summer of 1896 was tasting the exciting joys of Paris. André Ibel's, whose example young Gauss followed in dropping one of his names, was a minor poet and writer for the stage. Save for a political monograph, the only writings of his I have come across are a group of not especially distinguished poems—"Vers Impressionnistes." These verses are in the volume entitled Les Demi-Cabots (1896), in which the other writers are Georges d'Esparbès, Maurice Lefèvre, and Georges Montorgueil. The book's chief quality consists in the illustrations by Henry-Gabriel Ibel's, André's senior by three years. The elder Ibel's had, as a popular artist, the entree to cafés and restaurants, circuses and theaters—often behind the scenes. He it presumably was who introduced André and Christian to Bohemian resorts where artists and poets, actresses and démon-ton-daines mingled in the intellectual and less intellectual pleasures of youth.

I find many drawings by Henry-Gabriel Ibel's worthy of admiration; but the only lines of André that have through their suggestion left an impression are:

Néron fut l'égal du Titien,
Néron savait illuminer les ombres!

Young Gauss, the romantically self-styled "Sebastian de L'Isle," was, it seems to me, a far more gifted poet than the companion to whom he dedicated the poem that appeared in the June 1900 issue of East & West. And one wonders whether in this autobiographical "Masque" where the Muse adjures the poet to wake from the tavern table and to charm the world with song, Christian is dedicating his verses to André in the hope that he, too, will forsake the "vile cafés," the "drunken voices," and the "lolling grissette." The voice of disillusion becomes scarcely audible as at the voice of the Muse old dreams revive "with days long gone to their dim western home." Young Gauss, no longer tempted by the fruitless pleasures
of Bohemia, takes again the inspiring hand of the Muse. Ever remaining a lover of French literature and a student of French history, he went forward on his career as a fine educator of American youth.

In Bohéma: A Masque
(To André Ibel)
By Christian Frederick Gauss

SCENE: A tavern.

THE MUSE.  THE POET.  A VOICE.

THE MUSE.
Shame, Poet, at thy tavern table, wake!
It is my wonted hour, mine,—thy Muse.
Hast thou forgot the time when we did use
To walk together through the quiet night?
It is the hour; away, the lingering light
Is mingled with the darkness, haste, ah take
My hand and let us forth again,—For shame!

THE POET.
Thy words are idle; nay, not any more
Canst thou seduce me with the charm of dreams;
Thou shalt not find me any more the same.
I am aweary of the fading gleams;
Better to-night the sleepy mandragore
And balm of nodding poppies, than thy smile;
Thy voice to me is as the wash of seas
Ulyses heard, recalling treacheries
Of fond Calypso and the fatal Isle.

A VOICE.
Gathered gold of rainbows makes
Never cloth-of-gold;
Fondest heart of lover breaks
When the truth is told,
And the songless bird forsakes
Autumn woods grown cold.

THE MUSE.
Nay, Poet, nay, I pity thee; ah, come.
This tavern surely cannot be the home
Of one who dared the sheen, steep heights of song:
It is a phantasy; thy fevered brain
Is dazzled; come, thou shalt be healed again;
I'll lead thee forth where thou shalt all forget:
A journey perilous it is, yea long
And difficult thereto the narrow way;
Yet on those heights what wonder! There the day
Begins; the violet asphodel is wet
With dews ambrosial, and the singers gone
Chant on those heights forever;—Come!

THE POET.
What wonder on those storied heights, indeed!
I am aweary of that wonder.—I;
Come change thy lure, 'tis the world's tragedy
That the Sphinx smiles forever; creed
After foolish creed, age after age,
Have broken 'gainst her feet of stone, for need
Their dust is whirled about the desert. Sage,
Poet, clown and captain, tempted, fall,
And he who solved the riddle, what of him?
Another wrote that tragedy.—'Tis all.
Better for me the noise and life, the dim,
Blazed candle-light of vile cafés;
Better for me the smoke of cigarette
Chasèd by drunken voices,—the grissette
Lolling her ribald song, than wasted days,
Your heights of wonder, promised crown of bays.

THE MUSE.
Nay, Poet, nay, thou hast not understood;
Their name is written in the Book of Life
Who charmed the world with song: the noise, the strife
Boot not at all, this fever of the blood.
Thy soul must hunger still for peace; so come,
Come take my hand and I will lead thee home;
Leave this low tavern where the air is hot
And follow me into the realms of light;
The moon, that perfumed flower of the night
Sways in her cloudy gardens, and the grot
Of fair Endymion to-night we'll find;
The arcane beauty of the gods long dead,
Your eyes shall see; the spiced Aegean wind
That dizzied Sappho as she sat and sang
Upon the lonely cliffs of Mitylene
Shall fill your nostrils. Yea, all things unseen,
All marvels past of man and God, the clang
Of arms forgot on immemorial fields,
Strange victories mismamed defeat;—the yields
Of all the ages do I hold; upon
Their waiting glory shall your heart be fed,
By me from all things all the veils be drawn.

THE POET.
Ah, temptress, I am weary of thy song;
And yet—the fruitless nights all overlong,
The barren days, are empty of delight.
At thy low voice somehow old dreams revive,
I hear dead voices calling, a strange light
Falls over faded faces and I strive
With days long gone to their dim western home.—
Passionate temptress, thy hand again,—I comel
(He takes her hand; the lights fade.)

A VOICE. (In the distance, scarcely audible.)
Gathered gold of rainbows makes
Never cloth-of-gold,
Fondest heart of lover breaks
When the truth is told,
And the songless bird forsakes
Autumn woods grown cold.
portrait of Stevenson as a young man. J. C. Furnas, the author of the recent biography of Stevenson, in which this drawing is reproduced, suggests that "the thick, waving hair—Louis's own hair was always lank—and the costume indicate that he drew himself in theatrical get-up, with wig, probably for one of the Jenkins' amateur productions." An earlier effort as an artist was present in the exhibit in the form of a pen-and-ink drawing of a soldier firing a cannon, drawn in 1856, when Stevenson was only six years old. This was accompanied by an even earlier piece of juvenilia, a letter to his father, dated March 29, 1854, which was probably written with his mother's assistance. The exhibit included also two important association books: a first edition of Catriona, London, 1893, with a presentation inscription from the author to his mother; and Frederick Locker's copy of the second edition of A Child's Garden of Verses, London, 1885, in which Locker had tipped, in addition to other matters, a letter from Andrew Lang—"I asked R. L. S. for a scrap of his writing for you. He sends me this, which I hope you will stick in one of your books."—and the "scrap of writing" itself, a poem addressed to Locker and dated September 4, 1886:

Not roses to the rose, I row,
The thistle sends, nor to the bee
Do wasps bring honey. Wherefore now
Should Locker ask a verse from me? . . .

As the final items in the exhibit Mr. Block selected his copy of the first edition of Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde, London, 1886, and a letter to Stevenson's parents started by Mrs. Stevenson and finished by Stevenson himself (May 25, 1886), in which he writes about a lady who thought that Dr. Jekyll was "a medical man who lives here in Bournemouth."

The "Collector's Choice" from the seventeenth of March through the twentieth of April consisted of four engraved portraits by Robert Nanteuil from the collection of John Douglas Gordon '05. Nanteuil, the son of a merchant of Rheims, was born about 1629 and died in Paris in 1678. The greatest French engraver of portraits, he engraved well over two hundred plates, most of which are from his own drawings. Nearly all the French high dignitaries of church and state of his time appear in his work. In 1658 he was appointed portrait engraver to Louis XIV, who, at his suggestion, in 1660 issued "the decree of Saint-Jean-de-Luz,"
which raised engraving from the status of a trade to that of one of the "liberal arts," freeing it from state-imposed guild regulations. The first engravings selected by Mr. Gordon from his extensive collection of Nanteuil's work were portraits of Cardinal Richelieu (1657, after Philippe de Champaigne), Cardinal Mazarin (1659, believed to be after Philippe de Champaigne), Louis, Prince de Condé, "Le Grand Condé" (1662, from life), and Jean-Baptiste Colbert (1662, after Philippe de Champaigne).

The final "Collector's Choice" of the academic year 1951-1952, a group of English literary autographs of the nineteenth century lent by Alexander W. Armour, was exhibited from the thirty-first of April through the first of June. Included in the exhibit were a letter from Thomas Carlyle to an editor or publisher concerning the literary Edinburgh house-painter James Ballantine; a friendly letter from George Eliot to the poet William Allingham; a felicitously worded apology written by Robert Browning to Mrs. Inwood Jones in which he offers his excuses for having failed to appear at a dinner; a note from Charles Dickens to Tom Hood, humorist, editor, and author, about extracts from Donkey and Son and A Christmas Carol; and a letter to a lady written by Lewis Carroll in his characteristically whimsical vein.

36 UNIVERSITY PLACE

The 1951-1952 program of the Graphic Arts Division opened with an exhibition of prints selected from the Print Club's lending collection. The annual fall lending of prints to undergraduates took place on the fifth of October. Drawings and woodcuts by Fiske Boyd were shown from the fifteenth of October to the fifteenth of November. Through the courtesy of Philip C. Dusches, copies of the facsimile edition of William Blake's Jerusalem, published recently by the Trianon Press for the William Blake Trust, were exhibited during the month of October.

On the twenty-fourth of October Meyer Berger, author of The Story of the New York Times, gave an informal talk on some of his experiences connected with the writing of the book. Harry Scherman, organizer and President of the Book-of-the-Month Club, gave on the thirtieth of November a talk on the distribution of books. Drawings made by Whitney Darrow, Jr., '31 to illustrate his father's "informal account of the growing pains of the Princeton University Press, casually put together at the point of a gun for

the intimate friends of the Press," were exhibited from the fifteenth of November to the tenth of January. An exhibition of contemporary serigraphs, on view during the same period, was the occasion for a tea on the second of December and, on the sixth of December, a demonstration of the making of a serigraph by Leonard Pytlak.

An exhibition of woodcuts by Antonio Frasconi opened with a tea on the twentieth of January and a selection of prints and drawings by the Associated Artists of New Jersey was shown from January the fifteenth to February the fifteenth. The spring lending of prints to undergraduates took place on February the seventh. The Princeton artists annual exhibition, sponsored by the Princeton Group Arts (February 17-March 14), was followed by the showing of contemporary American color prints (March 4-April 14). Photogravures selected by Edward Steichen from the collection of the Museum of Modern Art were exhibited from April the seventeenth to May the sixteenth.

Albert Einstein is the subject of the 1951 Print Club print, a woodcut by Antonio Frasconi. The 1952 Print Club print, a lithograph by Francis A. Comstock '19, of the Department of Art and Archaeology, is entitled "Tiger Gate and Little Hall."

UNDERGRADUATE BOOK COLLECTING CONTEST

The twenty-seventh annual undergraduate book collecting contest was held at 36 University Place on May 7, 1952, with Frederick B. Adams, Jr. and Barklie Henry serving as judges. The first prize of twenty dollars, from the fund contributed by the Princeton University Store, was awarded to Virginius Cornick Hall, Jr., '54 for his collection of books on Prince Charles Edward Stuart's rebellion in 1745; additional awards of ten dollars each went to Robert D. Briskman '54 for his collection on English civilization and to Gerrit L. Schoonmaker '53 for an inexpensively assembled collection of books in the field of English literature. The three collections were exhibited in the Princetoniana Room of the Library.

EXHIBITIONS

"Classics of Greece and Rome" was the title of the exhibition in the Exhibition Gallery from December 20, 1951 to February 10, 1952. This was organized at the suggestion of the Department of Classics as part of the University's contribution to the meetings
of the American Philological Association and of the Archaeological Institute of America held at Princeton December 27, 28, 29, 1951. Coins, papyri, and inscriptions provided a brief introduction to the display, which consisted mainly of manuscripts and early printed books of interest for their intrinsic beauty or for their significance as landmarks in the transmission of ancient knowledge to the modern world. The grouping was by subject—Mathematics, Medicine, History, Drama, Poetry, for example—with a few of the great names in each field represented. Such special collections as the Vergil collection (presented by Junius S. Morgan ’88), the Horace collection (presented by Robert W. Patterson ’70), the collections of Arabic and Western European manuscripts presented by Robert Garrett ’97, the Grenville Kane Collection, as well as the general collections, provided an abundance of riches from which to choose. In many cases it was possible to show in juxtaposition a medieval manuscript of a classical work, the same work in its first printed edition, and later notable editions or translations.

From February 20 to April 20 an exhibition of books from the Gest Oriental Library, entitled “Eleven Centuries of Chinese Printing,” occupied the Exhibition Gallery. This story of the printed book in China and Eastern Asia, arranged by Dr. Hu Shih, Curator of the Gest Library, and by Mr. Shih-kang Tung, Librarian, brought to the attention of the general public for the first time the resources of this collection. As a preface to the history of the printed book, rubbings from stone inscriptions and manuscripts were shown. Among the latter a manuscript scroll of ca. a.d. 600, from the Tun-Huang caves in northwestern China, was notable. Shown with it was its hemp wrapper, signed by the woman who sewed it and dated by her a.d. 685. The earliest block-printed Chinese book, dated a.d. 888, was represented by photographs of the original in the British Museum. The oldest block-printed work in the exhibition was a copy of the “Dharani” Sutra printed in a.d. 975, lent by Dr. Stanley K. Hornbeck, of Washington, D.C. The oldest block-printed book from the Gest Library itself was a volume containing three Buddhist Short Sutras, dated February, 1232. This item is part of the Chi Sha edition of the Buddhist Tripitaka, cut and printed during the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries in Chi Sha, near modern Soochow. Of the 5,190 volumes comprising the complete work, the Gest collection possesses 700 volumes printed in the thirteenth century and 1,600 volumes printed in the fourteenth century.

The exhibition then traced the development of printing down through successive centuries to the present time, with examples of block-printed books and works printed from movable type (invented in the middle of the eleventh century). Both these methods have been used concurrently in China down to the present century, which also saw the introduction from the West of machine-made metal type and of the photolithographic process. Because of Princeton’s traditional interest in Christian missionary work in China, a special section of the exhibition was devoted to the Bible in Chinese translations—in the classical language, in the national spoken tongue, in twelve local dialects and eight aboriginal tongues, and in the Manchu, Mongolian, and Tibetan languages. Most of the dialects and all of the aboriginal tongues were written down and printed for the first time in these translations of the Bible. Documents relating to Guion M. Gest (1864-1928), the founder of the Gest Oriental Library, one of the largest collections of Chinese books in the Occident, and to his collaborator, the late Commander I. V. Gillis, completed the exhibition.

In connection with the dinner sponsored by the Friends of the Library in honor of Elmer Adler upon the occasion of his retirement as Curator of theGraphic Arts Division, a retrospective exhibition of his work in the graphic arts was held in the Exhibition Gallery from May 2 through May 25. This survey of Mr. Adler’s work with the Pynson Printers, The Colophon, and his later activities at Princeton, was arranged from materials forming part of the Graphic Arts Division, the collections of which were moved during May and June from 36 University Place to special rooms on the second floor of the Firestone Library.

The final major exhibition of the academic year 1951-1952, “New and Notable,” held during the month of June, followed the pattern of the one held in June, 1951. As in the case of its predecessor, it surveyed the outstanding additions to Special Collections during the past year, including those which have been described in the “New and Notable” section of the Chronicle.

In observance of Washington’s Birthday and as a feature of Princeton’s annual midwinter Alumni Day, an exhibition in the Princetoniana Room recalled Washington’s many associations with the University and the town of Princeton. Books from Washington’s library bearing his bookplate and signature (from the Gren-
ville Kane Collection), original letters and signed documents, prints, and other memorabilia formed a varied display. James Peale’s painting of “The Battle of Princeton,” which is the subject of an article by Professor Donald D. Egbert ‘24 in this issue, also formed a part of the exhibition. A volume of the original minutes of the Trustees of the College of New Jersey was shown through the courtesy of the Secretary of the University; it was opened to the entry for September 25, 1783, which reads: “Dr. Witherspoon has reported that his Excellency Genl. Washington had delivered to him fifty guineas which he begged the trustees to accept as a testimony of his respect for the college.”

Upon the occasion of the Princeton Conference on the Teaching of Modern Languages, held on April 5, an exhibit in the Princetoniana Room featured “Famous European Authors: Selected Books and Manuscripts in French, German, Italian, and Spanish.” Other exhibits in the Princetoniana Room included material on undergraduate debating, books and manuscripts of Benedict Thilen ‘43, the undergraduate book collecting contest, photographic portrait-studies of Princeton emeriti professors by Robert M. Mottar, Princeton tigers, and Princeton commencements and reunions.

During February and March the Theatre Collection presented an exhibit called “Dance—from Ritual to Red Shoes.” Books, photographs, posters, programs, and related material from the Library’s own collections were supplemented by loans from Allison Delarue ‘28 and Richard E. Morse. Included among the items lent by Mr. Delarue were rare prints and pamphlets relating to Fanny Elsler and original stage designs by Eugene Berman. In connection with the exhibition a lecture and demonstration, “Classic versus Modern Dance,” was given by Mila Gibbons in the Theatre Collection on the evening of February 19. In May and June the Theatre Collection held an exhibition, arranged with the help of Richard E. Morse, entitled “Clowns and Ballerinas, The Dance and Circus in Art,” which included an unusual group of items lent by Alan L. Wolfe ‘12.

**BERTHIER’S JOURNAL**

In the first issue of the Chronicle (I, No. 1, Nov., 1939) Professor Gilbert Chinnard, in an article entitled “The Berthier Manuscripts: New Records of the French Army in the American Revolution,” described an important group of manuscripts presented to the Library by Harry C. Black ’09, a trustee of the University.

The records were once part of the personal archives of Louis-Alexandre Berthier (1753-1815), who is remembered chiefly as one of Napoleon’s marshals. The papers at Princeton, however, concern Berthier’s early career when he was an aide-de-camp on the staff of General Rochambeau in America in 1780-1781. The Library’s Berthier manuscripts fall into three categories: a series of beautifully drawn maps showing in great detail the itinerary and camp sites of the French army on its march from Newport to Yorktown; memoranda and diaries constituting what might be called Berthier’s “professional journal”; and, finally, a personal journal cast in the form of “letters to a friend.” A substantial portion of this personal journal has recently been published in the original French text by the Institut Français de Washington, with an introduction, also in French, by Professor Chinnard. The publication records Berthier’s departure from Brest in June, 1780, the ocean crossing aboard the “Auguste,” his visit to Martinique in the West Indies, the arrival at Newport in September, and his experiences with Rochambeau’s army in Rhode Island during the winter of 1780-1781. The narrative then describes the departure from Newport in June, 1781, the march across Connecticut to the Franco-American headquarters on the Hudson, and ends with the departure for Yorktown in August. Berthier’s highly readable account, filled with picturesque comments on the American scene, has been printed in an attractive brochure of seventy-eight pages, illustrated with two of his maps (the camps at Providence and Phillipshurst under the title Alexandre Berthier: Journal de la Campagne d’Amérique, au mois de Août et de Septembre 1781), “publié d’après le manuscrit inédit de l’Université de Princeton.” In behalf of the Institut Français de Washington, Professor Chinnard has kindly placed at the Library’s disposal copies of this brochure for free distribution. As long as the supply lasts, Friends of the Library and subscribers to the Chronicle may obtain copies by writing to the Editor.
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NEW & NOTABLE

ARCHIVES OF HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY

During the past few years literary manuscripts, correspondence, and extensive groups of personal papers have been added to the Library's collections of original materials for the study of modern literature. The recent gift of the records of the publishing firm of Henry Holt and Company brings a new type of source material and thus broadens the scope of the existing collections. The Holt archives, roughly estimated to include some four hundred thousand letters and documents, were formally presented to the Library on April 14 in the new Holt offices at 583 Madison Avenue, New York City, in the presence of representatives of the Library and of the publishers. Dr. Harold W. Dodds, President of the University, accepted the gift from Edgar T. Rigg, President of Henry Holt and Company.

The Holt records, strictly speaking, begin with the firm's establishment in 1866, although there are included in the gift to Princeton some records of Holt's predecessor, Frederick Leyboldt, dating back to 1859. Daybooks, ledgers, and inventory books provide a nearly complete record of the firm's publishing activities. The correspondence files are unfortunately less complete. Prior to about 1900 these are in the form of press copies of outgoing letters gathered together in bound volumes. Incoming letters for this early period are only occasionally to be found. This fact should cause no surprise in view of the statement made by Henry Holt himself in a letter dated 1911: "Unfortunately as so much time has elapsed (over nine years), during which we have moved, and on moving placed many of our old records in a storehouse outside of our office—that it is difficult and perhaps in some cases impossible to recover all those bearing on this case; but we have unearthed all that seem essential to giving you a clear understanding of it..." The unearthing process, as far as the research scholar

A small selection of material from the Holt Archives on display in the Manuscripts Room
is concerned, will be somewhat easier for the later period, when the Holt correspondence is arranged in vertical files with both originals of incoming letters and carbon copies of outgoing letters present.

According to the Library’s agreement with Henry Holt and Company, correspondence less than twenty-five years old and correspondence of living persons may be consulted only with the firm’s permission. Periodic additions to the records are planned, thereby enhancing the importance of the collection to future historians. As in the case of any similar extensive group of archival material, the value of the Holt records will depend upon the use made of them by scholars. From a cursory examination it would appear that they contain material of great interest not only for the study of individual authors, but also for the history of publishing methods and problems, of changing tastes in reading, of textbooks and teaching, and of such matters as international copyright and Anglo-American literary exchanges. In lieu of any formal history of the firm of Henry Holt and Company, the memoirs of the firm’s founder, published under the title GARRULITIES OF AN OCTOGENERIAN EDITOR (Houghton Mifflin, 1923), may serve as a guidepost to some of the personalities and questions touched upon in the extensive collection of papers now in the Princeton Library.

OTTO H. KAHN

The personal papers of Otto H. Kahn (1867-1944) have been given to the Princeton University Library by his children, Gilbert W. Kahn ’26, Roger W. Kahn, Lady Maude Marriott, and Mrs. John Barry Ryan. The papers are subject to certain restrictions during the lifetime of the donors. The Kahn papers, which include approximately three hundred thousand pieces, contained in ninety-nine standard metal filing drawers, form the largest personal archives in the Library. The collection is made up almost entirely of correspondence, although it includes copies in typescript of Mr. Kahn’s writings and speeches. Covering the period from 1910 to the end of Mr. Kahn’s life, the meticulously arranged file reflects the many and varied interests of a man who, in addition to being head of the banking firm of Kuhn, Loeb and Company, had part in the management of other important business ventures and gave substantial support to numerous cultural and educational organizations and activities.
CHRISTIAN GAUSS

The personal papers of the late Dean Christian Gauss (1878-1951) have been given to the Library by his family. Dean Gauss’s connection with the University began with his appointment by Woodrow Wilson as Preceptor in 1905; he was made Chairman of the Department of Modern Languages in 1918, and held that post until 1956; in 1925 he was appointed Dean of the College. His papers, in the main, cover the years of his life in Princeton.

The collection is voluminous, amounting to the equivalent of some eight standard filing drawers. It includes his personal correspondence, notes and drafts of lectures given to his classes, notes and drafts of articles written for scholarly and popular publications, copies of innumerable talks and formal addresses given in many parts of the country, and reviews. One is impressed with the variety and range of the subjects to which he gave his attention: Dante, liberal education in a postwar democracy, college men and college boys, Flaubert, the first hundred years of Princeton, to name but a few.

THE GIFT OF IMRIE DE VEGH

Imrie de Vegh, to whom Princeton was already indebted for “an exceptionally interesting group of over sixty books, mainly early works dealing with law, science, and economics” (described in the Chronicle, XI, No. 3 [Spring, 1950], 144-145), has presented to the Library a number of important and unusual books in the field of political science, all of which are listed below.


La Vie Inquiète de Jean Hermelin indicate that the book was probably printed directly from the manuscript and that any further changes were introduced on the proofs. The first half, written meticulously in a schoolboy notebook (even though Lacretelle was beginning his thirties), is obviously a clear copy made from another manuscript. The second half, written on large folded sheets of papier écolier and replete with directional arrows and pasted-in fragments of paper, looks like a first manuscript but I happen to know that it is not. At any rate, it contains interesting variants which are still legible despite the corrections. Previously I had called this early work "Proustian" (Romantic Review, April, 1950). Now the Princeton manuscript makes it possible to insist also on a Gidean influence because of certain variants and because of the change of title. Originally called La Vie de Jacques Lamal, the title was emended to Les Cahiers de Jean Hermelin when, as so often happened with Lacretelle's characters, Jacques Lamal was rebaptized. As some point in the manufacturing process, the title had again to be revised in order to avoid too pointed a reference to Gide's Les Cahiers d'André Walter.

In my original study of this novel, I ventured the hypothesis that there was a real as well as a fictional lapse of time between the two major divisions of the narrative because of a noticeable change of style. Since then the author himself has contradicted me. However, I have been able to reassemble the fragments of the first manuscript remaining in the author's possession and find that this is a remarkable record of the author's self-education in the art of the novel. Even though there may not be a real gap between the parts, there is a visible progress in style and technique from one end of the manuscript to the other. The Princeton manuscript is particularly significant because it registers the stage when Lacretelle had successfully rewritten the first "Proustian" part of the novel but was still improving the objective second part, which now interested him more. In other words, he was already on the road to his objective masterpiece, Silbermann.

After the publication of La Vie Inquiète de Jean Hermelin, Lacretelle left Paris for the tranquillity of Versailles and there set about composing two works, an unpatbized and abscetb novel which the author is in the habit of calling Le Roman Protestant and a short story known from the beginning by the Racian title of La Mort d'Hippolyte. The first Princeton manuscript of the latter bears the completion date of December, 1920.
The two Princeton manuscripts of *La Mort d’Hippolyte*, taken with the three printed texts, constitute an unusual record of the creative processes of a writer. First comes the plan, the outline of the narrative and the definition of the characters. Actually the plan is missing; having been purloined as the manuscript passed through someone’s hands, but its existence is confirmed by a note in M. de Lacretelle’s handwriting on the *chemise* of the manuscript. As the author composes, he seems to have a clear idea where he is going and knows his characters thoroughly. Rarely does a basic change occur and rarely does a paragraph move from one part to another. Every stage is visible in the manuscript from the first more rapidly written version to the final polished and chiseled form. Since M. de Lacretelle has one of the purest French styles, there is a valuable lesson to be gained from the study of variants.

But that is not all that may be learned from a study of the first manuscript of *La Mort d’Hippolyte*. In this story and in the *Roman Protestant*, begun in 1820, we must look for the genesis of *Silbermann*, which appeared in 1922 a few months after the first publication of *La Mort d’Hippolyte*. The manuscript of *Le Roman Protestant*, now the property of M. Anne de Béville-Noyant, is amorphous in structure and style. It lacks an armature and the author himself now admits that he did not know where he was going. After *Silbermann* he returned to it for a time and then abandoned it on the advice of André Gide. However, the manuscript of *Le Roman Protestant* is important because it stops where a chapter on Silbermann begins—an unwritten chapter which suddenly broke loose and expanded into the novel *Silbermann* as we now know it. Interesting though the subject matter relationships undoubtedly are, *Le Roman Protestant* provides no clue as to how a masterpiece could suddenly emerge from it. The stylistic clue is to be found in the Princeton manuscripts of *La Mort d’Hippolyte*. Clearly Lacretelle perfected his art in this masterful short story.—Douglas W. Alden

BOOTH TARKINGTON ’93

During the past year a number of additions have been made to the Tarkington collection. Mrs. Tarkington presented a bronze bust of Mr. Tarkington executed by Walker Hancock in 1924. Only two casts of this bust have been made, the second being in the John Herron Art Institute in Indianapolis. From Hugh MacNair Kahler ’04 came an important series of 146 letters, many with enclosures, written to him by Mr. Tarkington during the years 1920 to 1946. Post Wheeler ’91 gave his own copy of the script of the Princeton University Dramatic Association’s 1893 production, *The Hon. Julius Caesar*, with which are bound photographs of members of the cast, a copy of the playbill, programs, clippings, and letters relating to the play. Mr. Tarkington, who was the president of the Association, played the part of Cassius, “an old-time villain, witty and tricky, with an unapproachable appetite for crime,” and was, with Mr. Wheeler, co-author and co-director of this “operatic-farce-burlesque-extravaganza-comedietta (or something of that sort),” Mr. Wheeler also gave two pen-and-ink drawings done by Mr. Tarkington as an undergraduate.

The Library received from Gaylord R. Hawkins ’01 nine Tarkington manuscript items, including seven letters written by Mr. Tarkington to Mr. Hawkins. A copy of the script of *The Fascinating Stranger*, by Booth Tarkington, as adapted for television by Elizabeth Hart and televised on the “Pulitzer Prize Playhouse,” April 23, 1952, was the gift of Foote, Cone & Belding.

THE KELMSCOTT CHAUCER

One of the most impressive books produced in England during the late nineteenth century as a result of the far-ranging revival of interest in fine printing is William Morris’ typographic masterpiece, *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, printed at the Kelmscott Press, Upper Mall, Hammersmith, and published in 1896. A splendid copy of this book, the famous “Kelmscott Chaucer,” has recently been presented to the Library by Mrs. H. Howard Hagar in memory of her grandfather, James Laughlin, Jr. ’08, and of her mother, Martha Page Laughlin Seeler.

Besides the eighty-seven woodcut illustrations designed by Sir Edward Burne-Jones, engraved by W. H. Hooper, this majestic folio volume contains a full-page woodcut title, elaborate woodcut borders, twenty-six large initial words, and numerous ornamental initials designed by William Morris and engraved by W. H. Hooper, C. E. Keates, and W. Spielmayer. The book, which was five years in the making, was printed, in black and red, on an Albion hand press in Chaucer type, with the headings to the longer poems in Troy type. It appeared in an edition of 438 copies, of which thirteen were printed on vellum.
The copy received from Mrs. Hagar is one of forty-eight bound, under the direction of T. J. Cobden-Sanderson, at the Doves Bindery in full white pigskin elaborately decorated with gold tooling. The binding was designed by William Morris and executed by Douglas Cockerell. The protective case which accompanies the volume was also made at the Doves Bindery. Both the binding and the case are dated 1908.

Biblia

DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF THE FRIENDS OF THE PRINCETON LIBRARY

Volume XXIII, Number 4
Summer 1928

During the past year the Friends lost through death four men closely identified with the Library: James Thayer Gerould, Librarian from 1920 to 1938, Wolfgang S. Schwabacher ‘18, a member of the Council of the Friends, George Mann Peck, Curator of Special Collections in 1917 and from 1919 to 1937, and A. E. Gallatin, donor of the Aubrey Beardsley and Arthur Symons collections.

CONTRIBUTIONS

Further contributions have been received from members of the Class of 1906 to the fund raised by the Class for the purchase of the copy of Rex Brasher’s Birds and Trees of North America now in the Library. The following Friends are giving continued help: Sinclair Hamilton, Carl Otto v. Kienbusch, and Charles C. Nicholls, Jr.

A contribution from Carl Otto v. Kienbusch ’06 enabled the Library to secure the “Supplement to the New-York Mercury,” Number 165, October 6, 1735, containing the address from the Trustees of the College of New Jersey to Jonathan Belcher, Governor of the Province of New Jersey, and his reply, in which he declines the honor of having the college building named after him.
and suggests the name of "Nassau-Hall"; and also a copy of the printed prospectus "Proposals for publishing by subscription The Monthly Journal and New Jersey Magazine," issued by the Princeton printer Moore Baker, November 15, 1854, on the leaf of which is a letter to G. and C. Merriam, Booksellers of Springfield, from Moore Baker.

With the approval of the Council, the free balance of $850.00 in the Graphic Arts Fund was transferred to the Friends Book Fund for the purchase of items for the Graphic Arts Division. These items are to be selected by Elmer Adler.

Also by action of the Council, $643.00 was transferred from the Operating Account to the Friends Book Fund to be used with the advice of the Committee on Purchases and Acquisitions.

GIFTS

Since the publication of the last issue of the Chronicle several interesting gifts have been made to the Library by Friends. Edward Duff Balken '97 presented ten prints to the Graphic Arts Division. From Alfred T. Carton '05 the Library received a copy of the fifty-four-volume set of the Founders' Edition of the "Great Books of the Western World." Further additions to the Sinclair Hamilton Collection of American Illustrated Books came from Sinclair Hamilton '66. J. Harlin O'Connell '42 gave the manuscript of the translation by Ernest Dowson of "Mémoires du Maréchal Duc de Richelieu," a copy of John Davidson's "Plan," London, 1894, in the scarce white buckram binding; and eighteen items of correspondence between Davidson and John Lane concerning this book. The prompt copy of John Davidson's "For the Crown," London, 1896, with autograph annotations in the hand of Davidson and Forbes Robertson, was the gift of J. Benjamin Townsend '40.
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