

Arminian forms of American religious liberalism.

The most interesting aspect of the nineteenth-century history of the Universalists, as Bressler writes it, was their relation to various fringe and reform movements—phrenology, hypnotism, and spiritualism. These involvements give the author the opportunity to suggest the sort of lived quality of Universalist religiosity in the nineteenth century. But the limitations of the evidence—mainly published writings—mean that this study has the feel of more traditional denominational history. Bressler has done her homework in the archives, but the sorts of material that would have enabled her to write religious history in the style of a social or new cultural historian are not available.

Universalism peaked as a denomination about 1880; thereafter, it became more and more associated with Unitarianism, a denomination with which it merged in 1961. In the twentieth century Universalists were identified with the diluted but progressive spiritual commitments of a few of the prosperous in New England and New York. Bressler treats these twentieth-century developments in only a few paragraphs, and the book would have benefited from a final chapter on the seventy-five-year decline.

Bruce Kuklick
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Teach Me Dreams: The Search for Self in the Revolutionary Era. By Mechal Sobel. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000. xvi, 368 pp. \$35.00, ISBN 0-691-04949-1.)

Mechal Sobel has produced the first historical monograph on popular conceptions of selfhood in revolutionary America. The monograph follows upon a pioneering essay collection that Sobel coedited with Ronald Hoffman and Fredrika J. Teute, *Through a Glass Darkly: Reflections on Personal Identity in Early America* (1997), and it offers a direct counterpoint to a book Sobel opts not to cite, Daniel Walker Howe's *Making the American Self: Jonathan Edwards to Abraham Lincoln* (1997). Sobel and Howe are similar insofar as

they both cover the long American Revolution spanning the mid-eighteenth to the mid-nineteenth century, but there the similarity ends. Defiantly traditionalist, Howe brought his intellectual history of selfhood to the verge of a supposed democratization of the ideal of self-fashioning beyond canonical white men, so that it might come to embrace at least women and blacks with intellectual credentials.

Sobel corrects the teleological bent of this narrative by broadening the notion of "selfhood" beyond the confines of liberal individualism. Selfhood in Sobel's view is only secondarily an ideology of individual autonomy, and primarily a mechanism for "alterity"—for constructing oppositional identities. Consequently, selfhood is not an ideological possession restricted to privileged white men, but a cultural process fundamental to the identity work performed by all people, whether female or male, black or white.

To investigate such an expanded notion of selfhood, Sobel must examine a source base broader than the canonical literature scrutinized by Howe, which she finds in an array of "self-narratives" from manuscript letters and journals to published memoirs and autobiographies. To exert some thematic control over such a vast array of material, Sobel concentrates upon dream reports because they invoke cultural meanings shared by many people. Dream reports, in other words, are best understood as microcosms of culture.

Having established the analytical importance of self-narratives and dream reports, Sobel next deploys the comparative approach she used so fruitfully in her previous monograph, *The World They Made Together: Black and White Values in Eighteenth-Century Virginia* (1987). Choosing now, however, to emphasize divergence rather than convergence, Sobel structures two sets of companion chapters around binaries of race and gender. Chapter 2 concerns whites' oppositional images of blacks, whereas chapter 3 examines blacks' oppositional images of whites. Chapter 4 focuses upon men's oppositional views of women, and chapter 5 upon women's oppositional views of men.

Given abiding inequalities in the historical record, Sobel's evidence unavoidably thins in the obvious places; black women, for instance,

are underrepresented. Even so, Sobel details how decades of religious and political upheaval impelled Americans from all walks of life to refashion their identities, typically in aggressive opposition to other social groups. In this, privileged white men were no different from anyone else, even if they alone manufactured an ideology of liberal individualism as a way to uphold social inequalities to their advantage. Yet Sobel's image of revolutionary America features such fundamental disunity that it is difficult to imagine what identity categories might have instilled some countervailing unity. Class? Religion? Nation?

Konstantin Dierks
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

Editorial note: It is *JAH* policy that staff members not review for the journal. This review was completed before Konstantin Dierks joined the staff.

Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier, 1756–63. By John Oliphant. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2001. xviii, 269 pp. \$39.95, ISBN 0-8071-2637-3.)

This highly complex and poorly organized work covers Cherokee relations primarily with South Carolina and secondarily with Virginia during the Seven Years' War. Whereas the Cherokees actively fought beside the British army against France and her Indian allies in 1757–1758, conflicts with the white settlers stemming from this alliance helped produce a Cherokee war with South Carolina in 1759 and with the British army in 1760 and 1761.

John Oliphant's hero, Lt. Col. James Grant, led the campaign that destroyed the Cherokee Middle settlements in 1761, but he always revealed "more sympathy for the Cherokees than for the white settlers." Most historians have treated Grant as an able and humane officer despite his destruction of fifteen towns and all their food supplies. Grant himself thought he had treated the Indians too harshly; Andrew Pickens, a young South Carolina officer on the campaign, thought it typified "british cruelty which I always abhorred" (Pickens to Lee, Aug. 28, 1811, Sumter MSS, I, 107, Draper Collection, State

Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison), and Attakullakulla, the Little Carpenter, dubbed Grant "the Corn Puller." Nevertheless, Grant in the peace preliminaries negotiated "the honourable compromise he and the Carpenter had always wanted." All South Carolina's demands for land and retaliatory executions were dropped, and a peace was created that at least had a chance of holding.

The villain of the story was Gov. William Lyttelton of South Carolina, who wanted to maintain his colony's primacy in Indian affairs, which of course included control of Cherokee trade. He did not understand the obligations of Cherokee clan vengeance, the Indians' fear of white expansion, or the consensual nature of Cherokee politics. "Consequently he did not regard the Cherokees as a free and independent people with a right to negotiate as equals." He declared war on the Cherokees in 1759, made hostages of an Indian peace delegation, and precipitated a war that drove his colony's frontier back a hundred miles. This forced Lyttelton to call on the army for help. The British government's attempt to imperialize Indian affairs had already placed the Indian superintendents "under the broad supervision of the commander-in-chief." In 1761 Grant realized "that the commander-in-chief and his deputies . . . alone possessed real supra colonial authority as well as the means to enforce it" and "must ultimately take responsibility for a coordinated Indian policy."

In his epilogue, Oliphant pushed his study to the Treaty of Augusta (1763) and the Proclamation of 1763. Britain's secretary of state south, Charles Wyndham, Lord Egremont, "knew that the security of the frontier, and common justice, required a coherent policy of Indian protection." Oliphant saw the Proclamation of 1763 as the embodiment of a policy evolving since the war of the Austrian Succession, mercantilistic in nature, "not a desperate attempt to stave off disaster in the American backwoods." At Augusta the Cherokees argued for restoration of their 1747 boundary with South Carolina; essentially it was restored in 1766 with a surveyed line that was enforced by the British army.

This volume creates surmountable but unnecessary difficulties for the reader with its