

Sims does not footnote Collins or indicate how she reached her conclusion that snake handling went into a dormant period in East Tennessee. Many works that have appeared lately by these so-called “creative writers” and journalists fall short of scholarly standards and are carelessly presented. I understand that these writers want to reach a wide audience and their publications are not necessarily written for academics. Regardless, certain rules apply that Sims neglects. Her work does not contain notes, and her research sources are presented as a bibliography. After a close examination, the bibliography should have been offered as a selected bibliography. For example, in describing Carl Porter and Clyde Ricker’s brush with the law in 1975, Sims simply uses the phrase “According to news accounts.” What news accounts? She does not footnote or place them in her “bibliography.” If these recent books by journalists are presented by their publishers as academic or historical, then they should follow the scholarly rules. Sims conducted her research almost two decades ago and was originally published by St. Martin’s. However, the work is presented here as if it were current. Like other churches, Pentecostal/Holiness religion is dynamic and does not stay fixed in time. If books like *Can Somebody Shout Amen!* are to be reproduced by scholarly presses, much revision and editing are needed.

DAVID L. KIMBROUGH resides in Stanford, Indiana, and is the author of *Taking Up Serpents: Snake Handlers of Eastern Kentucky* (1995) and *Joseph Tarkington: From Frontier Evangelism to Refined Religion* (1997).

*Recollected Words of Abraham Lincoln*. Compiled and edited by Don E. Fehrenbacher and Virginia Fehrenbacher. (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1996. Pp. liv, 592. Notes, index. \$60.00.)

Reminiscences, always necessarily present among the sources consulted by Lincoln scholars, are finally attaining the respectability they deserve. Important evidence of this is the publication of Don E. and Virginia Fehrenbacher’s *Recollected Words of Abraham Lincoln*. Calling their book “a step toward the evaluation of a great body of source material and toward a critique of its use by historians” (p. lii), the Fehrenbachers have assembled some 1,900 quotations as remembered by over five hundred informants. The result is a critical compilation of the recollected utterances attributed to Lincoln in contemporary or reminiscent sources. The Fehrenbachers’ purpose is to provide a comprehensive guide to things Lincoln is remembered to have said, from extreme youth until his death, to serve as a companion to the *Collected Works* (1953–1955), containing Lincoln’s speeches, letters, and memoranda.

Mostly the Fehrenbachers have consulted published sources in their quest for Lincoln quotations; in their bibliography of over four hundred items there is evidence of their consulting just thirty-six manuscript collections. They consider the "high-grade ore" of recollected Lincoln quotations to be found in diaries, letters, and memoranda, sources in which Lincoln's words were set down shortly after their utterance, mostly during Lincoln's presidency. The editors have developed a guide to the evaluation of such remembered utterances. Those cast in direct discourse and recorded contemporaneously receive a letter grade of A, indirect quotations or paraphrases recorded contemporaneously receive a B, and noncontemporaneous quotations (the majority of those compiled) rate a C. Quotations the authenticity of which the compilers consider to be in some or extreme doubt are given a D or E, respectively, though they are obviously not omitted altogether. Questionable quotations the Fehrenbachers consider "germane to the evaluative process" (p. liii) and too important to the Lincoln legend to be discarded.

The unsurprising result is that the Fehrenbachers give high marks to Lincoln's words as remembered by the likes of Orville Browning, John Hay, and Gideon Welles in their diaries. The Lincoln quotations that they cite from the reminiscences collected by William Herndon rate mostly C's because of their noncontemporaneity. They are more skeptical of Herndon's own recollections of Lincoln's remarks; they acknowledge Herndon's honesty but consider his memory unduly influenced by intermediate events and his credibility compromised by a tendency to elevate inferences and speculations "to the status of fact" (p. 238). Coming off less well are works attributed to Ward Hill Lamon and Alexander K. McClure. Of the latter they write, "Some of [his] recollections are so dubious as to cast a certain amount of doubt on everything he wrote about Lincoln" (p. 314).

The compilers find a number of cherished Lincoln lines to be questionable. One example, which originated with McClure, is Lincoln's assessment of Grant after Shiloh: "I can't spare this man, he fights" (p. 315). They are also skeptical of Norman Judd's recollection that Lincoln defended his second question of Douglas at the Freeport debate by saying, "I am after bigger game. The battle of 1860 is worth a hundred of this" (p. 271). And they doubt Elizabeth Keckley's memory that Lincoln feared that his wife might be sent to "that large white building on the hill yonder" (p. 273) after their son Willie's death because the insane asylum in question was not visible from the White House.

This work will hereafter be indispensable, but it will surely be followed up by one or more supplemental volumes. The Fehrenbachers would be the first to admit that they have not found all of Lincoln's remembered quotes. More exist in the soon-to-be-published reminiscent materials collected by William Herndon and in manuscript

collections around the country, and a lot of “low-grade ore” also remains in the Lincoln ephemera at the Huntington Library and the Lincoln Museum at Fort Wayne. But Lincoln scholars and buffs owe immense gratitude to Don and Virginia Fehrenbacher for bringing together and giving order and system to this important body of Lincolniana.

RODNEY O. DAVIS is Szold Distinguished Service Professor of History at Knox College, Galesburg, Illinois. With Douglas L. Wilson he is editing an edition of the letters and interviews about Abraham Lincoln that were collected by William H. Herndon.

*Explicit and Authentic Acts: Amending the U. S. Constitution, 1776–1995.* By David E. Kyvig. (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1996. Pp. xx, 604. Notes, bibliography, index. \$55.00.)

This book is the first comprehensive historical study of the formal process of constitutional amendment under Article V of the United States Constitution. That David E. Kyvig presents this first study more than two hundred years after the adoption of the Constitution suggests that the formal amendment process has been seen neither as the principal means of constitutional development in the United States nor as a feature of the system worthy of analysis. Kyvig disputes this judgment as a historian, and as a constitutionalist he argues that the only truly effective way to alter the fundamental principles, forms, and procedures of American national government is through the formal process of amendment.

The book is a straightforward account of the use of the Article V mechanism from its inception and original application in the adoption of the Bill of Rights to the long-delayed ratification of the Twenty-Seventh Amendment, which in 1992 denied Congress authority to adjust its own salary. Explaining the political and constitutional history of the amendments adopted, as well as controversial proposals such as the child labor and ERA amendments that failed, Kyvig provides an indispensable reference work for students of American history.

Kyvig’s work holds interest as well for critics and theorists of constitutionalism. Although he does not say so explicitly, he challenges the long-standing idea that the Constitution is what the Supreme Court says it is. Rather, the Constitution is what its framers and ratifiers declared it to be. Kyvig recognizes that from an early date judicial interpretation of the Constitution became a convenient substitute for formal amendment as a way of resolving constitutional problems. This practice did not have untoward consequences in the nineteenth century, Kyvig says, because the constitutional problems that were beyond the scope of judicial review were also beyond the reach of the amendment process requiring supermajority consensus. These problems—the status of slavery and the nature of the Union—