clude historical tables of the faculties, students, and officials associated with the school; biographical sketches of the three deans and of the teachers who served the school for ten years or more; outlines of the history of organizations associated with the school; tables of awards and scholarships; and transcripts of some of the most significant documents concerned with the development of the school.

The authors seem to have held to a high level of objectivity, which gives the book a lasting usefulness. On the other hand, the historical method of "let the facts speak for themselves" begs some questions of how educational policies were arrived at and how administrative problems were dealt with. The challenges and controversies that so often help explain historical change often drop out of sight.

Yet, the book is a remarkable achievement, considering the many duties of the distinguished senior author. Edward Reif, dean of the College from 1945 to 1958, had Thelma Reif, his wife, as co-author. The Reifs long have had respect for and knowledge of the historical and cultural background of the pharmaceutical profession. This helps explain their persistence, over many years, in collecting the materials out of which they fashioned this book. It is a rich source of information on how the Pittsburgh College of Pharmacy made its contribution to the Western Pennsylvania community and serves as an example of the life cycle of the association-schools that typify the initiative and self-help of would-be professions during an earlier stage of American education.

University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

Glenn Sonnedecker


This book is made up of three eyewitness accounts, hitherto unpublished, describing the ambush of General Braddock and his army by the French and Indians, July 9, 1755. Charles Hamilton, a dealer and collector of autographs, literary, and historical manuscripts, lists the three documents as: (1) The Journal of Captain
Robert Cholmley's Batman; (2) The Journal of a British Officer; and (3) Halkett's Orderly Book.

The known materials on Braddock's Defeat are quite rare, and, according to the author, some of the documents such as those of Captain Orme, and that of the sailor who kept the so-called Seamen's Journal, are of questionable authenticity. Hamilton claims that "Orme was not with the advance party on the day of the ambush," yet Freeman, in George Washington (vol. ii, pp. 77, 82) states clearly that Orme was wounded in the battle, and Orme is quoted as describing—"This disastrous jamming up of the troops" in the battle. The author also claims that the unidentified sailor who kept the Seamen's Journal was not present at the battle and recorded it only from hearsay.

The two journals were found by Hamilton in a London auction. That of the Batman (orderly) was supposedly written by a participant in the fighting,—"possibly attached to Capt. Robert Cholmley—likely the diary was presented to the Cholmley family by the batman on his return to England after the Campaign." Soon, thereafter—"a second unpublished and unrecorded journal of the expedition," kept by a British officer and sent home to England, was discovered in the files of a British book dealer, which—"despite the lack of private library numerals I believe it may once have formed a part of the immense manuscript collection gathered by Sir Thomas Phillipps." Hamilton considers it amazing that for a—"century not a single unknown complete journal or diary of the Braddock Campaign was uncovered, and then, within the space of less than a month two such precious documents should come to light!" Amazing, indeed!!

The third manuscript referred to is Halkett's Orderly Book, the original of which is in the Library of Congress, which the author says is published for the first time, although frequent references and quotations from it are made by Freeman and others writing of that period. This diary is written by Daniel Disney, an adjutant in Halkett's 44th Regiment of Foot, who later appears in the British 38th Regiment in the American Revolution. Both the Disney report of 270 pages and that of the British officer of 9 pages of foolscap were watermarked with the initials G.R. at the base of a crown. The Halkett Orderly Book does not cover the daily army routine of July 9, 10 and 11, 1755.
The author states that the texts were transcribed, checked and rechecked, and the spelling and syntax left in their original form, which enabled him to give an accurate transcript and—"I hope it will be unnecessary for any scholar to consult the original manuscripts of these three works." Is this statement to be interpreted to mean that others will not be permitted to examine the manuscripts for tests of authenticity?

The three diaries do not entirely agree as to the details of the marching and the battle; such differences are to be expected, since distances traveled were only estimates of roads untraveled before, and the scattered troops in the woods, crossing the river, and beyond could not be viewed in their entirety by any one person. The number of British and Colonial troops engaged in the campaign and battle is given as — "1300 or so troops with their servants and attendants — more than one third were killed. — with about five hundred private men [killed] and about four hundred wounded out of Better than twelve hundred." Again, the British officer states that 800 yards from the river the first flank was fired on and — "every man of them killed or wounded, — The greatest part of the men who were behind trees were either killed or wounded by our own people, even one or two Officers were killed by their own Platoon. Such was ye Confusion." The engagement began before 1 P.M. of July 9 and ended at 4:30 P.M. The survivors of the engagement, according to the journals, were pursued for more than a mile and were cut off in going through the river. The survivors who could not walk fell into the enemy's hands where they were given no quarter. The Batman speaks of his superior officer as "my master" rather than his captain. His horse was shot near the five horses the General "had Shot under him." In addition to Braddock, other prominent persons who were wounded or killed were Sir Peter Halkett; Lieutenant Colonel Thomas Gage who led the advance troops of Grenadiers; Captain Orme, an aide to Braddock, as well as Captain de Beaujeu of the French and Indian force from Fort Duquesne. Many Colonials and frontiersmen were in the engagement, including Captain George Croghan, Andrew Montour, Christopher Gist, the Indian Half-King, John Finley, Daniel Boone, Daniel Morgan, Richard Henry Lee, and of course, Captain George Washington, an aide to General Braddock.

As noted above, the diaries of the Batman and the British
officer are, in places, quite at variance. The latter records that the Monongahela River was 600 yards wide, the former that the river was "betwixt two and three hundred yards over and not much more than knee deep." The bank was "eight yards perpendicular — and not above 200 yards to Frazier's Plantation." The other diary gives the height of the bank as a twelve foot embankment. Fraser's Cabin near the mouth of Turtle Creek had been burned some time previous to the battle.

Hamilton refutes the idea that Braddock was shot by one of his own men, Thomas Fausett, whom he considered a pathological liar. He states that the bullet struck the upper part of the shoulder — scapular region and penetrated downward into the lung — a direction not likely from a bullet fired by an unmounted person. The general was carried on a litter supported on two long poles and carried by 6 men, one of whom was the Batman. As generally known, Braddock died on the 13th of July, 1755. The British officer's note that "— an unlucky shot hit him in the body which occasioned his death in 3 or 4 days afterwards" would indicate that this part of the diary was written after the general's death.

At the end of the British Officer's Diary is a list of the officers and men killed or wounded, and some not wounded. None of the diaries gives the name or number of the French Force engaged in the battle; Gordon, Washington and others estimated the attacking force not over 300 men, but Canadian Archives recorded a total of 885 French, Indians and Canadians; from other sources it is known that Captain de Beaujeu was mortally wounded.

For many years discussion, and probably speculation, has gone on as to the part Washington played in the expedition, how much Braddock was responsible for the ambush and just how much friction existed between the British regulars and the American Colonial troops. From the information furnished here and elsewhere Washington was much pleased to be made an aide to Braddock, but was displeased with the delay in accumulating men and material, and he was responsible for advising (about June 16) that the force be divided and the advance column hurried forward to reach Fort Duquesne before the French were strengthened from the North. As to advising Braddock during the actual battle, Washington was very discreet, but years afterwards wrote more in detail how he had used every "proper occasion" to tell Braddock and the other officers
that the French and Indians had to be fought in their own way. Hamilton feels that Braddock made a serious mistake in rushing forward into the middle of the attack already being met by Gage's forces without any form or order. "It was certainly no ambush for the troops under Braddock! — Braddock and his men joined the fight prepared for battle. But in the narrow road with little room for mobility, the men were telescoped together in confusion." Thus, continues the debate of just how much Braddock's defeat was due to unacceptability of advice given by Washington; how much to division of his forces (from Gage's front to the end of the rearguard was a distance of about 1900 yards, Freeman ii, 68), and especially to the Indian manner of fighting in a terrain that was decidedly disadvantageous to the British in a valley surrounded by ridges; how much to lack of Indians, which the French appreciated and used skillfully in woodland warfare and as guide and scout.

The general impression has existed that Braddock was ignorant of the type of fighting prevalent in America; that he was not inclined to take advice from the Colonials; that he lacked originality; that the methods of warfare he had learned in Europe were sufficient in America, and therefore he had no occasion to consult with Colonial aides. The diaries reviewed do not solve this question, but the evidence from them would emphasize that lack of vigilance and scouting, and scattering of forces, added to an inability to meet the Indian type of fighting, were largely the cause of the rout. Neither side came in contact with the other at the expected place: at the ford. Whatever the chief causes of the rout, many would agree with Freeman (ii, 99) that "the wonder was not that Braddock's men ran but that they stood as long as they did."

The text of Braddock's Defeat is illustrated with pictures of Braddock, Captain Washington, a Journal Entry of July 9, 1755, a map of Braddock's March, and printed on good paper with many illustrations of the text content.

This book will be read and much discussed by historians as to how much detail has been added to our knowledge of the expedition and battle, how much is authentic, and, rightfully, to what extent the data furnished can be used to lay out the battlefield with state markers to call the public's attention to a spot too much in controversy but yet all-important in Colonial history.

Pittsburgh

C. W. W. ELKIN