quidgeon lists eighty-four herbal remedies along with a description of their preparation and use. The next section deals with sixteen forms of treatment involving the use of such esoteric materials as skunk-oil, spider webs, mud, excrement, and other typical folk therapeutics. The succeeding short chapters cover witchcraft, dreams, natural signs and omens, and foods. The latter is significant in terms of Indian medicine, since various foods played a role in religious practices. Moreover, hunters had to perform certain rites in order to propitiate the spirits of the animals they killed lest these spirits bring on sickness and death.

The second part of the book provides a comparable account of the medical practices and therapeutics of the Mohegans. In several appendices she deals briefly with the Nanticoke, the Canadian Delaware, the Oklahoma Delaware, and the Mohegan of Connecticut.

The book is essentially a compilation, and the organization is open to question. For example, since the Nanticoke and Canadian Delaware are treated essentially in the same fashion as the Delaware and Mohegan, why relegate them to an appendix? A table of contents would be helpful, although this is compensated for by an adequate index. Despite these minor objections, the author knows her people, and she has produced a work which will be useful to students of both Indian lore and American folk medicine.

*University of Maryland*  
John Duffy


Votaries and students of mid-eighteenth-century Pennsylvania history are gratified to receive the first volume of *The Papers of Henry Bouquet*, even though it follows the second by twenty-one years. Priorities in projects to be accomplished by the Museum Commission and particularly a dearth in public funds have conspired to postpone this publication.

A much greater number of manuscripts transcribed and printed in this volume than in the former volume have been found in collections other than the British Museum, Additional Manuscripts. This
reviewer is acquainted with the papers in those libraries and can personally attest to the fact that careful and meticulous workmanship is here exhibited in the way of transcription.

It is unfortunate that these two volumes should have appeared under the same title, save for the one word, "Col./" that heads the earlier paperbacked, nineteen-volume edition of Bouquet papers. It is a matter of personal observation that many students and librarians alike, to say nothing of rare-book dealers, believe that these present volumes are a hardback reprinting of the former mimeographed edition. That is not entirely true, and scholars will have to have both sets available for reference. The mimeographed papers contain only manuscripts from the British Museum, Additional Manuscripts, and little more than half were printed. The conventional printing includes the letters of the campaign of General John Forbes with, in the first volume, many letters leading up to that episode, also some of Bouquet's South Carolina letters. As mentioned, nearly half of the series of documents after 1758 have not been published.

At the root of the confusion relating to the piecemeal printing of these papers is the unfortunate use of the definitive The in the titles of both publications. With new letters by Bouquet himself intermittently turning up (one came to light within the last four months), with so many series yet unpublished and not likely to be published, the use of the definitive article appears to be misleading. Our own Dr. Alfred P. James would have been excused for titling his Writings of General John Forbes definitively, had he chosen to do it, for he lacked only one letter, the contents of which he accounted for; yet he forbore that self-indulgence so dear to the heart of a true scholar.

Reluctantly we point out that the names of recipients of acknowledgments should be correctly designated. The director of the William L. Clements Library (p. xii) is Howard H. Peckham. In the same vein, we mention that the heading (p. 92), "Lyttelton: Orders to the Colonials of Militia," should read, "... Colonels of Militia."

More serious is the consideration of the fact that younger students use these volumes for footnote information, biographical, and landmark identification, more than for the letters themselves. Misleading reference information is perpetuated. An example is seen (p. 120, note) where Fort Loudoun is designated in South Carolina. This fort is not and never was located on land claimed by South Carolina. Ordered by Lord Loudoun to be built on land then thought to be Virginia soil, a later survey defining it as in North Carolina west of
the Great Smoky Mountains included in the formation of Tennessee, on the Little Tennessee River thirty-three miles southwest of Knoxville, the Fort Loudoun restoration and surrounding remains are larger in area than our Fort Ligonier restoration. The reference cited only states that part of the independent companies of British regulars based at Charleston, South Carolina, formed part of the garrison of Fort Loudoun, making no statement as to its location.

Another instance of obscure annotation is seen (p. 47) where Ensign Charles Rohr, engineer (actually the French army sergeant de Rhoir), is left ill and dying at Lancaster, there ending the matter with the inference that he then deceased. A reference to the prior published volume two, pages 275, 294, 366, 380, and 538-39, will afford ample proof that this remarkable officer performed his most valuable work during the months that followed. General John Forbes lamented his loss at Major James Grant's defeat, in September following, as "an engineer of more service than all the rest of his class put together." Again, the image of that illustrious figure in American colonial life, General James Oglethorpe, would have been enhanced had it been noted (p. 133, where he is left as a major general) that prior to his death in 1785, he was the highest ranking full general in the British Army Lists.

Withal, this volume contributes to a more comprehensive picture of the massive problems that confronted the British commanders in administration of the army and in supplying and directing its movements over a vast extent of largely wilderness territory during the mid-eighteenth-century struggle for mastery of this continent. The inclusion of the papers from the Lord Loudoun collection in the Huntington Library of San Marino, California, also the few letters from the Lyttelton papers in the William L. Clements Library in Ann Arbor, Michigan, have broadened the scope of the historical field of vision beyond that which would have been presented by only the British headquarters papers.

Edward G. Williams

Pittsburgh