AN ASSESSMENT OF THE CHOLMLEY'S BATMAN AND BRITISH A JOURNALS OF BRADDOCK'S CAMPAIGN

PAUL E. KOPPERMAN

In 1959, Charles Hamilton published Braddock's Defeat, a slim volume of primary material on the campaign that touched off the French and Indian War. Central to his work were two journals of the expedition by purported participants, one a British officer, the other, in Hamilton's opinion, the batman of Captain Robert Cholmley, or Cholmondeley. Both journals were previously unknown and had only the year before been purchased by their editor.1

The importance of Hamilton's contribution was readily apparent. Hitherto only one complete account of the expedition had been published, the famous journal kept by Captain Robert Orme, Braddock's favorite.2 Suddenly, two more versions were in print. Those with an
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1 Braddock's Defeat (Norman, Okla., 1959) also includes Sir Peter Halket's (Halkett's) orderly book.

2 Orme's journal is printed in Winthrop Sargent, The History of an Expedition Against Fort Du Quesne in 1755. Under Major-General Edward Braddock, Pennsylvania Historical Society, Memoirs, 5 (1855), 281-358. Sargent also includes a version of the famous "Seaman's Journal," 366-89. A second version is printed in Archer Butler Hulbert, Braddock's Road and Three Relative Papers, Historic Highways of America, Volume Four (Cleveland, 1903), 83-107. While some of the material included in this journal is interesting and is based on firsthand observation, the seaman who authored the account was unable to accompany the march due to illness. For a fuller discussion, see Paul E. Kopperman, Braddock at the Monongahela (Pittsburgh, 1977), 243-45.
interest in the campaign began to draw heavily on them, especially on the batman's account, which was the longer and fuller.

Within recent months George Swetnam has twice questioned the authenticity of Hamilton's journals. His charges should not be taken lightly. Either they raise reasonable doubt, in which case historians should treat the journal with caution, or they do not present a valid basis for concern. After having thoroughly reviewed Swetnam's complaints and the two accounts, I tend strongly toward the latter conclusion.

In this article I intend to refer to the author of the officer's journal as "British A," as I did in my book, Braddock at the Monongahela. To preclude the possibility that paraphrase may vitiate the case against the journals, I shall quote Swetnam extensively, as I shall the documents themselves. The reader should therefore be placed in the best possible position to judge.

When Swetnam reviewed Braddock at the Monongahela, he questioned my acceptance of the Cholmley's Batman and British A accounts: "The former is, if not wholly a forgery, completely untrustworthy, and the latter is also full of errors. The author might have been warned by many indications, such as that both soldiers (apparently near the head of the march) indicated an ambush (the batman asserting that he was within about ten yards of the guides who 'spied the Indiens lay'd down Before us,' British A saying the action began when 'our first flank upon the left was fired upon')."

Certainly, British A gives the impression that there was an ambush, a point that I noted in my book. However, he may not have had a very good view of the early fighting. At the moment the battle began, he was probably either toward the rear of the advance party or in the working party. In either case, he was likely more than one hundred yards from the scene of the first firing and his view was screened by scores of men. Furthermore, the Indians raced down the British

3 To explain the reason for this designation, I should note that British A and Cholmley's Batman are not our only anonymous reporters of Braddock's expedition or defeat. The other unnamed British or American sources are referred to as "British B, C, D, and E," respectively, in Braddock at the Monongahela. In addition, there are the anonymous French reporters, whom I designate "French A, B, and C." Such labelling may be prosaic, but it is also essential to avoid confusion.

4 Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine 60 (July 1977), 291 (hereafter cited as WPHM). All quotations included in the present article are drawn from the same page. I wish to make clear that this article is not intended as an answer to Swetnam's review. I intend to refer only to his comments on British A and on Cholmley's Batman.

5 On my positioning of British A, see Kopperman, Braddock, 166.
flanks and attacked them very early in the battle, and British A may have believed that this assault was part of the general action that initiated the engagement. His version is confused, but not suspiciously so.

The batman's account of the first fighting presents a more involved picture and should be quoted at length. According to him, after the advance party had marched from the river, "we had not got above a mile and a half before three of our guides in the front of me above ten yards spied the Indiens lay'd down Before us. He Immediately discharged his piece, turned Round his horse [and] Cried, the Indiens was upon us. My Master Called me to give me his horse which I tooke from him and the Ingagement began. Immediately they began to Ingage us in a half Moon." 6 Swetnam's contention that Cholmley's Batman depicts an ambush is nowhere supported. The batman does not claim that he himself saw the Indians, "lay'd down" or otherwise. He may have, but all he writes is that the guides spotted them. He does indeed give the impression that the battle began soon after the man on horseback warned the troops, but again he is imprecise. His version does not, for example, preclude the possibility that the British fired first, as in fact they probably did. Finally, the batman's statement that the Indians quickly deployed into a "half Moon" is quite accurate.

In his criticism of the two journals, Swetnam tends to give the impression that numerous mistakes are unique to Cholmley's Batman and British A. If this impression were justified, his general suspicions might be as well. However, it is not, in any of the cases that he cites. We may, for example, compare various accounts of the first moments of fighting, moments that were crucial and have since been controversial. Although at least ten and probably more of the eyewitnesses who have left us accounts of the battle were members of the vanguard — advance party, working party, and several small detachments — not one has provided a report of the early fighting that is both precise and inerrant.7 The points on which they slip vary, but let us take the question of whether the troops were ambushed, since Swetnam places great emphasis on the seeming inaccuracies of the versions presented by British A and Cholmley's Batman. Duncan Cameron, a private who on the day of battle marched with the advanced party, writes, "when our advanc'd Guard had got about one Mile from the River, a

6 Hamilton, Braddock's Defeat, 28.
7 The descriptions of the onset of battle are analyzed in Kopperman, Braddock, 50-61, and Appendix D.
Firing began in the Front: The Enemy were advantagiously posted on two Hills, one on each Side of our Way, which Hills joined in our Front. The Firing as a Signal began in the Front, and immediately was follow'd from behind the Hills and Trees all-along each Flank." Simply stated, Cameron claims that the British were ambushed. So does William Dunbar, who by his own word was in the advance party: "We had not marched above 800 yards from the River, when we were allarmed by the Indian Hollow, & in an instant, found ourselves attacked on all sides." 8 Dunbar was apparently closer to the initial action than was British A, though his view may well have been screened, as was that of the latter. As an officer, he was probably better able to analyze the battle than was Cholmley's Batman. Furthermore, his report shows him to have been one of the most accurate of our eyewitnesses. Yet he, too, claims that the enemy ambushed Braddock. Obviously, one cannot prove that an account is fraudulent simply by demonstrating that it misrepresents aspects of the early action.

In his review, Swetnam introduces further arguments that may cause the reader to question the authenticity of the journals, particularly the one by the batman. One complaint may be dealt with quickly. According to Swetnam, "The batman previously [to his account of the battle] stated that they marched 'Beating the grannadiers March all the way,' although good evidence would indicate it had not then been composed." While it is unclear what the "evidence" regarding the Grenadiers' March is — one should not expect sources to be cited in a review — it is certainly not "good." Even during the 1680s, various pieces entitled "The Grenadiers' March" or, significantly, "The New Grenadiers' March" were in vogue. The famous march, the one that may well have been played by Braddock's drummers, was probably composed shortly before 1700. In the "Epilogue" to The Recruiting Officer, the classic comedy that he authored in 1706, George Farquhar not only provides reasonable evidence that the Grenadiers' March was already in existence, but claims that it was internationally known: "Beat the Granadeer March — Row, row, tow.... The Granadeer March seems to be a Composure excellently

8 Ibid., 187. Cameron's version is printed in ibid., 178. James Furnis also claims that the British were ambushed (ibid., 189), but he may not have been in the vanguard; if he was, he was far back. Others who were definitely in the vanguard were Thomas Gage, who headed the advance party, Sir John St. Clair, who commanded the working party, Harry Gordon, Patrick Mackellar, Horatio Gates, and George Croghan. Their accounts are printed and analyzed in ibid., Appendix D.
adapted to the Genius of the English; for no Musick was ever follow'd so far by us, nor with so much Alacrity." 9

Swetnam's review retains one more charge to level at the batman: "Indeed, it is doubtful if such a character (a British personal servant) ever existed, since [Sir Peter] Halket's orderly book quotes an order that all batmen were to be chosen from American recruits unable to fight." Presumably, the order that he refers to is one that was given on March 31 at Alexandria: "As the Officers will be Allowd no baughtmen Or Servts: from the Regts they are to pitch upon baggage men in the best manner they Can from the Country people." At Frederick, on April 23, Braddock felt obliged to issue another order relating to the recruitment of batmen: "The commanding Officers of Regiments to order their Officers to provide themselves as soon as possible with Bat men out of such recruits and Levies, as are unfit to the Duty to do the of solder and such men are to be enlisted as can act as Bat men." At Fort Cumberland, yet a third order was given: "None of the men that came with the Regiments from Ireland to be suffered to act as Bat-men." 10 The fact that at least three orders were given on the subject may itself be significant. Usually commands were repeated when they were ignored in the first instance. In point of fact, orders were regularly disobeyed, by officers as well as by rank and file. If Cholmley had become partial to his batman he would likely have kept him, even if the servant had earlier been attached to one of the British regiments. It should also be noted that the three orders are emphatic only in prohibiting the employment of British regulars as batmen. Cholmley's Batman may have been a soldier by vocation, but he may also have been a Cholmley family servant, in which case the orders would not have touched him.11

9 This quotation is drawn from a 1706 edition. The reference to "Row, row, row" is significant, since in all eighteenth-century versions that are extant in full each verse concludes, "With a tow, row, row, row, row, the British Grenadiers." It appears that the melody of the Grenadiers' March dates from the sixteenth century. On the origins of the march, see Claude M. Simpson, The British Broadside Ballad and Its Music (New Brunswick, N.J., 1966), 279-80, and W. H. Gratton Flood, "Fresh Light on Old English Airs—The British Grenadiers," Musical Times (1913): 602-3.

10 Sargent, History of an Expedition, 327; Hamilton, Braddock's Defeat, 73; "Major General Edward Braddock's Orderly Books, from February 26 to June 17, 1755" (hereafter cited as "Braddock's O.B."), ed. Will H. Lowdermilk (appended to his History of Cumberland [Washington, 1878]), xxv. The fact that each of these orders is included in only one source is significant. Eighteenth-century orderly books never give all orders, nor are the orders they include necessarily complete. Braddock undoubtedly issued many orders that went unrecorded, and it is quite possible that some involved the choosing of batmen. We should not imagine therefore that we have the whole picture.

11 Swetnam himself seems to realize that batmen were sometimes civilian
In a recent article, "History's Unweeded Garden: Common Errors in Western Pennsylvania History," Swetnam renewed his attack on the journals. That he chose to do so is not to be regretted. Certainly, if a scholar doubts the authenticity of source material he should air his views. Swetnam is to be commended for having done so.

On the other hand, I can only condemn the personal attacks on Hamilton that appear in "History's Unweeded Garden." Noting that the editor of Braddock's Defeat, a New York-based manuscript dealer, acquired both journals in London, within a few months of each other, Swetnam adds, "The coincidence might not appear so amazing if a forger learned his work had been taken seriously by an American and decided to plant another where it would catch the same sucker." 12

One could argue that Hamilton, despite his experience, might have mistakenly concluded that two eighteenth-century forgeries were genuine. Anyone, regardless of training or ability, may be taken in. But to suggest, as Swetnam does, that Hamilton may have been gulled into accepting as authentic two documents that had been drafted just before, one, perhaps, in his "honor," does not even amount to intelligent conjecture. Without maintaining that Hamilton possesses godlike powers of discernment, I think it would not be too much to concede that when he examines a manuscript he checks to see if the ink is dry.

Taking Swetnam's charges against the journals in the order in which he presents them in his article, we first confront the question of whether an "extra" section of the British A document was written by the officer himself. In Braddock at the Monongahela, I quoted extensively from a second version of the British A journal, one that is included among the Hardwicke Papers at the New York Public Valets. In "History's Unweeded Garden: Common Errors in Western Pennsylvania History," WPHM 61 (Apr. 1978), he refers to Cholmley's Batman (p. 113) as a "faithful family servant." Indeed, the batman may well have been such.

12 Ibid., 112. All further quotations from this article are drawn from pp. 112-14, and will not be cited separately, nor will the references that its author provides. Swetnam's offhanded allusion to Hamilton as a "sucker" makes one wonder if he knows anything of the man. Hamilton's best-known historical work is Cry of the Thunderbird: The American Indian's Own Story (Norman, Okla., 1972). He has also produced several other books on American history and has a study forthcoming on eighteenth-century handwriting. Two works that reflect his fifty years as a manuscript dealer are Collecting Autographs and Manuscripts (Norman, Okla., 1961) and Scribblers and Scoundrels (New York, 1968). In both, he warns against the danger of being taken in by forgeries. Braddock's Defeat is clearly not without editorial weaknesses. Hamilton's explanatory comments are few, and as Swetnam points out ("History's Unweeded Garden," 113), they sometimes contain inaccuracies. Still, the editing is better than Swetnam allows, and the documents themselves certainly justify the book's existence.
Library. Hamilton’s document is quite possibly a fair copy of the Hardwicke manuscript. However, as I noted in my book, the concluding portion is not in Hardwicke. Taking up this point, Swetnam insists that “whoever is responsible for some of the material printed by Hamilton was either an intentional liar or was not present on Braddock’s expedition.”

Perhaps the best way for me to put Swetnam’s contention in perspective is to elaborate on the differences between the two British A drafts. The Hardwicke version breaks off when its author concludes his narrative of the action of July 9 — the battle, the first hours of retreat — while the Hamilton manuscript includes a summary account of events through July 17 and a list of officers who participated in the engagement. This appended section is far from the most important part of the journal. Most of the material that it includes on the retreat can be found elsewhere, and the list, while handy, is only one of several known. Therefore, even if we were to disregard the additions our knowledge of the campaign would not be significantly reduced. However, I am by no means suggesting that they should be disregarded. Swetnam is too bold in asserting that the author of the concluding portion was “an intentional liar” or at least was not with Braddock. There is a third possibility: that British A himself was that author. The style in which the appended material is written does not differ from that found earlier in the journal. The scope does in that there is less attention to detail, the events of July 10-17 being dealt with in less than four hundred words. Nevertheless, this inconsistency is not impossible to explain. Let us for the moment assume that British A did write both sections. If he did, the Hardwicke draft may well have been completed shortly after the battle, the fair copy some months later. By the time the Hamilton version was prepared, British A would have had only vague memories of the period July 10-17, so naturally his account of it would have been general. Why he would

13 Earlier in the same paragraph, Swetnam complains, “Nor was the Journal of a British Officer, as Hamilton claimed, a new discovery.” He then notes my references to Hardwicke. The implication here is that Hamilton was either grossly incompetent in not uncovering the Hardwicke draft, or else was somehow deceiving his audience. Since as of 1959 the Hardwicke document was not published or in any way publicized, why should Hamilton have known of it? For that matter, he never claimed that his version was the only one in existence. On the contrary, in Braddock’s Defeat he notes (p. 40) that the manuscript is a “fair copy,” rather than the original.

14 I discuss the differences between the two versions in Braddock, 162. British A’s list (Hamilton, Braddock’s Defeat, 54-58) includes thirteen persons not named in other known accounts. Of these, nine were medical men, and in most cases their participation in the expedition, if not their presence at the battle, can be confirmed by independent sources.
have decided to add the extra material is entirely a subject for conjecture. But there is no reason to suppose that he did not author it, just as there is no conclusive evidence that he did.

On the whole, it is not British A's journal that arouses the gravest doubts in Swetnam's mind, but the batman's. His portrayal of Cholmley's servant is the sort that can only lead the reader to assume that, indeed, one more weed in history's garden has been discovered. "The faithful family servant who writes better than the average officer of his day, who has access to the ship's log, and records each day's sailing mileage, and who is privy to plans and orders even his master probably would not have learned, is a proper figure in a Victorian historical romance, but utterly unthinkable in the cold light of history in the mid-eighteenth century."

The contention that Cholmley's Batman wrote "better than the average officer of his day" may offer the basis for a new school of opinion on why the British lost America — their officer corps was barely literate. In reality, however, even by the standards of his day the batman's syntax was haphazard, his expression garbled, his spelling horrific. He certainly wrote better than did most soldiers and servants of the time, for they were illiterate or nearly so. Nevertheless, some could write, though for the most part only on a grammar-school level. Cholmley's Batman was obviously in the more select group. But his command of written expression did not even approach that of a typical British officer of the period; the disparity will become obvious when we compare his style to that of British A.15

When Swetnam expresses doubt that any batman "has access to the ship's log, and records each day's sailing mileage," he is making two points of one observation. It is true that Cholmley's Batman records the miles sailed each day during the army's crossing of the Atlantic, but there is no reason to believe that he ever saw the ship's log. Swetnam seems to have inferred the latter point from the former. Nor is it suspicious that the batman would have felt qualified to record mileage. Many travelers of his day did the same, as one may judge from extant journals of voyages. One can only speculate on the source of his intelligence; possibly he relied on a seaman. In any case, the information was not classified. The troops knew that they

15 Of course, some officers also had limited education and consequently wrote poorly. Lieutenant Daniel Disney, who kept Halket's orderly book, had problems of expression that were at least as serious as were Cholmley's Batman's. Note Hamilton's assessment of Disney in Braddock's Defeat, 61-62. The average officer, however, wrote better than did either Disney or the batman.
were headed for America. There was no reason for anyone to feel that the daily progress should be kept secret.

As for the claim that the batman was "privy to plans and orders even his master probably would not have learned," one wishes that Swetnam had provided even a single example of such a plan or order. After having carefully reviewed the journal, I cannot. Cholmley's Batman often refers to orders, but these are invariably the sort that would have been read out to the troops.

Swetnam's next two paragraphs tie in. Both refer solely to the batman's journal.

The manuscript pretends to be a diary of the expedition kept from day to day, and even with a long description of the July 9 battle dated the same day, the facsimile page printed in the book shows no indication of having been written in haste or under strain. But under March 23 appears the singular entry: "At his place [Alexandria, Virginia] the two Regiments parted. Sir Peter Halket's Regt marched on the Virginia side [of the Potomac] and Colonel Dunbars Regt marched on the Maryland side till they Came to Fort Cumberland and there to Join." The next entry, dated April 13, takes up the march day by day until the writer reaches "Willses Creek" May 10 and "the Fort which his Called Ft. Cumberland."

It is amazing that this batman should have known in March, or even in May, the name of the fort. The title was used by others outside the expedition at least as early as March 7, but Halkett's orderly book does not use "Fort Cumberland" until June 2, nor regularly until June 11. Braddock's orderly book does not use it until May 10. Furthermore, while the batman was supposed to be attached to Halkett's command, that officer's orderly book shows only one company marching April 13, and that to Winchester, and on April 16 a detachment of "a Lieutenant and 30 men" to Wills Creek. (Bear in mind that the batman is supposed to have been attached to Captain Robert Cholmley.) The rest of his command was still in Alexandria on April 26 and reached Wills Creek May 18.

Swetnam scores a couple of points here, at least as far as I am concerned. The page of the batman's journal that is reproduced as a plate in Braddock's Defeat does not give the appearance of being an original draft. Of course, it is difficult to speak with assurance on the basis of having seen only one page, and that only as a photograph, significantly reduced, but the fact that it includes only one caret and no scratches must be considered atypical of rough drafts, to say the least. What we have is quite possibly a copy of the original. If so, it was likely prepared not long after the rough version, and it may well be in the batman's own hand. 16 Whether we have the original or a

16 The page appears as a plate facing p. 27. While Swetnam's point may be well taken, one should not assume, as he apparently does, that the journal entry for July 9 was prepared on that date. There is no further entry until July 12, and in fact the descriptions of the action of the ninth were probably recorded on the eleventh, when the batman was safe in Dunbar's camp. Hamilton himself, with whom I have spoken and corresponded, still insists that the batman's journal is an original, rather than a copy (cf. his comments on the British A
copy is, however, of limited importance. It is probable that, aside from a few exceptions to be noted below, the journal was kept on a day-by-day basis. And if the manuscript that Hamilton printed was a copy, there is no reason to believe that it differed significantly from the batman's rough draft. The spelling and grammar are those of a servant, and there are no hazy generalizations, such as one might expect in the case of material that was later inserted in the original.

The reference to Fort Cumberland by Cholmley's Batman is, as Swetnam claims, one of the earliest known. But we should remember that relatively little material from the period has survived and that by no means all of the letters and papers that are extant and deal with Fort Cumberland are in print. Construction of the fort began late in 1754, and it was probably named long before March 7. The name, once given, was not classified. There is no reason to doubt that a common batman would have heard it within a week or so of his arrival at Alexandria.

The assertion that Cholmley's Batman was wrong, suspiciously so, in his description of the march from Alexandria is more interesting and merits fuller treatment. Swetnam has obviously done a fair amount of research in his attempt to determine when the various units of Halket's regiment moved on to Fort Cumberland. Unfortunately, his work is largely undone by a single mistake. Contrary to what he believes, Cholmley (and, hence, the batman) was not attached to Halket's regiment, the Forty-fourth, but to Thomas Dunbar's, the Forty-eighth. To see what a difference this makes in assessing the batman's account of the march, and also to lay the groundwork for another point, it is worthwhile to examine three consecutive entries in his journal.

March the 18th. Where [Here] we lay in quarter till the Other Ships Arive'd. As soon as all the Ships Ariv'd, the town Being very small, only Built five years, Obliged us to go to Camp.

March ye 23. We Incamped By the town and Reed many Recruits to Boath Regiments. From thence we Sent two Recruiting Parties into Maryland. At this place the Soldiers Rec'd their Blankets, and all the heavy Baggage that Could not be taken along with [them] was left here in Store. Here we Bought Several Horses but the Baggage was Carried from hence in Wagons. At this place the two Regiments parted. Sir Peeter Halkets Regt marched on the

---

17 On the construction of Fort Cumberland, see Lowdermilk, History of Cumberland, 82-88.
18 Note Sargent's list of the officers in each regiment who participated in the battle, History of an Expedition, 362. Hamilton places Cholmley correctly in Braddock's Defeat, 6.
Virginia Side and Colonel Dunbars Regt marched on the Maryland side till they came to Fort Cumberland and there to join. April the 12th. We marched from Alexandria to Rock Creek on this side of the Creek. We crossed the Portwomack River into Maryland, it [being] here about three hundred yards over. There was flat[boat]s to carry us over, this days march being 12 miles. In crossing this River we lost one man.

The entries reveal quite clearly that Cholmley's Batman includes the events of more than one day under the headings of March 18 and March 23. Not all the ships docked March 18. This heading should therefore probably read "March 18-22." The entry for March 23 is even broader, extending through April 11 and possibly into the morning of April 12. After all, the regiments cannot have encamped, incorporated recruits, prepared a baggage train, and marched on the same day. Furthermore, the batman’s statement that "all the heavy Baggage that could not be taken . . . was left here in Store" is highly reminiscent of an order that Braddock gave on April 8: "The Commanding Officer’s of each of the Regimt as soon as their Regimental Store House are fixed are to order their Officers baggage and their mens Stores to be immediately lodgd." Beginning with his entry for April 12, Cholmley’s Batman records events on a strict day-by-day basis until his journal closes on August 8, the only multiple entry being the highly important one of July 9-11, which of course concentrates on the ninth.

Now the question of whether the batman errs in his coverage of the departure from Alexandria may be dealt with more precisely. Certainly there are no contradictions within his account. He tells us that Dunbar’s regiment was to march on the Maryland side of the Potomac and describes the crossing, in which he would have taken part. Aside from Cholmley’s Batman, no known source discusses Dunbar’s departure. However, on April 11, Braddock ordered, "Colo Dunbars Regiment to hold themselves in readiness but not to march till further Orders. . . . As there are Boats provided to carry Colo Dunbars Regiments Baggage to Rock Creek the former orders relative to their march to be obeyd." The next day, acting under the orders of Commodore Augustus Keppel, a detachment of seamen moved to join Braddock’s army as it marched. That evening, one of the seamen noted

19 For example, the ship bearing the bulk of the general hospital staff did not cast anchor until late on March 21; the passengers disembarked at Alexandria the next day. See "The Journal of Charlotte Brown, Matron of the General Hospital with the English Forces in America, 1754-1756," in Isabel M. Calder, ed., Colonial Captivities, Marches and Journeys (New York, 1935), 175.

20 "Braddock's O. B.,” xix.

21 Two earlier entries, those for March 10 and for March 13, also cover several days.
in his journal that "agreeably to our orders we proceeded and arrived at Rock Creek at 10 o'clock... found here Colonel Dunbar, whose orders we put ourselves under." 22 On the basis of the evidence, it seems fair to conclude that Dunbar marched on April 12, as the batman says he did. As for the final entry under March 23, "Sir Peeter Halkets Regt marched on the Virginia Side and Colonel Dunbars Regt marched on the Maryland side till they Came to Fort Cumberland and there to Join," clearly our informant does not mean that the entire march took place in one day, regardless of what the line may imply. He seems instead to be describing the orders that were read out to the troops on April 11. Clarity is not one of the batman's virtues. Considering the fact that he would have had only a limited education, he actually does quite well in getting his points across. But in interpreting his journal, the reader should take into account the verbal limitations of the author.

Swetnam provides his readers with still other grounds for concern:

The two questionable documents, by whomever written, would in their present form appear to have a common source. Both are filled with errors and inaccuracies which would have been most unlikely in the account of an eyewitness. Both give first-hand stories of the legendary ambush, both contain an apparently random scrambling of the forms "ye" and "the" of the definite article, and both refer to "Frayzors" or "Fraziers" plantation. Elsewhere it appears to be always referred to as Frazier's "cabin."

Taking the first sentence to mean that Swetnam considers the two journals, as printed by Hamilton, to be entirely or primarily by the same author, let us examine his bases for this assertion.

The respective accounts of the onset of fighting that British A and Cholmley's Batman provide have already been dealt with. As was mentioned, the batman's version may be reasonably accurate, depending on how one interprets his more ambiguous comments. British A's report is clearly incorrect, but it is just as clearly unlike the batman's, being in reality much more like Dunbar's. 23 Comparing the two journals in their entirety, one discovers numerous differences. The officer and the servant report many of the same activities on the march — common references to halting days, raids by the Indians, the fording of rivers — but often one mentions a seemingly important event, the other does not. Also noteworthy is the fact that in their re-

23 This does not mean that Dunbar influenced British A. The only reporter who may have was George Croghan, and even he had little impact, if any. Kopperman, Braddock, 166.
spective coverage of the last three weeks of the march they sometimes differ in assessing mileage covered on any single day. Needless to say, in the cases where they disagree, one is wrong or both are. Some might be bothered by such inaccuracies, but they seem to me to be at once trivial and reassuring. They are trivial in that estimates of the miles Braddock's army marched through the forest on a given day represent little more than opinions and may be far off. They are reassuring in that they point up, as does so much other evidence, the very great difference between these two journals.

Swetnam's point about "ye" and "the" is strange. By the mid-eighteenth century — indeed, for some time before it — the letter thorn was an affectation, used primarily by scribes and by those with pretensions to literary or epistolary sophistication. Others occasionally employed it for emphasis or simply for the sake of variety. It was seldom used except in the definite article and almost no one used it consistently even in this case. Given that it is employed at all by Cholmley's Batman and British A, we should expect that there would be "random scrambling" by both. For that matter, the Batman seldom uses it except in giving a date (e.g., "March ye 23"), while British A, in the Hamilton version, uses thorn in the definite article about half the time, often in streaks. If we are to use the "ye-the" distribution point at all, the most reasonable conclusion must be that the dramatic disparity in the frequency of the use of thorn suggests different authors. However, the issue itself is trivial. We cannot be sure that either Hamilton text is in the hand of its author. The British A fair copy is probably the work of a scribe, and the Hardwicke draft, while much more rough, may not have been written by the officer either. The batman's journal is more likely in the hand of the reporter himself — one doubts a professional scribe would have left his poor spelling unchanged — but we cannot speak with certainty. Since scribes often changed "the" to "ye" in copying a draft and sometimes "ye" to

24 Cholmley's Batman records miles marched every day between June 19 and July 8, inclusive. British A and Orme do as well, but their estimates, particularly those of the former, are sometimes given relative to specific points — for example, British A's entry for June 28 reads, in part, "We marched within half a Mile of ye great crossing of the Yaughaughany" — rather than in terms of total miles traversed. British A and Cholmley's Batman differ on mileage in their entries for June 19, June 24, June 26, and July 7; in three cases they differ by fully four miles. They agree in respect to June 20 and July 2, 3, 4, and 6. Orme agrees with both on July 4 and 6, disagrees with both on June 19, July 1, and July 3, differs with the batman, while agreeing with British A, on June 24 and June 26, and disagrees with the servant (whose estimates tend to be high), in cases where British A's assessments are too vague for comparison, on June 23, 27, 28, 29, and July 8. All three may have been voicing their own opinions or may have relied on the estimates of others.
“the,” though more rarely, it is unwise to make much of the differences between the two journals in this regard.

As for the charred ruin that served Braddock’s troops as a rendezvous after their crossing of the Monongahela, it is true that Cholmley’s Batman speaks of “Frayzors Plantation” and British A of “Fraziers Plantation,” though the latter also calls it “Fraziers house.” Contrary to Swetnam’s belief, however, the structure did not have a standard name. Actually, only two other eyewitnesses to the battle refer to it at all. Patrick Mackellar calls it “Frazer’s House,” while Orme writes simply of “Frazier’s.” There is no consensus and therefore no ground for suspicion.

Departing for the moment from Swetnam’s specific complaints, we would do well to compare the respective styles of British A and Cholmley’s Batman. On almost every criterion there is a clear disparity in the way in which they express themselves. In sum, the contrast is so great that there can be little question of common authorship.

Since Swetnam seems most concerned about the two journals as they appear “in their present form,” I shall concentrate on comparing the Hamilton versions. However, I would like first to make a few observations on the differences between the Hardwicke and Hamilton drafts of British A’s journal. Ampersand is used far more in the fair copy, “and” usually being written out in the Hardwicke draft. The person who prepared the fair copy also tends to use symbols for numerals, while in the Hardwicke version numbers are often expressed in words. The use of capitalization is very different; for example, the writer of the Hardwicke draft seldom capitalizes the first word of a sentence, but in the fair copy most initial words are capitalized. Thorn appears quite frequently in the Hamilton manuscript, only once in Hardwicke. Whoever made the fair copy had his quirks; for example, “miles” in the Hardwicke draft usually comes out “mile” in Hamilton’s, and semicolons often replace periods and commas. Spelling also differs between the two drafts on occasion. The scribe doubles consonants far less often than does the writer of the Hardwicke version.

Sentence structure sometimes differs as well. The individual who drew the fair copy often “neatened up” his version. He apparently did this

25 Sargent, History of an Expedition, 352; Kopperman, Braddock, 209. Frazier’s “plantation” was actually a trading post. In the eighteenth century, such frontier establishments were often accorded the more impressive designation, since they had, indeed, been “planted” in the wilderness. Christopher Gist’s trading post, which also played its part as a landmark on the Braddock expedition — despite the fact that it, like Frazier’s, had been put to the torch — was commonly called “Gist’s Plantation.”
for cosmetic reasons, but in some cases he may have felt that the earlier draft, assuming he worked from the Hardwicke copy, was not sufficiently clear. In writing of the changes in sentence structure, one point must be emphasized: The scribe seldom if ever altered the meaning of the original as he tidied its style. On the other hand, a few details and observations appear in one draft but not in the other. Such occurrences are rare, and the points at issue are generally trivial. The sort of differences one tends to find in examining the two drafts may be illustrated in the respective entries for July 2, 1755. First there is the Hardwicke version: "The 2d. Marched about three, and reached 6 miles to a place call’d Jacob’s Cabbin; course North." In the fair copy, this entry reads, "The 2d. We marched early about 3 & reached 6 Mile to a place called Jacobs Cabin; our course still to ye Northward." Moving on to compare the respective styles of the two journals, we find dramatic differences. To have bases for discussion let us look first at excerpts from the accounts of the battle that were prepared by Cholmley’s Batman and by British A. To the batman’s recollection,

My Master died before he was ten Minuits Ingaged. They Continualy made us Retreat, they haveing always a large marke to shoute at and we having only to shoute at them behind trees or laid on their Bellies. . . . Their was a man and his Son thought to have killed a Bout sixteen men. The Father, after Spent all his Ammunition, lay down his gun till he went to get a fresh Supply. In the mean time one of our men found her and to hinder the Enemy for having Any service from her he knocks her Round a tree and bent her like a Bow. Soon after the man Comes and finds his piece all Bent. He was seemingly very Angry. He afterward said he should do the same. He spyes a French Indien that had shot several Shots from behind a tree. He Immediately Called his Son to Shout at him, which he did and shot him dead. They begin to Inclose us more and more till they had Nigh Inclosed us in.

British A provides a broader perspective on the action:

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, that ye men were sometimes 20 or 30 deep, & he thought himself securest who was in the Center; during all this time the Enemy kept a continual fire & every shot took place. The General had given orders that they should fire in Platoons (which was impossible to be effectd) which would not have answered at all as the Enemy were situated. Within two hours & an half the Men were obliged (or at least did) retreat three or four times & were as often rallied.

One prime difference between Cholmley’s Batman and British A lies in the area of orthography. The former often spells phonetically.

26 Hardwicke, 136, document 5, Manuscripts and Archives Division, New York Public Library; Hamilton, Braddock’s Defeat, 47.
27 Hamilton, Braddock’s Defeat, 28-29.
28 Ibid., 50-51.
In the excerpt above, we see "Ingaged" for "engaged," "Inclove" for "enclose." Elsewhere in his journal we find "vialent" or "vilant" for "violent," "diserting" for "deserting," "governor," "volintears" for "volunteers," "shugar" for "sugar," and the like. Some of his usages, like "shoute" for "shoot," may have a dialectal origin.29 British A's orthography, on the other hand, is very much in keeping with the literary norms of his age. This is true of both drafts, even though, as was noted earlier, they often differ on the question of whether consonants are to be doubled in given words — "waggon" or "wagon," for instance. Spelling was somewhat fluid in the mid-eighteenth century and on some points, such as the doubling of consonants, the writer was left to follow his predilections. Even if judged by the yardstick of that age, however, the batman's spelling is substandard.

The two journals also differ sharply in the area of punctuation, with British A punctuating far more often than does the batman. In the Hardwicke draft, the comma is included considerably more often than it is in any comparable portion of the batman's journal, and the semicolon, which the servant almost never uses, appears fairly regularly. The person who prepared Hamilton's copy often substituted semicolons for both commas and periods, but did not alter the overall frequency of punctuation.

Grammatically, the two reporters are on quite disparate planes. Cholmley's Batman tends to write somewhat shorter sentences than does British A, which is fortunate, since the former is virtually incapable of producing a sentence of more than fifteen words that is grammatically correct. Indeed, when the batman does attempt to write a long sentence he is almost invariably overwhelmed by technical difficulties and winds up producing a jumble, such as "They Continualy made us Retreat, they haveing always a large marke to shoute at and we having only to shoute at them behind trees or laid on their Bellies." Even when he sticks to short sentences, the batman is not always easy to follow. He frequently uses pronouns without identifying his subject: "They begin to Inclose us more and more." Generally this tendency does not present great problems for the reader, but sometimes it does. For example, we might recall the batman's statement that "three of our guides . . . spied the Indiens lay'd down Before us. He Immediately discharged his piece, turned Round his horse [and] Cried, the Indiens was upon us. My Master Called me to give me his horse. . . ." Who

---

29 Hamilton asserts that, judging from orthography, the batman may have spoken with a Cockney accent: ibid., 5. This is quite possible.
was the man on horseback who sounded the warning? Perhaps he was a guide, but, after all, the batman has just referred to three guides. Perhaps he was the “Master,” Cholmley. There is simply no way to be certain. Another weakness characteristic of the batman’s style is that he frequently shifts tenses: “In the mean time one of our men found her and to hinder the Enemy for having Any service from her he knocks her Round a tree and bent her like a Bow.”

On all of these points, the batman’s style differs greatly from that of the officer. British A is sometimes guilty of a run-on sentence, mainly due to a tendency, common in his day (and, judging from the term papers my students submit, in ours), toward the comma splice. There is also an occasional sentence fragment, this being more typical of the Hardwicke draft, which is largely in note form. However, British A is fully capable of handling long, complex sentences: “Such was ye confusion, that ye men were sometimes 20 or 30 deep, & he thought himself securest who was in the Center; during all this time the Enemy kept a continual fire & every shot took place.” It is difficult to imagine Cholmley’s Batman as the author of such a sentence. British A is also generally clear in his pronominal usage. Despite the fact that the action he describes is often complex, he seldom leaves the reader wondering who “he” is or “they” are. And while Cholmley’s Batman shifts tenses quite casually, British A consistently places past action in a past tense.

Off the grammatical front, the respective excerpts reflect a general difference in perspective. The batman’s account is highly personal. He frequently refers to his own activities. He also reports many anecdotes that he has heard, such as the one that is included in the excerpt. British A, on the other hand, never tells the reader what he himself did during the march or the battle. His basic interest is in the action of masses. So, for example, in his account of the battle the only individuals whom he refers to are officers leading charges or attempting to rally the troops. Otherwise, he writes entirely about how the men behaved in general. To get a broad perspective on the action of July 9 one should read British A’s account. For a personalized version of the engagement, studded with “human interest” stories, he should look to Cholmley’s Batman.

The sharp differences in quality of expression and in perspective mirror the contrasting backgrounds of the two reporters. One should not expect Cholmley’s Batman to write on a level even approaching that of British A. Actually, considering that he probably had only a grammar-school education at best, the servant communicates with us
quite well. But the quality of his expression is naturally far below that of the better-educated officer. The batman's perception of events also reflects his comparative lack of sophistication. Although in his narrative of the battle he occasionally discusses mass actions, he concentrates on what he did or on stories that he heard about individuals involved in the fighting. British A and the officers generally would have considered his anecdotes to be trivial. They were trained to think mainly in terms of the movements of large groups of men. The fact that British A seldom personalizes his perception of the battle is perfectly in keeping with his background.

The marked divergences in perspective may also reflect disparate biases. Cholmley's Batman has a great deal to say about the activities of the "common men" on the expedition. His anecdotes tend to center on them, rather than on the officers. This tendency to write about the rank and file and the camp followers is, in fact, one reason why his journal is so important. British A, on the other hand, seldom writes about soldiers except in the mass. Moreover, he like most officers is highly critical of their behavior during the battle, while Cholmley's Batman defends the troops.\(^{30}\) What we have in British A and Cholmley's Batman is not only two reporters but two groups, distinct in their priorities, perspectives, and biases.

Despite their contrasting vantage points, and to some extent because of them, both reporters are of great use to the historian. In assessing his account of Braddock's defeat, I stated in my book that "Aside from Cholmley's Batman, British A is the most important of our anonymous reporters." Frankly, the competition is not very fierce. Of the three other anonymous sources, two were quite possibly not eyewitnesses at all. Furthermore, two of their accounts are quite sketchy, while the third is so unreliable as to be almost valueless. It is more important, therefore, to compare British A to all other reporters. It is on this basis that I assert in my book, "His account is both full and accurate. . . . Despite a few errors . . . British A is generally reliable. He is also honest."\(^{31}\) More than two years after writing these comments, I find no cause to change them. If anything, my estimate of British A's account of the battle has risen.

Of the batman's report of the engagement, I wrote,

Cholmley's Batman stands as our only first-rate source on the battle writing from the point of view of the common soldier. In surveying the day's activities prior to the attack, this report is quite possibly the finest of all. On the en-  
\(^{30}\) For a general discussion of the men's behavior, see Kopperman, \textit{Braddock}, 67-73. Both Cholmley's Batman and British A are cited in the analysis.

\(^{31}\) \textit{Ibid.}, 165-66; on British B, C, and D, see \textit{ibid.}, 173-74, 175, 177.
gagement itself, Cholmley's Batman is, however, a less informative reporter than we might wish. First, he becomes too anecdotal. . . . Second, he becomes less precise on matters involving large bodies of men. . . . Cholmley's Batman merits a high rating for honesty, but not always for accuracy. It is actually more difficult to judge the reliability of this account than that of British A. While all include their own touches, most of the officers, including British A, tend to cover pretty much the same ground in their reports. Therefore, one may look for consensuses and judge reliability using them as a basis. Cholmley's Batman, on the other hand, tends to give anecdotes that are unique to his account. When he does report mass action, he is often vague. Nevertheless, he is precise on some points where a consensus exists, and in these cases his statements usually hold up quite well.

Since this article deals with the two journals as a whole, I wish to say something of their relative reliability in dealing with the Braddock expedition prior to July 9. Among the sources with which to compare them Orme's journal is of course the most important, but several other eyewitnesses to the battle also provide sketches of the march. In addition, orderly books and a sizeable body of letters and papers yield information on the day-to-day progress of Braddock's army. Comparing the two journals to each other and to these additional sources, one finds that although they differ on trivial points such as miles marched on a given day, and although, as was noted earlier, often one reporter fails to note an interesting point covered by the other, both match up very well with consensus accounts of particular events during the expedition. It therefore appears that British A and Cholmley's Batman are reliable in their respective discussions of the march. It is important to state this, because each includes a great deal of material that is not to be found elsewhere and much of it is important.

Given the weight of evidence, it appears that a far stronger case can be made for the authenticity of the two Hamilton journals than against it. This is not to suggest that I, or anyone, can give either an entirely clean bill of health. Both journals are, after all, anonymous.
The only eyewitness accounts of Braddock's Defeat that are unquestionably authentic are those that are extant in signed holographic form and were written by individuals who are known to have participated in the battle. Even in using them, however, the reader must be cautious, since not even "eyewitnesses" necessarily see all of the events they discuss; rather, they often include in their accounts reports of action that others described for them, but that they themselves did not see.

Aside from the fact that it is anonymous, there does not, however, appear to be any cause to question the authenticity of British A's journal. It holds up very well against other eyewitness accounts, but is clearly not a rehash of any of them. It is extant in at least two drafts, one of which I have seen in manuscript. Although there may be some legitimate questions raised concerning the portion that appears in the Hamilton draft but not in Hardwicke, I tend to accept its authenticity. As to the longer, far more important section that precedes it, doubters would be hard put to make much of a case.

The batman's journal presents a slightly greater problem. Not only is the account anonymous, but I have seen it only in printed form. Also, while I do not feel that any charge Swetnam makes against it holds up, I am bothered by one aspect of the battle report. As was noted earlier, Cholmley's Batman claims that the enemy was first spotted by "three of our guides in the front of me above ten yards." Patrick Mackellar's famous sketch of the British deployment at the start of battle shows the guides to have been at least fifty yards ahead of the advance party, and for that matter Cholmley and his servant were likely not at the head of that detachment. There are several possible ways to explain the discrepancy. Mackellar's map presents a more static scene than the one that likely existed at the onset of battle. A few guides may well have been farther back — closer to the advance party — than he suggests. And the map does not of course prove that all officers were with their men at the time the enemy was encountered. Cholmley, accompanied by his batman, may have gone forward to consult with the guides. Then, there is the problem of the batman's style. Given his fractured syntax, it is not impossible that what he meant to write was that as the guides, having spotted the Indians, hurried back toward the advance party, they began to sound the alarm.35 Perhaps the best explanation, though, is that the

---

35 That the guides did race back to shout their warning is fairly certain. Their behavior is noted by Thomas Gage and by Harry Gordon. See Kopperman, Braddock, 191, 199.
batman was simply confused. He probably did not record his account for forty-eight hours after the battle. The intervening time had, to say the least, been trying and turbulent. He may therefore have erred in assessing his position relative to the guides.

Even if the batman was mistaken in this regard, that fact is scarcely an indictment. Every reasonably full account of Braddock's Defeat is marred by definite or probable error on some point. As has been noted before, the batman's journal holds up well when it is cross-checked against our other sources. At present, the case that can be made against the authenticity of the journal is far weaker than the one that can be made for it.

In preparing this article, I have generally relied on Hamilton's printed version of the journals, though in the case of British A I have also referred to the Hardwicke draft.36 Given the weight of evidence provided by these versions, I do not feel that it is essential to view the Hamilton drafts in manuscript, though it might be desirable to do so. Hamilton no longer has the originals, but thanks largely to him I have located the present owner and we have corresponded. My schedule and the physical distance between us will prevent me from checking the manuscripts, but I have passed the owner's address on to George Swetnam. If he is still concerned that the documents may not be authentic, he would do well to examine them himself. There are many of us who would be anxious to hear his observations on them.

While I disagree with much of what Swetnam writes in regard to the two journals, I think that he deserves credit for airing his suspicions. Certainly, historians are sometimes too quick to accept questionable sources, and in all probability the Braddock expedition has not been exempt from fabricated accounts. Indeed, during the course of my research I came to discount one report of the battle, because I considered it a probable hoax.37 An article that has only recently come to my attention has caused me to place a second account in the suspect category.38 If someone were to demonstrate to my satisfac-

36 The entire Hardwicke text, only a portion of which is printed in Braddock at the Monongahela, will appear in a forthcoming issue of WPHM.
37 I refer to the account by Francis Peyton. My suspicions are discussed in ibid., 220-22.
38 In “Substitute for Truth: Hazard's 'Provincial Correspondence','" Pennsylvania History 29 (July 1962) : 278-90, William A. Hunter claims that a number of documents included in Hazard's Register are bogus. Among them, he asserts (p. 284), is Matthew Leslie's purported account of Braddock's Defeat. Hunter devotes little room to Leslie. His main suspicions seem to arise from two points: Leslie's letter, containing his account, was printed in connection with a second document, whose authenticity he strongly doubts; mention is
tion that any of the remaining sources were of dubious authenticity, I would be the first to thank him. I do not feel that Swetnam has provided such a demonstration. Nevertheless, I thank him for his efforts.

made in the report of a Captain John Conyngham, whose existence cannot be proven. That Leslie participated in the battle is certain. Conyngham was obviously not a British officer — the Army Lists bear witness to this — but he may have been an American. Nevertheless, until he can be tracked down, it seems unwise to put much stock in Leslie's account. As I mentioned in Braddock (p. 205), the brief report is too vague to permit a check on reliability. I would now add that it permits no check on authenticity, unlike the journals by Cholmley's Batman and British A. Leslie's account does not, incidentally, add anything substantial to our knowledge of Braddock's Defeat; therefore, we lose little by ignoring it.

GEORGE SWETNAM REPLIES:

Score two points for Kopperman, but both against my writing, and neither decisive in regard to the question of authenticity. (a) Paragraph 22: I went to sleep on the question of the Batman's being with Halket's regiment, instead of Dunbar's. (b) Paragraph 9 and note 9: I confused the date of the Grenadier's March with that of the presently current composition.

His answer (which from its contents should be titled: "An Assessment of Swetnam's Strictures on Cholmley's Batman, etc.") falls far short in other respects of meeting the question whether the two manuscripts are seriously doubtful and need a thorough investigation. His apparent assumption (Paragraph 2) that Swetnam is the only one who has had any doubts on the matter is incorrect. While few have expressed such opinions in print, numerous scholars have told me they were suspicious. Further:

1. Paragraphs 5-8, 44: Kopperman's explanation of the Batman's statement about being near ten yards from the guides who "spied the Indians laid down before us" simply won't wash, and indeed serves to make the document more seriously questionable. The same with his defense of British A, in view of its assertion that the guides were held very close to the vanguard. His attempts to explain away the obvious assertions as not meaning what they say smack of special pleading.

2. Notwithstanding Kopperman's argument (Paragraph 11) that three orders in regard to batmen prove our Batman could be a real character, I note that each of the orders would have barred it.
One specifically bars "men that came with the Regiments from Ireland," which would include our man, another bars "batmen or servants from the regiment," and a third orders that they be limited to unfit recruits. I find nothing here or elsewhere that would have any bearing on whether or not the prospective batman was a family servant.

3. (Paragraph 12 and Notes 11 and 12). Kopperman's appeal to authority — in effect, "You shouldn't question Hamilton" — is for the birds in any case, and particularly in view of Hamilton's track record in colonial history. It is simply begging the question, which is, succinctly stated: "Did Hamilton err in this regard?" Either the documents in question are genuine, or Hamilton was taken in. It is as simple as that. (The only third alternative would be that Hamilton was party to a fraud. I'm sure neither Kopperman nor I would even suggest such a thing.) If I had no right to suggest that Hamilton could have been gulled, then I had no right to question the authenticity of the documents. Yet elsewhere Kopperman suggests that it was proper for me to do so. He can't have it both ways. And when Kopperman "can only condemn" the suggestion that Hamilton might have been a sucker, he should keep his hands clean: The phraseology of Kopperman's Note 11 can leave no doubt that he intended it as a personal insult, despite his effort to "damn with faint praise" this writer elsewhere.

4. In Paragraph 27 and Note 25, Kopperman has completely missed my point. It was not, as he supposes, that Batman and British A were departing from a standard name, but that they (and apparently they alone) were giving Frazer's a name that was not used because it did not fit. Furthermore, in Note 25, he seems to be completely confused in regard to Frazer and also Gist. Frazer was a blacksmith, not a trader, except that he was probably paid in skins. Gist had been a trader in North Carolina while trying to recoup his fortunes and avoid debtor's prison in Baltimore. But in the Pittsburgh area he was an agent of the Ohio Company of Virginia, and on its behalf had settled eleven families in the area of his "plantation," which really was a plantation. The conclusion: "There is no consensus and therefore no ground for suspicion," is ridiculous.

5. (Paragraphs 30-36) Kopperman appears to have the idea that a forger would be a person of very low mentality, in assuming that stylistic differences would be evidence that two documents could not be from the same hand. History indicates that forgers are usually very smart.
6. (Paragraphs 14, 40-41). The fact that a document agrees in part or in toto with known information is no proof it is genuine. Any smart forger would interlard his material with authentic information from other sources. It was this argument that "It agrees with what we know is true" that caused the backers of the notorious "Horn Papers" to publish that forgery.

7. But by far most suspicious is the secrecy which has shrouded these documents from the very beginning. So far as this writer has been able to learn, no scholar or expert has ever been given the opportunity of examining them. We know nothing of the provenance of British A, only the final step in that of the Batman's journal. Now, even the ownership and location are undisclosed. If — as he says, and we have no reason to doubt his word — Kopperman knows the present owner, he should reveal the name and place. If there were no other reason to suspect authenticity, these accounts should be considered extremely doubtful and suspect until experts have the opportunity to examine them. Scholars in the field have been kept in the dark far too long. Even if Hamilton were the ultimate expert, it would be rank presumption to assert: "The whole realm of scholarship must accept the authenticity of these documents just on his say-so."

I may and probably shall be criticized for raising the question as to the authenticity of these papers. If my action results in a full examination of them I shall consider it all worth while, and I am willing to abide the result and let history decide who is correct in this controversy.

Note: Since this was written, Kopperman has informed me that the present owner is Dr. Frank T. Siebert, Jr., P. O. Box 225, Old Town, Maine 04468, who has British A with him, but the Batman's Journal is in a safety deposit box which he cannot visit without incurring considerable expense. Kopperman suggests that I might ask him to see the manuscripts. I am not a manuscript expert, and have no desire to see the manuscripts. They should be examined by a team of experts.