subordinate," (p. 533), and is exemplified by the Shaker religious cult among the Wasco-Wishram. Compartmentalization is a "keeping-separate within a realm of meaning of elements and patterns taken over from the dominant culture" (p. 533), as represented by Pueblo success in maintaining the native character of their ceremonialism. Finally, the Wasco-Wishram illustrate biculturalism in their tendency to employ Indian concepts in Indian situations and white behavior patterns in white situations.

Both books amply confirm the bewildering diversity of Indian types both in aboriginal and twentieth-century America. It is a confirmation such as to discourage any but the uninformed from casual generalizations about the American Indian.

North Texas State University William T. Hagan

The United Colonies of New England—1643-90. By Harry M. Ward. (New York: Vantage Press, 1961. Pp. 434. Endpaper maps, illustrations, notes, appendices, bibliography, index. $4.50.)

If this book were half as long, it would be twice as good and might then earn a place on the list of recommended readings for courses in American colonial history. Unfortunately, it is one of those far too numerous historical works in which excellent research and an exploitable theme are nearly ruined by monotonous repetition (even of the same quotation on pages 271, 273) and by bad writing.

Professor Ward justifies his lengthy treatment by insisting that the history of the New England Confederation, or the United Colonies of New England, is a sadly neglected aspect of our constitutional and national development. "Neglected" is not, perhaps, the right word, since every textbook devotes at least a paragraph to the subject, but Ward really means that the Confederation has not been adequately studied, and this he demonstrates convincingly. His own thorough examination of manuscript as well as printed sources reveals many things usually overlooked. The textbooks, for example, almost invariably assert that Massachusetts Bay killed the New England Confederation in 1653 by nullifying its decision to fight the Dutch, yet Ward devotes four full chapters to the twenty-one sessions of the commissioners which occurred after that date, and which dealt with problems that ranged from "Praying Indians" to preying Indians. Ward's research even led to the discovery of virtually new material. Nearly all historians of seventeenth-century America—even Osgood—declare flatly that the ghost of the Confederation was finally laid in 1684 when Massachusetts lost her charter and Edmund Andros subsequently enforced a different kind of union in the Dominion of New England. Ward, however, has found clear proof, both in printed and in manuscript sources, that two sessions of commissioners from Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Plymouth were held in 1689 after the overthrow of Andros. What finally extinguished the last impulse toward colonial self-union was the creation of the royal colony of Massachusetts in 1691, which not only involved the annexation of one confederate (Plymouth) by another (Massachusetts),

but substituted an externally imposed unity under a royal military viceroy for the voluntary kind which had served well for sixty-five years.

Professor Ward's book is also valuable for the light it throws on Indian fighting, on diplomatic negotiations with the Dutch and French colonies (New Amsterdam authorities took the New England Confederation more seriously than did the English government), on missionary activity among the Indians, on the long quarrel between the Puritan colonies and Rhode Island, on the extinction by fiat of New Haven and Plymouth, and on the mechanism of union devised by the Yankee constitutionalists. On the other hand, there are serious oversights and glaring deficiencies. There is very inadequate consideration of the extent to which colonial union was an instinctive response to the troubled conditions in early seventeenth-century England and the extent to which the withering of interest in confederation reflected stability and prosperity in the mother country under the later Stuarts. A considerable part of one chapter is devoted to a purely speculative essay on the possibility that the United Colonies had a striped flag which became the forerunner of our present national ensign. The sole evidence for this fantasy is a dim, contemporary painting of New Amsterdam harbor in 1647 (reproduced in the text) showing a ship flying a four-striped banner. Even if this were proof, one might well be skeptical about its significance. Professor Ward ends this seven-page diversion, believe it or not, with a parody on Francis Scott Key in which the pine tree and the cross wave over the land of the free in place of the star-spangled banner. Just what the connection may be is pretty difficult to explain.

One is also annoyed by Professor Ward's constant effort to endow the New England Confederation with a weight of historical significance far beyond anything it can possibly bear. Not only does it, in his opinion, provide precedents for the Continental Congress, the Articles of Confederation, and the Constitution, but it anticipated, as well, the federal marshals in American territories, the superintendent of Indian affairs, and the process of nullification. "The Puritans," declares Ward, "left a rich legacy to American federalism, implanting into the colonial consciousness an experience in federal union and an example of the capability of the colonists to shape their own destiny. Fifty years of Confederation left a feeling for union and a longing for independence that was never to die" (p. 382). Perhaps—but it certainly lay dormant for a long time, and when it did revive a century later, no one seemed to remember the United Colonies as much of a precedent. With the possible exception of Benjamin Franklin, the Founding Fathers did not look for lessons of experience in their own history. Madison studied the constitutions of the Achaean and Aeolian Leagues before he came to Philadelphia in 1787, but if he was influenced by the New England Confederation, it must have been unconsciously.

A final word. This book is a literary curiosity, moving without warning from inspired flights of fancy into wastelands of fractured syntax and misbegotten vocabulary. "But what of this union?" the author asks on page 43. "What has God wrought into One from the imperfect clay?" The answer to this eloquent question is a series of sentences such as these—"Concentrating his efforts on the Bay Colony,

the Andros Council proceeded to levy taxes without the consent of an assembly of the people" (p. 333). "During the life of the Confederation, each Puritan colony dared not take on the sole responsibility of breaking this compact" (p. 51). "The United Colonies, under the Articles of 1643, was on the road to survival . . . " (p. 178). "The Bay was well adept to political maneuvering" (p. 181).

These samples, to say nothing of numerous typographical blunders, should be sufficient to suggest that before a scholar produces a book he should learn to write, and that before a printer undertakes to publish, he ought to exercise some degree of discrimination in the public interest.

Otterbein College Lynn W. Turner

The Memoirs of James II: His Campaigns as Duke of York, 1652-1660. Translated and edited by A. Lytton Sells. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1962. Pp. 301. Illustrations, maps, index. $6.95.)

The Indiana University Press offers, in joint publication with Chatto & Windus of London, with full, acute scholarly apparatus, the translation of a unique manuscript—indeed, a gem—from among the treasures of the Lilly Library: the Bouillon manuscript.

The Bouillon manuscript, discovered in the summer of 1954 by David A. Randall, now librarian of the Lilly Library, Indiana University, consists of 290 folio pages and is a French translation made in Paris in 1695-1696 under James II's care, supervision, and correction, of the records James kept, as a young man in his twenties, from 1652 to 1660. The manuscript covers the day-to-day action of the campaigns in which he served, originally with the great Turenne, and later with the Prince de Condé; James included also the evolving affairs of his personal life and of his family as leisure and the winter months permitted.

This French translation was made as a gift to the Cardinal de Bouillon, nephew of Turenne, a man and a memory both James and the Cardinal cherished. Within the same binding as the manuscript and preceding it are two remarkable manuscript documents—the first, the Cardinal's bequest in 1715 of this manuscript to his family, in which he relates the circumstances that brought the manuscript into being; and the other, an attestation made in 1734 by five heads of the Scots College, James's official depository for his private papers, attesting the authenticity of this translation and distinguishing it from the French translation made for James's widow in 1704.

The worth to scholars of the Bouillon manuscript, now published in English dress under the editorial care of Professor A. Lytton Sells, will not be inconsiderable. The sources for the career of James II have suffered on the one hand from the heightened emotions of those who were deeply concerned, pro and con, in James's wavering fortunes, and on the other from the losses incurred in the French Revolution—difficulties long since cogently canvassed in Sir Winston Churchill's *Marlborough*—for example, Vol. II, chaps. 3 and 4. In the midst of much that is shifting sand, the Bouillon manuscript, as far as it goes