

to follow Charles across the Danube and force him to give battle. Had he done so, he would have thrown the Austrian army "into the forests of Bohemia, where it would have disbanded for want of supplies; the *Landwehr*, which afterwards furnished 60,000 men, would not have formed, our depots of recruits would have dispersed, and in a fortnight Napoleon would have become master of and disposed of all our resources." Such, at least, was the opinion of the Austrian Gr  nne, expressed to the Prince de Ligne at the close of the war. Equally destructive of the legend of the brilliant generalship of Napoleon during this campaign is the description of the battle of Essling. All English accounts of this battle attribute Napoleon's failure to win to the breaking of the bridge of boats over the Danube before reinforcements could cross. Mr. Petre, however, writes:

For the defeat of Essling the Emperor had himself to blame. He had certainly been careless in his preparation for the crossing, once more a result of his unbounded pride and his contempt for the enemy. He had been amply warned of the danger of a sudden rise of the Danube. . . . Yet he trusted his army to a single bridge of boats without any protection by stockades, or by boats cruising about to arrest such floating masses above the bridge. His information about Charles's position seems to have been bad, and to have led him not to expect serious resistance immediately after the passage. Even on the morning of Essling, his cavalry had failed to detect the advance of the whole Austrian army. Napoleon was always preaching the advantages of field fortification, yet he neglected it before Essling. . . . Perhaps Napoleon's escape from still greater disaster at the battle of Essling was due as much to the Austrian failure as to his own efforts. . . . Napoleon had no justification for attributing his defeat to the breaking of the bridge.

The conclusion of the whole matter is that "brilliant as many of Napoleon's man  uvres had been, the campaign differed widely in the degree of its success from its predecessors of Austerlitz and Jena." Mr. Petre declares further:

Its comparative failure must be attributed largely to Napoleon's preconceived idea of marching on Vienna, irrespective of the enemy's movements, an idea to which he obstinately adhered when Charles retreated through Ratisbon into Bohemia. Had Napoleon followed him to Cham with the corps of Davout, Mass  na, and Lannes, it is difficult to doubt that the result must have been the defeat of the Austrian army, with its complete break-up in the Bohemian forest.

*A Concordance to the English Poems of Thomas Gray.* Edited by Albert S. Cook. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. \$3.00.

This concordance is the first to appear under the auspices of the Concordance Society, organized at Yale in De-

cember, 1906. Professor Cook has been assisted in gathering the material by several Yale teachers and others, and in the proofreading by professors and teachers at Yale, Columbia, Cornell, and elsewhere; but, unfortunately, the book is marred by omissions, errors, and inconsistencies, due in the main not so much to lack of scholarship and care as to the bad mistake made at the outset in the selection of Gosse's edition (1884) as the basis for the text and the collation of the manuscripts and early editions. For his text, Gosse follows Dr. W. J. Rolfe, whom he credits in his preface with being "the first to return to the revised text of 1768," in his "Select Poems of Gray" (1876). Gosse, however, copies the one misprint in Dr. Rolfe's first edition (found in many other editions of Gray), of "Not" for "Nor" in line 36 of the "Hymn to Adversity." This has led to the omission of that "Nor" in the concordance. Another strange omission—the only one we have noted in the text of the poems—is "drooping" in line 107 of the "Elegy." This, however, is the only poem which we have carefully compared with the concordance, and to which we shall confine ourself here.

The entire body of the standard text of Gray's poetry is so small that it hardly needs a concordance; and the "Elegy," which we all know by heart, is least dependent upon any such aid. But the three extant manuscripts of that poem in the poet's handwriting are less accessible, and are of peculiar interest for their many *varia lectiones*, which, so to speak, let us into the poet's workshop and illustrate the gradual elaboration of the final text. The Mason (or Fraser) manuscript was probably the earliest, as indicated by its having, in stanza 13, "Cato," "Tully," and "C  sar," the change of which to English names is one of the most interesting and significant in the poem. Critics have given reasons for believing that the Egerton manuscript was earlier, but this change seems to settle the question. The four stanzas, beginning "The thoughtless World to Majesty may bow" are also peculiar to the Mason manuscript. The interlineations, marginal readings, and deletions in this manuscript are so numerous and complicated that it would not be possible to indicate them clearly in ordinary concordance form, without frequent explanatory notes under the entries, or, better, a detailed description in an appendix. But Professor Cook's plan might have worked much better, if he had not blindly followed Gosse's imperfect and inaccurate collation of this manuscript. A few out of fifty or more of Gosse's blunders will serve as illustrations:

In line 6 of the "Elegy" ("And all the air," etc.) Gosse says that the Mason manuscript has "Now" for "And." It reads "And now."

In stanza 4 "Village" is crossed out, and "Hamlet" written over it. Words thus crossed out might be omitted in a concordance, but Professor Cook is inconsistent in treating them. Here he omits any reference to "Village," as Gosse does; but in stanza 18, where "Burn" (in line 4) is crossed out, and "With" written over it, Gosse gives "Burn" as a manuscript variant of "With," and so does the concordance. Neither mentions "crown" in the preceding line over "at the"; or "hallow'd" (line 4) with "by" over it, and "kindled at" under it. Gray, after first writing:

And at the Shrine of Luxury and Pride  
Burn Incense hallow'd in the Muse's Flame,  
finally decided on the present reading:

Or heap the shrine of Luxury and Pride  
With incense kindled at the Muse's flame.  
The reader will see that in cases like this—which is not a solitary one—the history of the passage could not be made clear in a concordance without special note or explanation.

In stanza 8 the manuscript reading is muddled by both Gosse and Cook. The manuscript underlines "useful" and puts "homely" (underlined) in the margin; but they give "rustic" as the manuscript reading for "useful," though it is really the manuscript word for "homely" in the next line. In stanza 12 both ascribe "Reins" for "rod" to the same two manuscripts, but it is in all three.

In stanza 13, neither gives "had damp'd," the reading of the Mason, with both "depress'd" and "repress'd" over it.

In stanza 27, the Mason reads thus:  
One morn' we missed him on th' accustomed  
Hill

By the Heath-side & at his fav'rite Tree.  
"Along the" is written over "By the," "side" is crossed out, "near" put above "at," and the first syllable of "accustomed" is crossed out. The only change noted by Gosse and Cook is "I" for "we." In the next stanza, only one of four changes ("yon" for "that") is noted by them.

These specimens of the defects and errors of Gosse's edition, unluckily reproduced in the concordance, should serve as a warning to the editors of the concordances that are to follow. Let them at the start be sure of their texts and authorities. In the Gray the publishers have done their share of the work admirably, and it is a pity that the book should be so "faultily faultless."

*The Life of Mary Baker Eddy.* By Sibyl Wilbur. New York: Concord Publishing Co.

In telling the life story of Mrs. Eddy, Sibyl Wilbur says that she "plants herself unreservedly on the methods of St. Mark. St. Mark, I believe, was a scribe

who related what he had been able to gather from witnesses in a direct and unvarnished way." She adds that "all statements of fact made in this narrative are founded upon reliable evidence, town registers, church books, and court records." Here are two rather different historical methods; in the main, however, the writer's material is journalistic, and not documentary. This circumstance destroys its value as a presentation of the much controverted facts of Mrs. Eddy's life. The time has passed when, upon this subject, the public will accept patiently anything but sworn testimony. Mrs. Wilbur's book is semi-official, and is clearly intended as a counter-blast to the Milmine biography, recently published in *McClure's Magazine*. That work consisted of little more than a collection of documents—private letters, court testimony, extracts from contemporary newspapers, and sworn affidavits of people who had come personally into contact with Mrs. Eddy. Manifestly, any rejoinder, if it is to be made convincing, should adopt the same methods. The fact that Mrs. Wilbur, after spending many months carefully going over the ground, was unable to produce that kind of testimony in rebuttal, seems rather conclusive evidence that it cannot be found.

Miss Milmine, for example, published the affidavit of a certain Horace Wentworth of Stoughton, Mass., in which, with much circumstantial detail, he accuses Mrs. Eddy of attempting to set fire to his mother's house. In reply to this Mrs. Wilbur simply ridicules Horace Wentworth; the fact that Mrs. Eddy's theories as to the unreality of disease aroused in him, as a young man, a spirit of "jocularity" and "mockery," is apparently adduced as a reason for disbelieving his sworn statements. The Quimby controversy is an even more important and significant case in point. Whether Mrs. Eddy obtained her ideas from Quimby is of little importance, so far as the value of these ideas is concerned; but inasmuch as Mrs. Eddy vigorously repudiates any such obligation, the discussion, in its bearing upon her own character, is worth while. The documentary evidence on this point, all printed in the Milmine biography, is extensive. Among other things, there was produced an original letter, written in 1871 and signed by Mrs. Eddy herself, in which she informs her correspondent that her theory "has been practised by one individual who healed me, Dr. Quimby of Portland, Me., an old gentleman who had made it a research for twenty-five years, starting from the standpoint of magnetism, thence going forward and leaving that behind." Mrs. Wilbur absolutely ignores this pertinent document, which, of course, in itself forever disposes of Mrs. Eddy as the originator of the Christian Science idea.

Quimby, as is well known, left ten volumes of manuscripts, now in the possession of his son, George A. Quimby, of Belfast, Me. Mrs. Wilbur regards these as negligible, simply because they are not in Quimby's handwriting—his wife, son, and one or two favorite pupils acting as his amanuenses. On the same ground she could prove that Milton did not write "Paradise Lost," or Benvenuto Cellini his autobiography. These illustrations, which could be multiplied indefinitely, show the futility of the present attempt to explain away the facts of Mrs. Eddy's career. In other details—in the description of Mrs. Eddy's queer nervous temperament, her "seizures," her cradle-rockings, her strange aversion to her own child, her fondness for associating with spiritualists, her colossal egotism—the present book confirms impressions received from other sources.

*Before and After Waterloo:* Letters from Edward Stanley, sometime Bishop of Norwich. Edited by Jane H. Adeane and Maud Grenfel. Pp. 308. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

"Before and after Waterloo" is too pretentious a title for fifty letters, some of them mere notes, written during the hurry of travel and never intended for publication. It is safe to assume that no one would have been more amused than the good Bishop of Norwich himself at this attempt to add extraneous dignity to his hasty jottings of travel. The nature of the volume is characterized much more truly by the dedication, "Echoes of Past Days at Alderley Rectory." Edward Stanley was born in 1780, the son of Sir John Stanley of Alderley in Cheshire. Graduating from Cambridge in 1802, he set out for a "grand tour" of the Continent, and passed the most of a year in Spain. On his return to England, he took orders, and in 1805 he was presented by his father to the living of Alderley, where he remained until his appointment to the bishopric of Norwich in 1837. It was in 1814 and 1816, while rector of Alderley, that Stanley made his second and third trips to the Continent. The letters are in three groups, corresponding to the three journeys.

The first (forty-five pages) contains nine letters, all by Stanley. They are sprightly and interesting, reflecting the point of view of a young man of culture, keen vision, and artistic tastes. But the historian familiar with the pages of Arthur Young will find these first letters rather destitute of new material. Here and there we encounter an incident recorded with so sure a touch and such appreciation of its importance as to fill us with regret that the young man did not follow the example of Young and keep a journal. One such event was an execution that Stan-

ley witnessed at Lyons. The description is rendered more vivid by a sketch of the guillotine from his notebook. After the abdication of Napoleon, Stanley visited France, the Rhine country, Belgium, and Holland. He was gone about six weeks, and wrote fourteen letters, which are preceded by a collection of fourteen others written in the same year from London by Lord Sheffield, Lady Maria Stanley, Miss Louisa Clinton, Miss Catherine Fanshawe, and Mrs. Edward Stanley. At this time King William of Prussia, Alexander of Russia, and Madame de Staël were the lions of London, and the letters of the ladies, full of incidents relating to these distinguished persons, are well worth reading. For this second journey Stanley's letters are longer and meatier, and are supplemented by sixteen full-page sketches, some of them in color. His Paris letters afford illuminating glimpses of the life at the Tuilleries and in the salons, with pen-portraits of Louis XVIII, Madame de Staël, Sir Charles Stuart, and the former marshals of Napoleon. On the third journey, lasting about a month, Stanley was accompanied by his wife, by his brother-in-law, Edward Penrhyn, and Donald Crawford. In this group there are sixteen letters—three by Lord Sheffield (1814 and 1815), six by Stanley, and seven by Mrs. Stanley. With Crawford, who had fought at Waterloo, the party explored the field. From Waterloo they went to Paris, where they remained about three weeks. The letters themselves, containing lively descriptions of the movements of the Stanleys, resemble much the letters of modern tourists, with only here and there a bit of fresh information. The text of this third section is illustrated by ten drawings from the sketch-book of Stanley, some of them very clever.

There are two excellent portraits of Stanley. The face is so full of "sweetness and light" that the editors might well be forgiven for believing that all the world would be as much interested in what he wrote as were those who knew and loved him.

*Alaska, the Great Country.* By Ella Higginson. New York: The Macmillan Co.

Hear it all, ye polar bears,  
Waltz about the pole in pairs.  
All ye icebergs, make salaam.  
You belong to Uncle Sam!

So sang the mockers forty years ago, sure that in the purchase of Alaska we were badly over-reached. Such misconceptions have long since passed away. Successive travellers record more and more wonderful stories, until now, in Mrs. Higginson's book, we seem to have touched the limit of enthusiasm. She belongs to the class of women-travellers and explorers which includes