

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

P 01057

the agitators for international disarmament and the abolition of compulsory military service meet with success, it will be an evil day for the Continental countries."

Major André's Journal, 1777-78. Boston: The Bibliophile Society.

In two beautiful volumes, illustrated by many finely executed maps, the Boston Bibliophile Society issues what purports to be a journal kept by "Captain" John André from June, 1777, to November, 1777, with a break in the record from January to June, 1778. The maps and plans, forty-four in number, stated to have been drawn by André, are very beautiful drawings, some being colored and very elaborate in detail and finish. Senator Lodge supplies an introduction. The journal adds little to our information as to the movements of the British army, but any record from André's pen would possess a certain interest. It may be said at once that the maps are of the highest value, and are finer examples than any series of military maps of the Revolution known in any collection outside of the War Office. The reproductions are all that can be desired, and it is only to be regretted that the edition is so small, as they should be available for every student of the military history of the Revolution. They should have been issued in atlas form.

The history of this journal, so far as known, is briefly told in the letter of the agents who sold the manuscript to an American collector. "The journal was recently discovered by Earl Grey, on his opening at his house a box that had not seen daylight for at least 100 years. . . . Major-General Grey and André were exceptionally intimate friends, and hence the preservation of this MS. amongst Earl Grey's papers. It was probably brought home by Grey to show what he had done." André's name or signature nowhere appears in the journal, and the writing was identified by a photograph of a letter vaguely described as being "in America." This letter is the well-known request for a soldier's death, written to Washington after sentence to be hanged.

It is strange that more attention was not given to identifying so important a manuscript, and the journal and its contents raise some difficulties. The army lists show that Captain André became an aide to Major-General Charles Grey in 1777 or 1778. In September, 1779, he served as aide to Sir Henry Clinton, but did not receive his major's commission until August, 1780. Grey was made colonel of the Twenty-eighth Regiment in March, 1777, and André was a captain in the Twenty-sixth Regiment. So far as dates and rank are involved, the journal may have been written by André. But how can the statement of the agent regarding the exceptional intimacy existing between the two men be reconciled with the fact that not a scrap of André's writing could be found in Earl Grey's collections, not so much as would serve as an example for testing the writing of the journal? Further, if Gen. Grey was solicitous about his service, and almost every one connected with the campaigns of 1777 and 1778 had reason to expect investigation, would he not have saved some other records than a journal by his aide? And would not a complete record of the year be a better defence than one that said nothing of some

six months of the period? The record was probably a personal journal of the writer, one who was at headquarters and therefore in a position to know what was being done. It was not an "official" document. This is not convincing as to the authorship, nor does it aid in explaining the presence of the manuscript in Earl Grey's box. It is neither a full nor a fair test to compare the writing of the journal, of which a few pages are reproduced, with the letter written just before the execution, when strength of feeling might easily modify the usual form of the script. Notable differences may be seen, however, and a comparison with the account of the Mischianza, known to be in André's writing, would have been a better test.

Nor do the difficulties in accepting this record as described end with the question of penmanship of the journal. Unless André was specially set apart to prepare maps, was it possible for an aide, busily employed while the army was on the march and in a campaign, to prepare so large a number of elaborate maps, perfectly drawn and bearing evidence of close study of actual conditions? The difficulty might be lessened by saying that André merely "copied" maps sent to headquarters; or the groundwork of the maps might have been drawn by a regular engineer, while André filled in the names of places and the manoeuvres of the troops. Neither of these explanations would be satisfactory in itself, and either would detract from the claim made, that the maps were drawn by André. It is known that he was clever at drawing, but the workmanship of the maps would have demanded too much of his time from other duties, and their presence in the journal would seem to show that he prepared them (if indeed he did) for his own amusement. The writing of draughtsmen, like that of business clerks, is often conventionalized, offering many nice points of difference in the absence of an actual name or signature. It was certainly very uncritical to accept in so unquestioning a spirit the attribution of authorship that accompanied the manuscript. In themselves the maps are a really great addition to the cartography of the Revolution; but it still rests with the Bibliophile Society to prove that either journal or maps were of André's making. There is so much looseness in identifying unsigned manuscripts that every precaution against error should be taken before the stamp of authority is given to a doubtful piece. The Society appears to have taken no precaution, and thus offers a fair opportunity for questioning the correctness of its assumptions regarding this journal and the maps.

Notes on the Composition of Scientific Papers. By T. Clifford Allbutt. Macmillan Co. 1904. 8vo, pp. 154.

Dr. Allbutt adds to the characteristics of an elderly physician those of a don of a small college in an English university. Thus, he is particular to let us know that he has "read no grammars, nor the handbooks of literary artists." In other countries an author usually desires his readers to know that he has not entirely neglected the literature of the subject upon which he writes. But, considering how nearly identical the greater part of the matter of these "Notes" is with the time-honored recom-

mendations that are found in all the textbooks of rhetoric, we cannot suppose that Dr. Allbutt expects us to think he has worked them all out by original reflection. The volume contains not a few remarks that argue a higher kind of discrimination; but a good many of these have sound in our ears like reminiscences of observations that were certainly made by one or another of the older French writers on style, from Pascal to Sainte-Beuve; and, notwithstanding his modest-arrogant disclaimer, we should not wonder if all that La Bruyère, Fénelon, Voltaire, Marmontel, Vauvenargues, and Buffon ever wrote about style were perfectly familiar to Dr. Allbutt. Yes, and the utterances of modern critics as well. For when he tells us that "Le Capitaine Fracasse" (which, though he does not name it individually, is included among its author's writings of which he does speak without limitation) "will not endure," for reasons which would equally apply to the conversations in Alexandre Dumas's novels and 'Impressions de Voyage,' this sounds a little as if it might have been said by one of the later critics in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*. At any rate, it is sufficiently striking. Dr. Allbutt evidently approves of French rhetoric. It is something like that that he chiefly aims to enforce, though he sometimes fails to strike the nail squarely on the head. Thus, in order to illustrate Sainte-Beuve's manner of opening a "Causerie du Lundi," he quotes a sentence (in translation) which would have been an illustration of this author's sometimes failing to devise the kind of opening he preferred for his *causerie*, were it not that (though Dr. Allbutt does not remark it) it really comes from one of the 'Portraits Contemporains,' where a somewhat different style was chosen by Sainte-Beuve.

The "scientific papers" of the title-page appear in the body of the book as "scientific essays," by which are meant theses required from candidates for the degree of M.B. or of M.D. by the University of Cambridge—a motive entirely different from that of any genuine scientific writing. Now, rhetoric ought to be the doctrine of the adaptation of the forms of expression of a writing to the accomplishment of its purposes. Hence, the rhetoric which is specially appropriate to a thesis for a degree (whose soundest maxim is that the forms of expression must be such as the examiner, Dr. Allbutt or whoever it may be, will approve) is not specially appropriate to any writing having a really scientific purpose. The almost incredible quantities of incorrect writing with which this volume is no less replete than are ordinary books of rhetoric, are examples of what writers of all kinds should shun. We doubt if they could have been culled out of American country newspapers—unless from the columns of jokes. Bad style rather than good style of writing has always been characteristic of the medical profession; it naturally would be so, for more than one reason. Sir Thomas Browne is often set up as one of the glories of English literature, and the mannerisms of the majority of doctors have been less agreeable than his; moreover, of the really great stylists among them a few only carry a distinctly professional stamp. But it is very surprising to find how atrocious must be the faults of the theses which call for such a book as this to correct them.

Dr. Allbutt's own style is one of those that may be perfectly delightful to some persons and at the same time nauseating to others. He is more capacious than correct, and more meticulous than engaging. He is very fond of employing technical terms of logic, but almost always applies them wrongly. He insists, for instance, that the word "theory" can properly be used only in a sense which would make it nearly synonymous with "theorem." Yet in one place he seems to confess (what is at all events true) that such a limitation is not in accordance with usage. From his dicta it would follow that the "atomic theory" ought not to be so called. The word "scientific," on the other hand, is used by him with extraordinary latitude. Thus, we read that "scientific writers are apt to suppose that restatement in bigger words is explanation." Evidently, the "scientific writers" he has in mind are the writers of the "scientific essays" he talks of—undisciplined candidates for medical degrees.

It is singular that while he holds that very few, if any, pairs of English words are synonyms, yet he thinks that all such half-English expressions as *raison d'être*, *tout ensemble*, *cortège*, *par excellence*, have their precise English equivalents. The extreme improbability of the proposition passes unnoticed. But who cannot see that all this is nothing but his personal taste, good or bad, hunting in quite a wrong direction after justification? In many cases his judgments are good, while the reasons he gives for them are bad. But in this, as in most respects, the book is very much like any ordinary book of rhetoric. Had he dropped all pretension to being himself very scientific or to having anything to say specially germane to the communication of scientific discoveries, and had he acknowledged that his book differed from a common text-book on style chiefly in not covering the ground systematically, we might have thought it a nice little thing in its way.

The Organization of Agriculture. By Edwin A. Pratt. E. P. Dutton & Co. 1904.

The subject treated by Mr. Pratt would, as he suggests, afford abundant scope for the enterprise of some twentieth-century Arthur Young. Even the hasty survey here taken is fascinating, and it is evident that a closer view would reveal many things of interest which lack of space prevents the author from noticing. His original purpose was to investigate the complaints made by British farmers against their railways. He found that in order to carry out this purpose it was necessary to inquire into conditions on the Continent, and this inquiry revealed the existence of organization, or combination, among farmers to a wonderful extent. The grievances of the English farmers were found to be due to their own lack of enterprise. They have allowed their own market to be taken away from them because they would not work together to maintain it.

It is hardly necessary to say that the managers of the English railways have no desire to cripple English agriculture. They know well enough that the local traffic is better worth cultivating than the foreign. But they simply cannot transport small quantities of perishable

goods at carload rates. It is true that the Continental railways make very low rates on exports; they are generally under the control of governments that undertake to give bounties to exporters. But these low rates are not the chief factor. By means of organization, the farmers of the Continent are able to bring goods to the railways in wagon loads and even train loads. The National Poultry Organization Society recently asked one of the English railways for a lower rate on eggs from a certain county. The railway was at the time carrying through the district foreign eggs in twenty-five and fifty-ton lots. The railway officers replied: "If you will send us eggs in four-ton lots, we will give you a rate 25 per cent. lower than what we get for carrying the foreign eggs." But the offer had to be declined. In fact, a consignment of English eggs weighing a hundredweight is exceptional.

Mr. Pratt declares that in every one of the countries now pouring their agricultural produce into Great Britain there has been an agricultural revival, due to the spread of agricultural education and to combinations for an endless variety of purposes. Fertilizers are obtained by these associations, of better quality and of lower cost. Expensive machines are bought. Societies are formed both for production and for distribution. Agricultural credit banks have played a great part. They exist by thousands on the Continent, but are practically unknown in England. They have not been established in this country, though all other forms of coöperation are known to us. On the whole, Mr. Pratt's account of the progress of agricultural enterprise is very encouraging. It is only in England that the farmers seem to be unable to combine successfully. Even Ireland has been aroused, and the labors of Sir Horace Plunkett in establishing co-operative dairies have brightened the future of the Irish peasantry.

Collectanea Anglo-Premonstratensia. Edited for the Royal Historical Society by Father Francis A. Gasquet. Vol. I. London: Offices of the Society, Chancery Lane.

This initial volume contains documents drawn from the registers of the Premonstrat Order. The original register is now in the Bodleian Library, and there is in the British Museum the transcript of another register. From these sources Father Gasquet produces materials which open up a new chapter in the monastic history of mediæval England. That the Premonstratensians never reached the importance of the Cluniacs or Cistercians is sufficiently well known, but they came to England as early as 1143, built up in all more than thirty houses, and remained a factor in the ecclesiastical life of the island until the Reformation. St. Norbert, their founder, was son of the Count of Genève, in the Duchy of Cleves, and connected through his mother with the Emperor Henry IV. The original monastery of Prémontré was situated in the forest of St. Gobain, within the diocese of Laon; and here, on Christmas Day, 1121, Norbert, with forty companions, received the white habit of canons regular from Bartholomew Viry, Bishop of Laon.

The chief aim of the Premonstratensians was preaching among the poor. In point of organization, Norbert followed the Augus-

tinians, save that with his order the head of a daughter-house was styled Abbot, while with the Augustinians the official of corresponding rank received the lesser title of Prior. The only real innovation of Norbert seems to have been the establishment of Tertiaries on lines which were afterwards adopted by the mendicant orders. There were also Premonstratensian canons, but only two houses of these existed in England, and neither attained more than local influence. Welbeck Abbey, founded in 1153, grew to be the leading establishment of the English Premonstratensians.

The documents which are here edited by Father Gasquet may be divided into two main groups, the first belonging to the early years of the fourteenth, and the second to the later years of the fifteenth century. As every student of Rymer's *Fœdera* knows, a great deal of friction arose in the days of the Edwards between the Crown and those members of alien religious orders who were sending money across the Channel at the instance of the Abbot-General or the Chapter-General. These documents of the Premonstratensians reveal the presence of heartburnings within the orders themselves on the subject of contributing to the funds of the mother-house abroad.

"From the English canons," says Father Gasquet, "Prémontré claimed three things: regular attendance on the part of the abbots at the annual general chapter, held at the mother-house; the appointment of the visitor to examine and report to the abbot-general as to the state of the houses; and the right to tax the affiliated houses for the benefit of the order in general and Prémontré in particular. It was this last demand which, in practice, caused many difficulties and led to many misunderstandings."

A crisis was reached in the reign of Edward II., when Adam de Crècy, Abbot of Prémontré, tried to insist on the full exercise of his prerogative. This policy led the English abbots to appeal from their superior to the papacy, and in 1316 they secured a settlement which, while nominally a compromise, left the solid advantage with them. The fifteenth-century documents here published relate chiefly to the career of that distinguished Premonstratensian, Bishop Redman of Ely. Father Gasquet's preface contains an admirable summary of the documents and a discussion of the main points which they suggest.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Annual of the British School at Athens. No. IX. Session 1902-3. Macmillan.
Bishop, Joseph B. Our Political Drama: Conventions, Campaigns, Candidates. Scott-Thaw Co. Conterbin, Pierre de. La Chronique de France: 4th year. Paris.
Dreman, Marcus R. P. History of the British Empire in the 19th Century. Vol. II. The Campaigns of Wellington and the Policy of Castlereagh. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co.
Eashy-Smith, J. S. The Department of Justice: Its History and Functions. Washington: W. H. Lowdermilk & Co. 75c.
Foucart, Paul. Le Culte de Dionysos en Attique. Paris: G. Klincksieck. 8 fr.
Gibbs, George R. Personal Reminiscences of the First Duke of Wellington. Charles Scribner's Sons.
Hamilton, Arthur S. Copyright Cases. G. P. Putnam's Sons. \$2 net.
Lawrence, T. J. War and Neutrality in the Far East. The Macmillan Co. \$1.25.
McLaren, J. Wilson. Wolf the Wizard. (Fiction.) London and Edinburgh: Sands & Co. 6d.
Protection in Various Countries: Protection in the United States, by A. Maurice Low; Protection in Germany, by W. Harbutt Dawson; Protection in Canada and Australasia, by C. H. Chomley. London: P. S. King & Son. 3s. 6d. net each.
Purchase and Exploration of Louisiana. 1.—The Limits and Bounds of Louisiana. By Thomas Jefferson; 2.—The Exploration of the Red, the Black, and the Washita Rivers. Loughton, Mifflin & Co.
Rosenbach, Prof. Dr. O. Physician versus Bacteriologist. Funk & Wagnalls Co.