

teacher. That indeed is, I venture to think, the error of the system on which this book is composed. It endeavours to do by a mechanical arrangement what could really be done only by the action of an individual mind.

I may have seemed condemnatory. I may seem to have dwelt rather on the defects of conception than on the undoubted merits of execution. If so it is only because I have measured the book by a high standard. I should be the last to underrate the accuracy, the labour, the sobriety of tone, which marks each separate part of the book, or the permanent value which each has as a contribution to the literature of its own special subject.

J. A. DOYLE.

A History of England from the Conclusion of the Great War in 1815.
Vols. IV, V. By SPENCER WALPOLE. (London: Longmans & Co. 1886.)

WITH the completion of the fifth volume, Mr. Walpole's useful work reaches its close, bringing the reader down to the peace of Paris in 1856, and the suppression of the Indian mutiny in the following year. The fourth volume starts from the formation of Peel's second ministry in 1841. After a preliminary review dealing with various aspects of English social and political life at the epoch of the reform bill, the author proceeds with a narrative which is in the main parliamentary, entering with much detail into Peel's earlier financial measures—measures which Peel may be said to have originated of his own free will, and without the pressure from outside which, a year or two later, brought him over to the policy of the anti-corn-law league. Mr. Walpole, though the bias of his own mind is towards a rather advanced liberalism, does more than justice to Peel who is in fact the hero of the later part of his work. He does not, however, conceal the backwardness or timidity of the minister in the matter of the factory acts, which would never have been carried had there not been men in this country whose human sympathies and religious earnestness opened to them things that were hid from the wise and prudent among politicians. Mr. Walpole does well to bring the factory acts to the front in his history; his statement of their vital importance to the English people is not at all too strong; and the impression which his narrative will leave, that there never was a case where one side was so wholly in the right and the other side so wholly in the wrong, is thoroughly warranted by all that has happened since in England. Nor is Mr. Walpole's treatment of Irish events less honest and straightforward; he has a miserable story to tell, and he tells it without prejudice towards either side. If any one is entitled to complain of hard treatment, it is perhaps O'Connell, whose patriotism Mr. Walpole calls in question on the double ground that O'Connell was in love with a young lady at a time when all his thoughts ought to have been given to Ireland, and that he directed by his will that his heart should be interred at Rome. Surely there may be tides of religious as well as earthly emotion in a nature like that of O'Connell, which are not to be adjusted to the Saxon standard of a legal M.P.'s range of feeling. In dealing with the consequence of the repeal of the corn laws, it may be thought that Mr. Walpole,

whose strong point is really financial history, might have entered more fully into the effect of that measure on prices and on agriculture. He shows indeed that, so far from disappearing, rents rose largely in England during the thirty years between 1846 and 1877; at the same time he speaks as if the expectation of low prices from free trade in corn had been fully realised. We are not charging Mr. Walpole with inaccuracy in his figures; but he ought to have explained, or at any rate to have asked, how it was possible that, if prices fell, rents could nevertheless rise. It may be remarked that the Crimean war made wheat for some years much dearer than it had been before 1846; that an enormous quantity of land was brought into cultivation between 1846 and 1877, so that, even if rent per acre had fallen, the gross rent of 1877 would nevertheless have been greater than that of 1846; and that circumstances operating over other countries besides our own appear to have postponed the full effects of Peel's legislation on English agriculture until the present time, when it is again an open question whether English corn-growing will not succumb before free trade. By concluding a survey at any arbitrary date, like 1877, any conceivable position may be established. The agricultural Cassandras of 1846, if any of them survive to read Mr. Walpole's work, will with some justice compare Mr. Walpole to a physician who speaks of a dying man as in full health because he left him in robust condition ten years ago.

Mr. Walpole is not an admirer of Lord Palmerston's blustering mode of conducting the business of the foreign office. His sympathies are rather with the friendly and considerate methods of Lord Aberdeen, though it is scarcely disputed that this gentleness of demeanour gave to the emperor Nicholas the impression that, with Aberdeen in office, England would never go to extremities, and so occasioned the Crimean war. In his review of English foreign policy between 1841 and 1851, Mr. Walpole has at any rate taken the trouble to form his opinions for himself; and in one question, that of the Spanish marriages, he has come to a conclusion opposed to that which is usually accepted. It is well known that Louis Philippe had undertaken, on the English government consenting to the marriage of his son Montpensier to the sister of the queen of Spain, that this marriage should not take place until the queen of Spain should herself have been married and have borne children. The two marriages were, however, solemnised simultaneously, to the great indignation of England; and the judgment of almost all historians has been that Louis Philippe was guilty of an act of gross treachery towards his ally. Mr. Walpole defends Louis Philippe on the ground that Palmerston, who had just come into office, intended to repudiate the understanding made by Aberdeen, that the queen of Spain should marry a Bourbon, and meant to support the candidature of a Coburg instead. Whether the documents cited by Mr. Walpole in support of this contention will fully sustain his own view is a matter on which readers of his book who refer to the originals will perhaps have some difficulty in making up their minds; but in this question, as in others, Mr. Walpole is rightly anxious to avoid partiality on the side of England.

The least satisfactory chapter in these volumes is that on what may be called the religious history of the period. Whether it was necessary for the historian to go much into the details of the Tractarian movement

at Oxford may be matter of opinion ; but surely all the dismal chronicle of the Hampden case might have been left to rot in the dull books which are full of it. It is, however, in subjects of this kind that Mr. Walpole's limitations are most apparent. As an annalist or chronicler he is excellent ; and he goes beyond this, for his political and social generalisations at the end of the volume are both sound and definite ; but in the larger range of thought and knowledge, the background, so to speak, formed by an historian's whole mental habit and experience, he is, it must be confessed, far from impressive. This comes out curiously in his estimates of men and his comparisons between them. Thus he twice speaks of Peel as a greater statesman than Pitt ; and he actually says that in capacity Wellington 'was not, possibly, superior to Moore.' Coming to minor men, he speaks of Newman and Dr. Hampden as if the two were much on a level. Mr. Walpole is of course within his rights when he says that he has nothing to do with Wellington's military career ; but the logical conclusion would have been to refrain from offering any general estimate of Wellington's powers. If a man is to be weighed, account ought to be taken of his whole life and work. Had Wellington died before he set foot in the Spanish peninsula, the record of his Indian career as a warrior and an administrator would by itself have stamped him as a man of great genius. In 1815, and again in 1822, he showed himself the best diplomatist and one of the most prescient statesmen in Europe. To speak of him as merely a man of unusual judgment, who, as a general, made fewer mistakes than other generals, is like speaking of Milton as a well-balanced writer of English who made fewer bad rhymes than most of his contemporaries. The same absence of severe and comprehensive mental discipline appears in Mr. Walpole's too frequent rhetorical exaggerations, as where he says that, while Palmerston was quarrelling over the Spanish marriages, no statesman 'thought it worth while to convey a few words of pity or of hope to twenty millions of Poles.' Had there been not twenty, but two, millions of Poles who cared anything whatever about Polish independence, Poland would not have vanished. Yet Mr. Walpole when he is in an optimist mood tells us that 'vain are all the measures of repression,' and that 'a great movement never perishes for want of a leader ;' as if half the history of the human race did not consist of instances of the opposite. This undisciplined habit of mind appears again in Mr. Walpole's excursions over literary and scientific ground, as where, in leading up to the Tractarian and the Scotch disruption movements, he gives two pages to a comparison between the theologies of Homer and Milton. In narrating the discovery of the electric telegraph he goes back to Thales, and in expounding the importance of petroleum he quotes Nehemiah. It is impossible for a writer to indulge in proclivities of this kind without diminishing the respect due to his work. The truth is that the correction of Mr. Walpole's book would be the affair of the scissors more than of the pen. If all the occasional rhetoric and all the superfluous passages which have been written rather with the hand than with the mind were cut out, the book would be greatly improved, and there would remain, instead of five volumes largely debased with alloy, three or four volumes of good and sterling work.

C. A. FYFE.

Two volumes of the series of *Epochs of Church History*, Dr. Plummer's *The Church of the Early Fathers*, and Mr. Carr's *The Church and the Roman Empire* (London: Longmans), are of unequal merit. Dr. Plummer has written a little book as a condensation of large knowledge, while Mr. Carr has contented himself with gaining a little knowledge to write a little book. Both volumes are useful handbooks; but Mr. Carr has written a readable condensation of Gibbon and Milman, while Dr. Plummer, writing from contemporary sources, has given freshness to his sketch of the extension of the church and the nature of its literature in the ante-Nicene period, and has produced a little book which all students will read with pleasure.

We have received from Messrs. Weidmann the second edition of Waitz's convenient collection of *Urkunden zur deutschen Verfassungsgeschichte*, ranging from 959 to 1151. It does for German history, within the limits of the tenth and twelfth centuries, much what Bishop Stubbs's *Select Charters* do for our own constitutional history, except that the editor's comments are more succinct and are addressed to a more advanced class of students. The little volume has a peculiar interest, since the preface is dated just six weeks before the editor's sudden and lamented death in May of last year.

The fourteenth edition of Hook's *Church Dictionary*, edited by W. Hook and W. R. W. Stephens (London: Murray), is the result of such a thorough revision as to be almost a new book. The original plan remains, it is true, but most of the articles have been rewritten and many new ones are inserted, but the scale of the book is not materially changed and it still keeps its character as a popular handbook rather than a guide for scholars. But within its limits it is excellent; the information given is clear and precise, though perhaps an increased number of references would have added to its usefulness, and the tone on disputed questions is moderate and judicious. The limits of the book make the historical articles of necessity very brief—so brief that some of them might have been omitted. The architectural and legal articles, which are mainly written by Lord Grimthorpe, are certainly the best reading in the volume and have a freshness and directness peculiarly their own.

Mr. Bullen's edition of *The Works of Marston* (London: John C. Nimmo) is marked by the same care which has characterised the previous volumes of this excellent series of the works of the English dramatists. We are only sorry that Marston's works do not repay better the pains which his editor has taken. It must, however, be admitted that Mr. Bullen, in his introduction, does not make any undue claims for his author, whose bombast is inexcusable, and whose extravagances are only rarely redeemed by any felicity of expression or grasp of character. A series must presumably be complete, and as Marston wrote he has to be edited, but we wish that Mr. Bullen had been better employed.

Clarendon's History of the Rebellion. Book VI. Edited with Introduction and Notes by THOMAS ARNOLD, M.A. (Oxford: Clarendon

Press.) This little book forms one of the series of English classics published by the Clarendon press. Mr. Arnold's preface gives a brief sketch of Clarendon's life and an account of the circumstances under which his history was composed. The notes are chiefly biographical or explanations of obsolete words in the text. There is also a long and valuable account of the battle of Edgehill, illustrated by a plan (pp. 269-277). The biographical notes are not free from errors. For instance, the battle of Langport took place on 10 July 1645, and not, as stated, in 1646 (p. 255); the battle of Horncastle was in 1643, and not in 1644. In the note on p. 300 two Sir John Borlases are confounded. Sir Nicholas Biron was uncle, not brother, of Sir John Biron (p. 264), and Sir John Digby, sheriff of Nottinghamshire, is not the Sir John Digby brother of Sir Kenelm (p. 247). In the preface (p. ix) it is stated that Hyde joined the king in August 1642. Hyde left the parliament in May, and after staying a few days at Nostall, near York, joined the king at York early in June. Mr. Arnold states that Hyde 'seems like Hampden to have had nothing to do with the bill of attainder against Strafford' (p. vi). But Hampden certainly voted for it, and all the facts seem to show that Hyde did the same. His name is not in the list of the members who voted against it. Falkland voted for it, and we are assured by Hyde that a disagreement between himself and Falkland, which took place later, was their first difference of opinion.

The title of Mr. C. P. Lucas's *Introduction to a Historical Geography of the British Colonies* (Oxford: Clarendon Press) is misleading. It is an introduction to a *future* work on the subject, and only a third part of it has anything to do with the British colonies themselves. The book is really a short treatise on the motives and methods of colonisation in the ancient and modern world; it is carefully written and clearly arranged, and it promises well for the subsequent volumes dealing with the British colonies in detail. A good account of the territorial stages by which our possessions overseas grew to their present magnitude is certainly wanted, and Mr. Lucas, from his position in the colonial office, ought to have special advantages for writing it. But we trust that in future instalments he will take more pains about his maps. It is inexcusable in a work on historical geography to make a modern map, with modern names and divisions and submarine telegraphs, serve for all times by merely colouring it differently; and the maps in themselves are confused and carelessly drawn.

Mr. T. Dunbar Ingram's *History of the Legislative Union of Great Britain and Ireland* (London: Macmillan & Co.) is written for a purpose, and this fact makes it difficult to treat the book here with the attention it deserves, especially since approval or disapproval of the policy of the union has unluckily become a question not of history, but of party. That such should be the case after a lapse of three generations is at once deplorable and ridiculous, and Mr. Ingram has done his best to show that the discussion can be conducted fairly and can lead to a definite historical conclusion. At the same time it may be argued that he has relied too confidently on the information supplied to Lords Cornwallis and Castlereagh,

and has neglected other accessible materials. What Mr. Ingram has made out most successfully is the fact that the union was effected at the desire of the catholics, and that the main resistance came from the protestants, whose property in seats, and whose interest in keeping the centre of affairs at Dublin, were threatened by the proposed change.

Economic Aspects of State Socialism. By H. H. Smith. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1887.) The Oxford Cobden Prize Essay for 1886 deals chiefly with modern theories and modern experiments in reducing them to practice, but it includes a brief sketch of the different systems of industrial policy which have been in vogue in Europe since the Middle Ages. These are clearly and fairly delineated, though the treatment is necessarily slight and sketchy; the doctrines of the Physiocrats deserve a more careful examination than the author seems to have bestowed on them, as there is little ground for the insinuation that they were only half in earnest about their main principles. There is some want of caution too in ascribing modern scientific socialism so very directly to Hegel, as his own doctrine of property and his indications of opinion on various economic points show clearly that he would not have recognised either the writings of Lassall or those of Karl Marx as legitimate developments of his teaching.