

the attempt to revive the deliberative functions of the Council, by abolishing the standing committees, broke down of its own weight. Business was never actually done by the whole Council, but by a few members who were specially familiar with the subject in hand. The editors mention only one case of actual attendance, when three lords constituted the committee of the whole Council and sat as "The Lords of the Committee for hearing Appeals from the Plantations", so that it would be worth while to examine the Register and the memoranda of committee meetings among the unbound papers to see if conclusive evidence cannot be obtained on this point. But probably there was little real difference between the system under the Stuarts and that adopted after the Revolution, except that the absence of definite nomination must have detracted very much from the unity, independence, and solidarity of such committees. Any one of the Council could come in and debate and vote as he liked, and this fact must have prevented any shaping of policy on the part of the committee. The meetings might under some circumstances have resembled those of the private bill committees of the House of Commons under George III., though there is no reason to believe that the scandals arising from the attendance of the "guinea" members of Parliament would ever have accompanied the sittings of the committee of the Privy Council.

The editors of this volume have done their work remarkably well. The entries are models of compactness, and the plan which they have here adopted of bringing together all extracts relating to a particular subject in a single section will prove a great convenience to scholars. Cross-references are given to the Plantation Register, and to the *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial*, as far as December, 1700. Four appendixes are added, containing (1) commissions and instructions to colonial governors; (2) nominations, etc., to colonial councils; (3) colonial acts confirmed or disallowed; and (4) additional entries from the Plantation Register, not included in the rest of the work. The arrangement of entries, the elaborate tabulation of embargoes, the making up of the appendixes, and the gathering of the cross-references must have involved a great deal of intelligent and prolonged labor. Finally, it is a matter of congratulation that Sir Almeric W. FitzRoy, to whom the inception of the work is due, is able to announce the speedy completion of the undertaking. A third volume is promised for the autumn and a fourth will appear some time during the winter.

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

Le Parlement de Bretagne et le Pouvoir Royal au XVIII^{me} Siècle.

Par A. LE MOY, Docteur ès Lettres. (Paris: H. Champion. 1909. Pp. xxiii, 605.)

THESE two attractively printed volumes by M. Le Moy form a most valuable contribution to the literature, still far from complete, of the history of the French parlements in the eighteenth century. The work

rests upon a solid base of original material, consisting, in addition to the printed documents, of a great mass of manuscript material found in Paris, in departmental, municipal, and private archives. With the secondary literature, M. Le Moy is as well acquainted as with his sources.

The first volume, the more important of the two, deals with the struggle between the Parlement of Bretagne and the royal power in the eighteenth century. Some portions of this period had already been well treated in monographs, but there were considerable gaps, fresh material rendered possible some slight modifications in the theses defended by the writers of monographs, and it seemed desirable to present the period as a whole. The volume falls into two parts. In the first, M. Le Moy gives a sketch of the social and economic conditions among the members of the Breton parlements, in which he describes the prestige of that body in the province, the prices paid for their offices, absenteeism, the slowness in the administration of justice, the partizan spirit of the court, parliamentary manners and customs, and parliamentary society. The study is largely new, well done, and will prove of great value to the student of the history of the French courts in the eighteenth century. The second part treats of the various causes of strife between the parlement and the royal power. M. Le Moy divides the century into four periods: 1715 to 1756, 1756 to May, 1765, 1765 to the death of Louis XV. in 1774, and 1774 to 1789, the end of the parlement. In the first period, the parlement exercised its political power only intermittently and preserved up to 1756 its primitive character of a court of justice. "After 1756, the Parlement of Bretagne resembled rather a deliberative assembly, invested with a right of control over the state." The period was filled with grave conflicts between the monarchy and the parlements, in which the Parlement of Bretagne played an important rôle. Much of the responsibility for the hostility of the parlement, M. Le Moy lays at the door of the Duc d'Aiguillon. The long struggle between d'Aiguillon, commandant of the province, and La Chalotais, procureur of the parlement, is described in detail. M. Le Moy's conception of the character of the two men and of the significance of the rôles they played differs from that of MM. Marion, Carré, and Pocquet, who have dealt with this episode of the parliamentary struggle. "La Chalotais", writes M. Le Moy, "does not seem to us, furthermore, to deserve all the rigors of MM. Marion and Carré. Perhaps he does not deserve either the eulogies heaped upon him by M. B. Pocquet." It has not been his aim, however, to rehabilitate the Duc d'Aiguillon. The third period, a most troubled one, was marked by the continuation of the struggle between La Chalotais and d'Aiguillon, ending, in 1768, with the withdrawal of the duke from the province and the triumph of the parlement. The last period, 1774 to 1789, was perhaps the most interesting of all. It was marked by the attempt of Brienne to destroy the political power of the parlements, the failure of the attempt, the calling of the *States General*, and the loss of popular favor by the parlement, because of its opposition to the doubling of the representation of the Third Estate.

The second volume contains the texts of seventeen remonstrances of the parlement in the eighteenth century, preceded by an introduction, in which M. Le Moy describes the form and contents of these remonstrances. Under the head of "form", he gives an account of all the steps taken by the parlement in drawing up and presenting a remonstrance; under that of "content", he enumerates the different matters that gave rise to remonstrances. This introduction will prove to be as great an aid to the student of parliamentary remonstrances as the introduction of the first volume will be on the social and economic conditions of the courts. When we shall have as satisfactory a volume on the history of the other parlements of France as those of Flammermont for the Parlement of Paris and Le Moy for the Parlement of Bretagne, it will be possible to write the history of the struggle of the royal power in France with the parlements in the eighteenth century.

FRED MORROW FLING.

Hungary in the Eighteenth Century. By HENRY MARCZALI. With an Introductory Essay on the Earlier History of Hungary, by HAROLD W. V. TEMPERLEY, M.A., Fellow of Peterhouse, Cambridge. (Cambridge: University Press. 1910. Pp. lxiv, 377.)

THE number of works on Hungarian history accessible to those not conversant with the Magyar language is so limited that it is always a particular pleasure to welcome an addition to the list; and in this case, fortunately, we have presented to us one of the best productions of recent Hungarian historiography.

Dr. Marczali, now professor in the University of Budapest, published in 1881-1888 under the auspices of the Hungarian Academy of Science three volumes (seven books) on *The History of Hungary in the Reign of Joseph II.* It is the first book of this highly reputed work that now lies before us, revised for this purpose by the author and translated with the co-operation of Professor Yolland of the University of Budapest. Mr. Temperley's introductory essay is, in general, concise and adequate, though not always quite accurate in statements of fact.

Professor Marczali's book is not a political history of the country and period in question, but seeks rather to describe the state of Hungary about the time of the accession of Joseph II. The eighteenth century in Hungary has usually been branded by historians as an age of sad decadence in every branch of the national life. The author has set himself to test this verdict by making for the first time a thorough study of the archives, official and private, with the aim of getting to the bottom of the question, of bringing to light the inner forces of the nation, the silent processes going on below the surface, the real nature of, and the organic connections between, the chief factors, political, economic, and intellectual, then at work. The result has been something like a "rehabilitation" of the Hungary of the eighteenth century.