

Marmont and Dorsenne before Ciudad Rodrigo proved Wellington's point.

When the campaign of 1812 opened, Wellington for the first time had the whip-hand, with results no less ruinous for Napoleon than the Russian blunder. Professor Oman's fifth volume covering the climax of the war will be awaited with impatient interest.

GEORGE MATTHEW DUTCHER.

*Constitutional History of England since the Accession of George the Third.* By the Right Honorable Sir THOMAS ERSKINE MAY, K.C.B., D.C.L., edited and continued to 1911 by FRANCIS HOLLAND. In three volumes. (London, New York, Bombay, and Calcutta: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1912. Pp. xvi, 468; xiii, 441; xvii, 398.)

IN the title above, volumes I. and II. comprise what has been known for many years as May's *Constitutional History of England, 1760-1860*. The text, except for a few additional notes by the editor, is Lord Farnborough's last revision of his original work. Volume III. is the "continuation" by Holland, and covers the period, 1860-1911.

The appearance of a work in this form raises a question in the ethics of continuations. It will be admitted that a monastic chronicle, an annual register, or a series of law reports are capable of being continued. Can the same process be applied to an author? Now to students of historical literature, May's *Constitutional History* is not a colorless, impersonal compilation, but the work of a distinctive author; and even though its substantive value should depreciate, it will remain, probably for some generations, a pleasing monument of early-Victorian Whiggery. As such, it deserved to be left by itself. However justifiable the motives of the publishers, or of Mr. Holland, may be in presuming to put out a continuation, the result cannot be deprecated too strongly as a display of literary violence from which Lord Farnborough might have been spared. Far better would it be for Mr. Holland to have written independently, and to have offered us for the period a separate work of his own, free from the ambiguous association of a great name.

The reasons for urging a criticism on these grounds are more than formal: they are based upon the evident lack of a common purpose between Lord Farnborough and his "continuator". Lord Farnborough, eminently judicial and moderate, wrote with great care for scholars and students: Mr. Holland, with the clever touch of a journalist, almost disdaining foot-notes and citations, writes for the general reader. He thus places himself not only in striking contrast to his predecessor, but also beyond the range of serious critics.

This aside, however, his work has certain very conspicuous merits. It is not only well, but even brilliantly written: some of the single par-

agraphs devoted to subjective descriptions of recent statesmen are among the best of the kind to be found anywhere. The prevailing attitude is that of a Free-Trade Liberal Imperialist, looking somewhat askance at Gladstone, and practically ignoring Lloyd George. A rather undue amount of space is allotted to the Parliament Act of 1911; which leads us to conclude that the book was prompted by the excitement of that constitutional dispute. Certain omissions are noticeable: for instance, the lack of any adequate discussion of the recent socialist movement among the ranks of unskilled labor—or of any discussion of tendencies in legislation dealing with social reform, such as the widening scope of the London Education Authority. In a journalist, it is perhaps a pardonable error to suggest (p. 213) that the tradition of the Whigs has been unfriendly to the Church: in reality, the reverse is the case; it is the tradition of the Church that has been unfriendly to the Whigs. For the very reason that it was written for the general reader, volume III. could be used as an introduction to the study of recent English history; and in this respect, as well as for purposes of review, it ought to be very valuable.

C. E. FRYER.

*Männer und Zeiten: Aufsätze und Reden zur neueren Geschichte.*

Von ERICH MARCKS. Bände I. und II. (Leipzig: Quelle und Meyer. 1911. Pp. ix, 340; 314.)

THOSE who still talk of German historical writing in the vocabulary of Carlyle as the work of Professor Dry-as-dust, piling fact on fact without any attention to their significance, are sadly out of touch with contemporary historical work in Germany. The present-day German historian writes general history, organizes co-operative productions both narrative and bibliographical, contributes diluted history for the masses to illustrated periodicals, furnishes historical reasons for larger fleets and more colonies, and explains to statesmen and to his countrymen the real reasons for the present renaissance of eighteenth-century diplomacy. He is even beginning to furnish his books with indexes and to insist that the library where he works should have card catalogues. Not the least interesting indication of the changing character of German historical writing is the freedom and frequency with which historical essays and addresses are made into volumes and evidently find a publisher and a public ready to receive them.

Professors Lenz, Hintze, Heigel (in six volumes), Delbrück, and now Professor Marcks, are the latest entries under "Gesammelte Abhandlungen" in Dahlmann-Waitz and every entry under this caption dates since 1870. If the events of that year taught the French the value of German *Gründlichkeit*, the Germans are no less indebted to their opponents for lessons in *haute vulgarisation*.

The stout volumes of Professor Marcks are the occasional products of the last twenty-five years, republished in unchanged form—that it