

A word of praise, in conclusion, is due the author's estimates of public men. Though he sometimes needlessly repeats himself, his judgment of his characters is wonderfully well balanced, and even Townshend's behavior receives a measure of justification.

T. W. RIKER.

History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century. By G. P. GOOCH.
(London, New York, Bombay, and Calcutta: Longmans, Green,
and Company. 1913. Pp. 600.)

"THE object of this work", says the author in his preface, "is to summarize and assess the manifold achievements of historical research and production during the last hundred years, to portray the masters of the craft, to trace the development of scientific method, to measure the political, religious and racial influences that have contributed to the making of celebrated books, and to analyze their effect on the life and thought of their time. No such survey has been attempted in any language." The comment of any student of history who reads this work through is that this object has been achieved; henceforth there is such a survey. It is a contribution to literature as well as to history. Such a gallery of portraits is not often presented from the ateliers of serious scholarship. There is swift and telling characterization, life, and movement. The figures of the great historians "hold"; they are interpretative and real. The judgment upon their work is sane and either bears the marks of a conscientious study of the evidence or reviews with discriminating insight the judgments of more special and competent critics. One has but to compare such a volume as this with the compilations at present upon the reference shelves of our libraries to realize what a valuable contribution it is. Let us hope that the comparison will be possible in any library before very long.

After an introductory chapter in which is hurriedly traced the rise of modern historiography—from a sermon to a science, the volume opens with Niebuhr, "the first commanding figure in modern historiography". This is the first of a series of eight chapters tracing the development of history in Germany; through Wolf, Böckh, Otfried Müller, Eichhorn, and Savigny, the brothers Grimm, the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, Ranke, Ranke's critics and pupils, and finally the Prussian school. Then follow six more on France, six on England, one on the United States, and separate surveys of minor countries, Rome, Greece, the Ancient East, Jewish and Church History, Catholicism, and the History of Civilization. It is a comprehensive plan, and in the six hundred pages there is little waste space in carrying it out. Critical reference is made in all to some six hundred historians, of whom many receive comment in more than one place.

The book justifies the labor which the author has put upon it, and one recognizes throughout the essential qualities of scholarship. Indeed it is much the type of book which one might have looked for from

Lord Acton, impressive in scope and finished in workmanship. It is therefore not one of those where the reviewer's business is to pick out small details of oversight or technical blunders. So far as the writer knows, the best sources and best guides have been used, and used with independence and self-restraint. To be sure there are many places where no satisfactory guide exists, especially in the matter of recent biography. *Éloges* and magazine articles are often rather thin, but not less often they are the best we have. And yet the weak point of the book is just here, in the mechanism for reference. One should perhaps not look such a good gift in the foot-notes; but the fact remains that the student of history, for whom the book was obviously written, will often turn away, disappointed that he has no further guidance. While the foot-notes are well chosen and helpful, and the references uniformly bear the date of publication, the aim has been apparently to keep them at a minimum and to offer them only for the major works. One realizes how much more could have been done in this line when one turns to such a fine survey as Eduard Fueter's *Geschichte der Neueren Historiographie*, which, by the way, is hardly a rival, since it covers the whole modern period and omits contemporary history. Fueter's minor references are often hardly more than bibliographical notes. This makes them still highly valuable; all that one misses in their compression is the comment of the author. Mr. Gooch, on the other hand, generally contents himself, in such cases, with the passing comment, often characterizing works of high importance in their own field, yet not of general interest, by allusions which are useful only to the reader who knows already what they are about. Who, for instance, but a specialist in church history is likely to make much out of the statement (p. 547), that "The most sensational of recent additions to knowledge is Stein's discovery of Manichean documents in Turkestan", which is the only remark upon this matter? It may seem sufficient to an Englishman to remark (p. 400) that "the transition between the England of the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries has been lit up by the writings of Mr. and Mrs. Webb", but how much more useful it would have been to have stated in as many words the relation between the *History of Trade Unionism* and the *Industrial Democracy*. It may seem trivial to insist upon the initials of names—which are never given in the notes—and yet what thesis of the *École des Chartes* was ever passed with such careless references?

In the difficult matter of proportion every reader will be his own judge, but it seems questionable policy to analyze the volumes of a Masson one by one, giving in all over twenty pages to historians of Napoleon, and to dismiss Holland Rose with one line. Moreover, it is at the close of chapters or sections where evidently the problem of space was uppermost in the author's mind, that one comes upon the hurried references by allusion, running as high as fifteen to a paragraph. Yet the volume remains an impressive contribution to the history of historiography, and, as we said above, it seems ungracious to ask more of it.

Perhaps if it had had a perfected mechanism it would not have shown the gift of style.

J. T. SHOTWELL.

The Franco-Prussian War and its Hidden Causes. By ÉMILE OLLIVIER. Translated from the French with an introduction and notes by GEORGE BURNHAM IVES. (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company. 1912. Pp. xxxvii, 520.)

A QUERY addressed by Mr. Ives to M. Ollivier (as to the possibility of extracting from the latter's voluminous history of the Second Empire the story of the Hohenzollern candidacy for the throne of Spain and of the negotiations that immediately preceded the Franco-Prussian War) led the ex-premier to make up the book which Mr. Ives has translated. By adding notes and appendixes, drawn in part from the author's larger work, in part from other sources, the translator has made himself virtually editor. His labors have greatly increased the usefulness of the volume, for in many instances he gives us parallel and variant accounts of the same episodes, and, in the later appendixes, he reprints some important documents.

The title of the book arouses expectations that are not fulfilled. M. Ollivier reveals no causes of the Franco-Prussian War other than those that have been known for many years. For the period which the volume covers in detail—the first half of the month of July, 1870—his narrative is a primary source; but the points in which it varies from the narratives previously published are of minor consequence. The interest of the book, both to author and to reader, lies in the interpretation of the facts. M. Ollivier's theses may be stated as follows: (1) that he was not personally responsible, either by act or by omission, for the outbreak of the war; (2) that the French government was not responsible; (3) that the war was deliberately forced upon France by Bismarck; and (4) that it was an unnecessary war. The order in which these theses are here stated fairly represents their relative importance in M. Ollivier's mind, as indicated by the amount of space he has devoted to each. It seems desirable, however, to examine them in the reverse order.

It may doubtless be shown that few wars would have been fought if the nations and governments concerned had acted rationally. It is probable that the Franco-Prussian War could have been avoided if the majority of the French people had shared M. Ollivier's view that German unity was a German question, that France could not claim "revenge for Sadowa", and that a united Germany constituted no menace to French interests. It is, however, a notorious fact, which M. Ollivier corroborates, that the majority of the French people—the majority, at least, of those Frenchmen who made themselves audible—felt very differently. It is equally notorious that few Germans believed German unity attainable without a French war. Given this state of mind on either side of the Rhine, and behind it the memories of centuries of conflict, and it