

*The Constitutional History of England Since the Accession of George the Third.* By SIR THOMAS ERSKINE MAY. Edited and continued to 1911 by FRANCIS HOLLAND. (New York & London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1912. 3 vols. Pp. 468, 441, 398).

Very welcome is the appearance of a new edition of this standard work, supplemented as it is by a third volume continuing the narrative to the year 1911. The work of May himself is so well known that no critical estimate of it is here required. First published in 1861—3, in two volumes, a third edition in three volumes was issued in 1871, which has since been repeatedly reprinted, but never before continued beyond 1860, except by a single chapter furnished to the third edition and covering the period between 1860 and 1870. In the volume which Mr. Holland has prepared, May's topical method of treatment—certainly the best method—has been continued, though, necessarily, some of the topics are different, or, where the same, receive relatively less extended treatment. Thus, in particular, the Crown receives very much briefer consideration than May had given it for the obvious reason that during the period which Holland covers the powers of this branch of the English Government have not substantially changed. The subjects to which Mr. Holland devotes separate chapters are Parliamentary Reform, Party, The Home Rule Movement, Religion and the State, Local Government After 1870, Reforms in the Civil Service, The Army, the Judicature, The Self-Governing Colonies After 1860, and The Parliament Bill of 1911. The forty pages which are given to this last subject furnish an exceptionally clear account of this important constitutional measure and of the circumstances leading up to its enactment.

In the main Mr. Holland writes in an almost disappointingly objective manner. He does at times, however, pass estimate upon the events of policies which he describes. Thus he deems absolutely impracticable an Imperial Parliament in which the colonies might be represented in proportion to their contributions to the Imperial revenue. So also he doubts the value of an Advisory Council similar to the Indian Council, armed with no binding authority. However, he welcomes the tendency of the Conferences to develop into an instrument of common Imperial action. The Parliament Act of 1911, which is recognized to be but the first step to a complete reform of the constitution of the House of Lords, would, he thinks, have been avoided had

the Unionists made proper use of their tenure of office, or taken warning by the reverse of 1906, and have not, by their tactics, forced the moderate Liberals into an alliance with the extremists. The future is to Mr. Holland not free from constitutional dangers:—"the constitution is now at the disposal of a vast and mobile electorate, to whom tradition and history mean very little. To this electorate, as to all the successive depositories of power, the flatteries of ambitious men are addressed. A modern theory, resting on no historic basis, seeks to show that the main function of the House of Lords has always been to give effect to the permanent and considered will of the people, whereas in fact it is as a check to democracy that a second chamber is really useful, and was always justified as such in former times not only by Tories but by Whigs."

*The International Law and Custom of Ancient Greece and Rome.*

By COLEMAN PHILLIPSON, M. A., LL. D. (New York: Macmillan & Co., 1911. Vol. I, pp. xxii, 419. Vol. II, pp. xvi, 421.)

No more striking illustration of the fact that the present generation is rewriting the history of the past, especially of the remote past, could be found than in this latest contribution to the history of international law. When Kent, in his *Commentary on International Law*, states that even the most civilized states among the ancients seem to have had had no conception of the moral obligations of humanity and justice between nations, and when Wheaton, in his *History of the Law of Nations*, published in 1845, tells us that the Greeks considered they had no obligations towards other states apart from those regulated by an express compact, and that states not parties to the compact were in the position of outlaws,—we can only conclude that the vast array of facts presented by Mr. Phillipson were entirely unknown to them.

The distinctive feature of international law among the Greeks is that it was based upon the peculiar city-state system of the Hellenic world. The city-state was an organized community, dwelling usually within a walled town, and enjoying independence and autonomy. The citizen of these city-states owed a double allegiance, an allegiance first to his city, and then to the wider Hellenic circle. The latter allegiance, which was founded upon a common race and a common religion, undoubtedly tended to promote friendly relations between the various cities, but as these cities constituted independent states possessing