

lapsed in a common ruin." Here is a series of facts which are of the utmost importance in guiding the student who undertakes to study the manner in which landed property was held, used and controlled in England. It is the outline of a treatise that needs to be written. Especially suggestive is the chapter on "The Joint Stock Principle in Capital," in which the question of limited liability is discussed in a most fruitful manner; the complementary chapter on "The Joint Stock Principle in Labor" is not as satisfactory.

It would perhaps be impossible for economists of the present generation to judge fairly the place which Professor Rogers will hold among nineteenth century economists. They are too greatly indebted to him for the mass of material which he has placed at their disposal, and their gratitude would incline them to undue charity when dealing with his industrial theories. One statement, however, may be made with confidence: the permanent reputation of Professor Rogers will rest on his earlier rather than on his later publications.

HENRY C. ADAMS.

*History of the English Landed Interest, its Customs, Laws and Agriculture.* By RUSSELL M. GARNIER. New York, Macmillan & Co., 1892. — xviii, 406 pp.

In this work an attempt has been made to write the history of the landed interest of England from the earliest times to the close of the Stuart period. It is in the mind of Mr. Garnier but the beginning of more extended publications, for he proposes, if encouraged, to write for the casual reader not only a second volume, bringing the above subject down to the present time, but also short, simple histories of the land laws, agriculture, gardening, *etc.* I trust that this first installment is not Mr. Garnier's conception of a short, simple history; if so, it is to be hoped for the sake of the casual reader, for whom the above work has been put together, that the others will never be written.

In the latter part of this work, from the fourteenth chapter to the close, there may be found some appreciable merits. These, however, are mainly negative. The agriculture of the Middle Ages is fairly well described; there are some good pictures of estate life — convenient *résumés* of Walter of Henley, Fitzherbert, Tusser and others, with a liberal sprinkling from Rogers' various books. But Mr. Garnier is not always accurate even here, and unfortunately we can discover no symmetrical plan of treatment, and no logical arrange-

ment whatever. The best that can be said is that the chapters contain considerable information for the curious reader who wishes some sort of knowledge of mediæval landholding and agricultural life.

The defects of the later chapters are more marked in the earlier and the merits are altogether wanting. Here at least it seems to be the case of an attempt to write a history without historical training or judgment and without any conception of historical perspective or of the laws of cause and effect. Mr. Garnier has plunged boldly, almost gaily, into a subject to treat which requires something more than an interest in current English agrarian problems. Mr. Garnier writes with the judgment of an English land-agent of the nineteenth century. He has no historical imagination; all times are alike to him, as are all authorities. Although he says that Anglo-Saxon life was "a retrograde movement towards the savage times of the aborigines" (page 95), yet in the same breath he can talk about a national Anglo-Saxon clergy and houses of worship and an Anglo-Saxon civil service and fiscal system; he can speak of bocland as evidence of the Anglo-Saxon legal acumen, and as controlled by a national statute book. He uses a strange medley of old and new authorities and seems to have no conception of their relative merits. Hume and Sharon Turner are of an equal value with Stubbs, Maitland and Ashley. There are many confused quotations, bad etymologies, misspellings and erroneous statements. All this, however, might pass for the casual reader, were the style clear and the impression left a true one. Such is not the case. The style is confused; the arrangement of matter is illogical and apparently aimless. The reader, if he has no ideas at all upon the subject, will be lost in the confusion; if he has ideas, they will become hopelessly befogged. The impressions left will be erroneous because Mr. Garnier has no adequate conception of the subject himself and cannot therefore be expected to teach others. I wonder the Messrs. Macmillan & Co. have lent their name to a book with so few merits.

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

*The Old English Manor: a Study in English Economic History.*

By CHARLES McLEAN ANDREWS. Baltimore, the Johns Hopkins Press, 1892. — 291 pp.

This is a solid and useful piece of work. Dr. Andrews has worked carefully through the Anglo-Saxon material; he has read widely, if somewhat hastily, in recent literature; he has put together