

For the period subsequent to the General Election of December, 1918, the material is far more abundant, and the reader is better able to corroborate M. Goblet's exposition, because of the closer attention given by the press of the world to the various negotiations and the course of the war between England and the Irish people. M. Goblet's record of the activities of the American Commission on Irish Independence in Paris during the Peace Conference, it may be said in passing, is a better example of historical impartiality than the references to this matter in many recent books, some collaborative, and others biographical, purporting to review and justify the events of Versailles. Finally, the somber narrative of the "Liquidation of the Universal Crisis in Ireland" (1919-1921) is brought down to the early months of 1921.

Despite the author's restraint, it is not difficult to perceive the conclusion his studies have led him to formulate as to the outcome of the Irish struggle for independence. From January 21, 1919 (the date of the Appeal of the Irish National Assembly to the Nations of the World), "the British Administration no longer governs Ireland—it can do no more than prevent Ireland from governing herself. Whatever the cause of this situation, its existence is historically established. Henceforth, as a logical result, Ireland will present her case to the world as that of a nation upon which, contrary to its own wish as expressed by the exercise of the franchise, there is imposed the authority of a foreign power, contrary to the new Law of Nations" (p. 360).

C. E. MCGUIRE

WASHINGTON, D. C.

*England in Transition, 1789-1832: A Study of Movements.*

By WILLIAM LAW MATHIESON. New York, Longmans, Green and Company, 1920.—xiv, 285 pp.

This book deals with the social, spiritual and intellectual forces operative in England from the beginning of the French Revolution to the passage of the Reform Bill, certainly an interesting and suggestive period, but withal one very difficult to treat adequately. It is not clear why 1789 was selected as the starting point. 1769 would have seemed a more logical place to begin a study of political reform; if economic movements are considered, any year from 1770 to 1785 would have been preferable; if the influence of the French Revolution is to be stressed, the results were not visible until later.

English history teachers have long bewailed the fact that we have

so few satisfactory reference books on the period just after Lecky closed his meaty volumes and just before Walpole began his scholarly work. In recent months Farrer, Brown, Alington and Mathieson have done much to fill this gap, but of the four, the last has given us easily the best work for general reference. Mr. Mathieson is known to us largely by his scholarly work upon eighteenth-century Scotland, but his latest work is a welcome addition to the studies of a significant period.

The volume is a chronological treatment of the period in five chapters of equal length. For that reason, the author is compelled to treat in several different places of the struggle for educational facilities for the poor, of the reform of prison conditions etc. A topical discussion of such movements would have given greater unity and coherence. Moreover, the need for a good treatment of the years from 1815 to 1832 is not nearly so great as for the earlier part, yet curiously enough those are the very years to which Mr. Mathieson devotes half of his compact little volume. In the reviewer's opinion, the introductory chapter is not only the best chapter in the book, but the best summary of the eighteenth-century origins of the many social movements that came to fruition early in the nineteenth. These fifty pages are literally crammed with information gleaned from many fields, but nowhere else so accessible or so well digested. Chapter I, on the other hand, is the least satisfactory. It slights the many evidences of the repressive attitude of the English government during the French Revolution as shown so clearly in that excellent book, Kent's *English Radicals*, which is damned in these later days by its very title, as being more than faintly reminiscent of Bolshevism. In general, it would have been better had the first half of the book been much expanded to give the author space to dwell upon the significance of the movements which he traces.

Mr. Mathieson's book is not based upon researches in unpublished materials, but he has ranged far and wide in correspondence, memoirs, tracts, and of course in the ubiquitous *Hansard*. His touch is sure, even in the midst of detail. Three slight errors are noted: *Cook* (p. 9) should be *Cooke*; 1798 (p. 66) is a misprint for 1789; and the first Annual Indemnity Bill was passed in 1727 not in 1743. We regret, more than the errors of commission, the omission of a bibliography and the brevity of the index. In spite of all this, this work is the most satisfactory compact treatment of the social movements of the period.

WILLIAM THOMAS MORGAN

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

*Commons Debates for 1629. Critically edited and an Introduction dealing with Parliamentary Sources for the Early Stuarts.* Edited by WALLACE NOTESTEIN and FRANCES HELEN RELF. (Research Publications of the University of Minnesota, Studies in the Social Sciences, Number 10). Minneapolis, published by the University of Minnesota, 1921.—lxvii, 304 pp.

An historian should be judged not merely by the obvious test of the thoroughness of his work. He must be more than accurate. He must feel and must show the relation of his studies to the whole drama of human events that has made the present out of the past. We have a right to enquire not alone whether his work is sound, but whether it is significant. We are entitled to judge him not less by his choice of a subject than by the definiteness of his knowledge and the correctness of his conclusions.

Estimated by either of these tests this book is one of the most valuable and most welcome that has appeared in the field of English history for a long time. The editors have not only done their work well: they have had an historian's sense of what ought to be done; something only to be understood by one who grasps the importance of English constitutional history as a whole and has a first-hand knowledge of the lamentable difference between what our printed records of English parliamentary history are and what they ought to be. This is a knowledge gained only by long and intimate acquaintance with the enormous mass of the materials of English history printed and unprinted.

Everyone whose work has lain in these materials must often have asked himself whether much of the recent historical investigation in this field has not been misplaced. We have long known that the printed parliamentary records are not only defective but in many places inaccurate. Many separate studies have shown that hardly a single important enactment among the Statutes of the Realm should become the basis of definite conclusions without a recourse to its manuscript history. Maitland's brilliant paper on Elizabeth's great statutes of supremacy and uniformity—to take one instance only—stands out to show not alone what may be done in one important case, but what must be done practically in all.

For years, too, it has been common knowledge that the Rolls of Parliament should be regarded as illustrations of parliamentary activity rather than as complete records of it. The same is true of the journals of both Lords and Commons. It is equally applicable