

brought at once to close quarters with his task, and shut up alone with his glossary to make the best of it. Mr. Earle's preface, if less bracing, was a pleasanter way of approach to the study. But those students are not to be pitied who come first to the later edition, and there are riches waiting for them—some years ahead—in Mr. Plummer's commentary.

The new glossary will not easily be found wanting. It is not overloaded with linguistic apparatus and etymologies, which were not much wanted: a great deal of work has been put very compactly here. The explanations, though short, really explain. It must be remembered what the 'Chronicles' are made of, that they contain English of King Alfred's time, and of Henry II's, and a good deal of poetry in addition to the plain prose history, before this part of the editor's work can be rightly appreciated.

W. P. KER.

*The Byzantine Empire.* By C. W. C. OMAN, M.A. (London: Fisher Unwin. 1892.)

THE mere fact that it occurred to the organisers of the popular series entitled the 'Story of the Nations' to include a volume on the 'Byzantine Empire' is one of some recent signs that the endeavours of Finlay, Mr. Freeman, and Mr. Tozer to give the Eastern Rome its due place in history, have not been altogether in vain. That the Eastern Empire should appear among the Nations at all is much; and perhaps we ought not to grumble that only one volume has been assigned to it; but it may be questioned whether it was wise to press more than eleven centuries, charged full of important events, into a compass of 350 pages. Mr. Oman, however, has been successful in producing a fresh and readable abridgement of a long period of history, yet without omitting any important facts. This feat, however, only makes one regret the more that he was not set the easier task of treating the same subject in twice as many pages. His skill is shown especially in dealing with the empires, kingdoms, principalities, duchies, and all manner of lordships, which sprang up after the Latin conquest of Constantinople, and present—as any one who has glanced into Hopf's 'Griechische Geschichte' knows—a history not less complicated than that of modern Germany. The illustrations—most of them taken from Bayet's 'L'Art byzantin'—are good.

In a book of this kind, written by a scholar like Mr. Oman, there is hardly any room for criticism in detail. I notice that he calls John Chrysostom a 'fifth-century Becket.' Perhaps Chrysostom and Eudoxia rather recall John Knox and Mary. I am glad to see that Stilicho is spoken of as 'half Romanized'—with leave of Mr. Hodgkin. Mr. Oman doubts, as I did, the Procopian authorship of the 'Secret History'; but I must now own that a recent monograph by J. Haury (*Procopiana*, 1890) has put the question on a new footing. Mr. Oman shows (p. 196) that Constantine V, 'though strong and clever, was far below his father in ability.' This is doubtless a just judgment, and suggests the comparison of these two emperors to their more famous predecessors, Constantine the Great and Constantius. The two fathers inaugurated new policies, Constantine an ecclesiastical, Leo an iconoclastic; the two sons pursued those policies and showed their inferior ability by not knowing where to draw

the line. Mr. Oman entitles his thirteenth chapter 'The first Anarchy,' and we naturally expect another headed 'The second Anarchy.' I do not feel quite sure whether it is intentional or due to inadvertence, that none such occurs. The 'third anarchy' is mentioned on p. 248, but I cannot find the second. Though it is hardly fair to criticise Mr. Oman for omissions, a word might have been said about the monasteries of Athos under the reign of Nicephorus Phocas; and the unsuccessful expedition sent by that emperor to Sicily, and the exciting affair of Rametta, might have been worth a line. A line, too, might fairly have been given to the appearance of the Magyars in the ninth century. J. B. BURY.

*Studien zur Rechtsgeschichte der Gottesfrieden und Landfrieden.* Von LUDWIG HUBERTI. I. 'Die Friedensordnungen in Frankreich.' (Ansbach: Brügel. 1892.)

THE theme that Dr. Huberti has chosen for elaborate treatment is fascinating; indeed, to an historian who would write about a great movement the whole middle ages will hardly offer a more fascinating theme. It has so many and such deep roots, so many and such luxuriant branches; it is of primary importance in the history of civilisation; it becomes implicated with other great themes, and yet it preserves its unity. He who would paint the *pax et treuga Dei* has a splendid if an arduous task before him.

In this book Dr. Huberti aspires to show himself rather as an accurate draughtsman than as a colourist. He asks us not to overlook the three letters 'zur' which stand upon his title-page. His method may be briefly described; it is the commentator's method. What can be known of the earliest stages of the movement that is under review is to be found almost exclusively in documents which profess to give the canons that were made, the resolutions that were passed, and the oaths that were sworn at various councils and assemblies held in France—for France is the movement's 'domicile of origin,' and with France only is this first volume concerned—during the tenth and eleventh centuries. These documents our author prints at full length in his text. He attempts—this is not always an easy feat—to assign to each its proper date; he then carefully analyses its contents and discusses the relation which it bears to its predecessors and successors. This is the commentator's method, and regard being had to the nature of the subject matter, it may well appear to us as not only the most scientific, but also the most artistic method. It is very doubtful whether the most skilful word-painter could improve upon the language of these documents or substitute for it any that would be half so picturesque. Take, for example, these extracts from an oath exacted by Bishop Warin of Beauvais in the year 1028:—

'Villanum et villanam vel servientes aut mercatores non prendam nec denarios eorum tollam, nec redimere eos faciam, nec suum habere eis tollam, ut perdant propter verram senioris sui, nec flagellabo eos propter substantiam suam . . . Bestias villanorum non occidam nisi ad meum et meorum conductum. Villanum non praedabo nec substantiam eius tollam perfide iussione senioris sui [pro fideiussione senioris sui?] Nobiles