

## *Reviews of Books*

*A Guide to Diplomatic Practice* (Contributions to International Law and Diplomacy). By the Right Hon. Sir ERNEST SATOW, G.C.M.G., &c. 2 vols. (London : Longmans, 1917.)

THE principle on which Sir Ernest Satow has arranged his highly opportune, as well as in many respects remarkably interesting, survey seems convenient and, in intention at least, simple. He has reserved for his second volume the discussion of what may be termed the materials of diplomacy, viz. treaties and other international compacts, together with the various methods of arriving at international agreements, such as congresses and conferences, good offices, mediation and arbitration ; and he has devoted his earlier volume to what (as Debidour puts it in the preface to his well-known *Histoire Diplomatique de l'Europe*) concerns 'the form rather than the substance of international politics', and, more especially, the attributes and the immunities of diplomatic agents. But, perhaps unavoidably, it has not proved possible to make an absolutely logical distribution of contents between the two volumes ; and such delicate matters as *ultimatum* and *casus foederis* have had to find refuge under the heading of 'Latin and French Phrases' ; while repetition and here and there apparent self-contradiction could hardly be altogether escaped.

Perhaps the least satisfactory pages of the book are those which form its actual opening. The danger which lurks in definitions is proverbial ; and, unlike the late Montague Bernard, who in the middle of his attractive course *On Subjects connected with Diplomacy* proffered two definitions of the term, as harmless as they were vague, Sir Ernest Satow enters the field with one of which the first line is assuredly redundant : 'Diplomacy is the application of intelligence and tact to the conduct of official relations between the governments of independent states.' And when he adds, 'extending sometimes also to their relations with vassal states', he becomes, if he will pardon me, obscure. Whatever supplementary definition the author may be prepared to give of the term 'vassal state' (in a note to p. 199 of the same volume he applies it, of course correctly, to the whilom Transvaal Republic), it is clear that, from the days of the Allobrogian envoys, or from earlier days, downwards, the relations between independent and vassal states, or of sovereign and subject states, have been constantly subjected to diplomatic treatment. A further objection must be taken to the brief and rather perfunctory opening chapter, 'Diplomacy' : that it fails to do justice to an important branch of study which lies at the root of a wide growth of historical research. Diplomatic, of which Mabillon may be regarded as the founder, lies at the root of all

productive research into the genuineness of historical material, and, coupled with palaeography, forms an indispensable part of all systematic historical teaching. This science is here dismissed with the words: '*La diplomatique* is used in French for the art of deciphering ancient documents, such as charters and so forth.' Sir Ernest Satow adopts a more decided tone in reminding his readers at the outset that when we speak of a 'weak or unintelligent diplomacy', we should not be so ignorant as to blame the agents of a country who reside abroad, instead of (to venture no higher) the secretary of state or minister of foreign affairs. It might be possible to show that even the least successful of foreign ministers have on occasion had to bear the responsibility for rashness or blundering not perpetrated by themselves. Yet there is a great deal of force in Sir Ernest Satow's incidental remark (i. 172) that, from the point of view of ensuring to ministers of foreign affairs a clear idea of the policy to be pursued by them in regard to each particular foreign state, it is to be regretted that 'the earlier practice of providing an envoy proceeding to his post for the first time with general instructions has in some countries fallen into disuse'. There can be no doubt that the great advantages of rapid intercommunication between, let us say, Downing Street and other foreign offices or its own agencies abroad are appreciably counterbalanced by the danger of decisions being taken without sufficient reflexion and consultation, as well as by the consequent diminution of the invaluable sense of diplomatic responsibility.

With the subsequent chapters of his first volume the author enters at once *in medias res*. His 'Book I', which has no collective title or specified theme, lacks the more methodical arrangement of its successors; but it may have seemed desirable to group certain portions or aspects of the general subject together at the outset; and a note or two will here suffice as to details. In the chapter on 'The Minister for Foreign Affairs', which concludes with a surely inadequate paragraph on archives of state, the history of the secretaryship of state is summarized in rather confusing fashion. It would have been simpler to say that the third secretaryship (for the colonies), established in 1768 and discontinued in 1782, was revived in 1794, when colonies and war were combined in the same department, till in 1854 a separate secretaryship for war was established. (The secretaryship at war was, of course, a departmental office only.) In Germany, we read (i. 12), 'the chancellor of the empire is also head of the ministry for foreign affairs'. This statement, as such, is incorrect: the chancellor of the German empire, who has under him a minister for foreign affairs, is himself also minister-president and minister for foreign affairs in the kingdom of Prussia.

The chapters on Precedence among States and Sovereigns cover a large span of history, and their interest is very varied. In the order of precedence said to have been promulgated by Pope Julius II in 1504 there figures an 'Archduke of Austria'; does this refer to Charles or to Ferdinand, both of whom were in that year living archdukes, besides Philip *Austriacus* (who in this very year became king of Castile, and whom a year earlier his father, Maximilian I, tried to raise to the dignity of elector). But who in 1504 was called 'Grand-duke of Florence'? Cosmo first took

the title of duke of Florence in 1537, and of grand duke in 1569. We are on surer ground in the eighteenth century; but the description of George I as 'King of England' should be avoided even by Englishmen who are not Scotsmen. From the suggested list of precedence of kingdoms those which as such date from the nineteenth century and after are omitted; but their sovereigns duly appear a few pages later. The seventeenth- and eighteenth-century disputes among states as to precedence, and this subject (including the convenient usage of the *alternat*), together with that of the precedence of diplomatic agents and others at table, discussed in a later chapter, belong to the inner mysteries of diplomacy. The Holy Roman Empire cannot with technical exactitude be said to have 'come to an end, in September 1805, by the establishment of the Confederation of the Rhine'. The act of that confederation was not signed till 12 July 1806, and it was on 6 August following that the Emperor Francis declared the dissolution of the bonds between emperor and empire. To his note on the incorrect designation 'Emperor of Germany', Sir Ernest Satow might have added that it required all Bismarck's courage at Versailles early in 1871 to prevent King William I's (with whom the crown prince at first agreed) preference for it from carrying the day against the rather less incorrect 'German Emperor'. At the other end of the scale, I do not think Sir Ernest Satow quite flawless as to the use of the predicate royal highness, which is also bestowed upon grand dukes (e. g. Mecklenburg and Saxe-Weimar). And what is his authority for the qualification that the title *Durchlaucht* (of which it must be allowed that *Altesse Sérénissime* or *Serene Highness* is an awkward translation) is 'borne by sovereign princes (not of ancient descent)'? What would the houses of Schwarzburg and Waldeck, among many others, say to such a distinction? And why should we be told that the heir presumptive of the German emperor is called *Kronprinz*, as is the heir of the emperor of Austria, without any notice being taken of the crown princes of Bavaria, Saxony, and Württemberg? (By the way, Sir Ernest Satow does not refer to the long-standing dispute of precedence between the last two of those kingdoms.) Nor is it clear why 1792 is given (p. 39) as marking the close of the useless protests of the Teutonic knights against the titles of duke, and afterwards king, of Prussia. Soon after that date the order had more practical reasons for protests before its immediacy came to an end. At the close of this portion of vol. i we learn with satisfaction that no definite rule has been laid down with regard to the position of an ex-president of a republic when travelling in a foreign country.

Then follow two valuable chapters on 'The Language of Diplomatic Intercourse' and on 'Credentials and Full Powers'. The earlier of these contains some curious matter, in addition to useful definitions, especially those of different kinds of diplomatic notes (among which particular attention may be directed to the paragraph on 'identical' notes). Since Latin has ceased to be the general diplomatic language (the commercial treaty between Great Britain and France in 1713 and the treaty of peace between the emperor and empire and France in 1714 alike were still in Latin, and so was the full power to the duke of Manchester for negotiating a treaty with France, dated 23 April 1783), there has been much diver-

gence as to the language or languages employed. But finally the practice seems to have settled down to the use of French when treaties or conventions are concluded between more than two powers; 'but, if between two Powers only, then it is very usual to have two texts, one in each language, signed by the plenipotentiaries of both parties.' The question of the language to be used in ordinary written diplomatic intercourse has been even more contentious; and though the practice now generally followed is that diplomatists should address the foreign minister of the state to which they are accredited in their own language, and that he should use his own in reply, yet this usage must perforce be subject to modification in certain instances. Sir Ernest Satow makes no reference to his own experience at Tokio or Peking; but he cites Bismarck's refusal to look at notes written in Russian, though he held it not unreasonable that the foreign minister at Petersburg should (if he chose) write in Russian to diplomatists accredited to the Russian court. A more important Bismarckian reminiscence might be supplied from the Arnim days, by way of illustrating the breach, rather than the observance, of the rule that the formal communications of one government to another are usually made through the representative of the former at the capital of the latter. And wholly Bismarckian is the maxim as to dealings with sovereigns cited elsewhere in this work from the well-worn manual of Callières, who wrote before the term *diplomate* had come into existence: 'Il est plus avantageux à un habile Négociateur de négocier de vive voix.' More roundabout was Lord Palmerston's device for informing Louis-Philippe of the view taken by the British cabinet of the Spanish marriages project and of Spanish home policy in general; but in this case the reverse of an understanding was in the minister's mind.

In the section 'Latin and French Phrases and Terms', already noticed, it was perhaps hardly necessary to include *démarche*, the general use of which seems fully to cover the diplomatic, or *Quos ego* (though I think it was, at least once, employed by Bismarck). On the other hand, both *entente* and *détente* (of course, by no means correlatives) might have been worth explaining—the former perhaps better incidentally—in the section on 'Treaties of Alliance'. The discussion of the term *ultimatum*, on the other hand, is very interesting, more especially as connected with the whole subject of declaration of war, so lucidly treated some years ago by the late General Sir F. Maurice, and in its application to the events of 1914. The use of the word is not restricted to cases where the alternatives are acceptance or war, but it is at least consistent in signification, which cannot be said to be the case with the phrase *status quo*, or, as our foreign friends will persist in calling it, *statu quo*. Sir Ernest Satow's discussion of this phrase (i. 157) does not strike me as altogether clear; and at all events it must be regretted that usage should refuse to limit the use of the term to where it means *status quo ante* in contradistinction to *uti possidetis*.

Book II ('Diplomatic Agents') contains not a little that will be new to many of Sir Ernest Satow's readers. The note on '*ministère public*' (p. 173) is not quite clear to me, and I do not quite understand whether it is of the power of appointing diplomatic agents (with native princes?) that the British

governor-general of India is 'another example' (p. 178). In the chapter on 'Diplomatic Agents in General', where Sir Henry Wotton's jest has once more to do duty, it might have been worth while to touch on the change of residence on the part of an embassy or legation in cases of a change of the seat of government, as from Paris to Tours and Bordeaux in 1871. Particular interest is likely to be taken in the chapter on 'The Selection of Diplomatic Agents', which it would have been tempting to examine in detail, more especially with reference to the report of the royal commission of 1914. Sir Ernest Satow's suggested addition to that report, and his rendering of the standard observations of Schmalz (whom it is pleasant to meet with in so uncontentious a sphere), as cited by Schmelzing, are full of excellent sense; but it is imperative to express amazement at the dictum as coming from such a quarter, that 'geography, beyond elementary notions, is not of great value' for young diplomatists. The chapter '*Persona Grata*' is equally curious and instructive. But can it be a correct translation of the words 'ex eo ob quod mittitur' (p. 188), when we read that a diplomatic agent may be declined 'because of the character with which it is proposed to invest him'. A notable instance mentioned here (p. 187) is the refusal of Pope Pius IX in 1872 to receive Cardinal Hohenlohe as German ambassador—a refusal probably not solely due to the abnormal idea of allowing a cardinal to represent a foreign state at the Vatican, whence (we learn on p. 229) cardinals are never sent forth as nuncios. On the other hand, there is no reason for mistrusting the assurance of the Austro-Hungarian government in 1885 that its refusal to accept Mr. Keiley as United States minister was not occasioned by the fact that his wife was a Jewess (p. 194). The instances, by the way, cited in these volumes from the annals of United States diplomacy are frequent, though as a rule much to the point. That of Mr. Henry W. Blair's resignation of his appointment as minister to China is, however, a rather startling example of a politician whose earlier public utterances and conduct had made him a person *a priori* eminently *ingrata* to the government to which he was accredited. The president, while accepting Mr. Blair's resignation, seems (if I rightly understand) to have protested against the Chinese view as to the strong language formerly used by him having proved a sufficient objection to his being received at Peking; but there was no interruption of diplomatic relations between that court and the United States.

The chapter on the 'Classification of Diplomatic Agents' will perhaps be neglected by those intelligent journalists who hold themselves at liberty to make havoc of diplomatic titulature; but it will interest, among others, students of language and its niceties. How many persons are acquainted with the derivation of ambassador (Skeat's literal translation of the doubtful Celtic *ambactos*, 'one driven about', is almost worthy of taking a place by Wotton's definition), or with the force of the epithet in *legatus natus* and in *envoy extraordinary*? Much valuable information is, in this as well as in other chapters, to be found in the notes. I confess to having been among those who believed, erroneously, that an ambassador may at any time demand access to the person of the sovereign to whom he is accredited; it appears, however, that even in this respect the

etiquette of each particular court is supreme. Sir Ernest Satow adds that it is highly doubtful whether ambassadors of the United States, who do not represent the president, but the country itself, can be said to have a 'representative character'; but, though he observes that it is not customary to issue new letters of credence on the inauguration of a new president, is it not a fact that in most cases the persons of the ministers to foreign courts are changed on such occasions? I must not dwell further on this branch of the subject, which, from the institution of permanent missions by Venice in the sixteenth century onwards, has an historical fascination about it, except by way of noting that the classification of diplomatic agents adopted at Vienna in 1815, and at Aix-la-Chapelle in 1818, has since been further enlarged by the addition of a fifth class, 'agents and consuls-general'. These seem generally, though not invariably, to have been appointed only to states not fully sovereign; and thus this came to be the official title by one of the greatest of recent representatives of British foreign policy—the late Lord Cromer.

With reference to the interesting chapter on 'Immunities of Foreign Agents', I suppose that the well-known affair of Sir Horace Rumbold, which is not mentioned here, rightly falls under violations of neutrality; while the murder of the French delegates at Rastatt (mentioned vol. ii, p. 64) is an altogether doubtful case, since the Austrian generals had declared the place no longer neutral. The personal inviolability of the foreign agent, of course, extends to his movable property, including his correspondence; but no reference to recent experiences is required in order to confirm Sir Ernest Satow's judicious doubt whether an agent's 'official correspondence through the post-office would escape examination in countries where that practice is still carried on'. Real property belonging to the agent is subject to the local civil jurisdiction, with the exception, however, it seems, of his embassy house or legation, 'if it should happen to belong to him'. We do not learn what happens in the more usual case of the legation belonging to the state whose minister resides in it. On the not uninteresting subject of marriages before diplomatic agents (and consuls), which used, I think, to be more common than they now are, more distinct information might perhaps have been obtainable. In connexion with the question of exemption from taxation, we read of a bachelor ambassador having refused to import a ball-dress for the wife of one of his secretaries, on the ground that no one could suppose him to have any use for such an article. On the very much more important issue, however, of the immunity of a foreign agent's house from the right of entry by the local authorities, and from the execution of a summary process (such as searching papers) within its limits, the authorities—even Hall—seem to speak without absolute certainty, except in the case of a government being justified in arresting the agent himself. Connected with this is the right of asylum, of which, apart from earlier cases in Europe, where it has practically ceased to be enjoyed by political refugees, advantage has been largely taken in South America. The wider claim of *Franchises du Quartier*, thanks largely to the exertions of Pope Innocent XI, has long ceased to be effectual in Rome or elsewhere. In Spain the exemption from import duties of articles for ambassadorial consumption had, in

the latter part of the seventeenth century, given rise to so much abuse that it had actually been commuted for an annual sum of 16,000 livres allowed to each ambassador by the king. On the religious privileges of diplomatic agents there is not much to be said; but it is curious that when Joseph II allowed protestants at Vienna to meet for the private exercise of their religion, he closed the chapels of the protestant embassies, but that the pope (which ?) in 1846, with better logic, informed the Russian envoy at Rome that services in Italian would not be tolerated in the chapel of his legation.

Under the sub-heading, 'Situation of a diplomatic agent accredited to a belligerent state, and found there by the other belligerent in territory under the military control of the latter', reference is made to the case of the Comte de Broglie, whom, after his invasion of Saxony in 1756, Frederick II found at Dresden in attendance on the queen of Poland, and to that of the nuncio, who, with the American and other ministers, remained at Paris after the beginning of the siege in 1870. Bismarck asserted that they had no right to be there, and that their correspondence must unavoidably be subject to the military control of the besieger; and the United States government, whose minister at Paris had taken under his protection the subjects of the North German Confederation there and had consequently been allowed to dispatch and receive closed mail-bags once a week via London and Versailles, notwithstanding which permits in these had been occasionally delayed, seems, after much quibbling, to have tacitly allowed the German contention. Sir Ernest Satow aptly cites a precedent, showing that Canning's view on this point in 1823 practically agreed with Bismarck's in 1870.

The chapters on 'The Diplomatic Body' bring the reader into the very midst of those questions of precedence and titulature in which, in accordance with human nature, that body itself has always taken special delight. But I must not enter here into subtleties like that of 'giving the hand' or into refinements like that of the use of the term 'Excellency', which Sir Ernest Satow has the hardihood of suggesting it to be 'good policy' to accord even to officials not strictly entitled to it—the same good counsel, no doubt, applying to their ladies likewise. The section on presents of money happily deals with a practice that has become obsolete: the literally golden days of Gentz and the state chancery at Vienna have gone for ever.

Vol. i closes with a chapter of exceptional significance, entitled 'Termination of a Mission'. Sir Ernest Satow reminds us that, by English rules, the head of a mission is appointed for five years only. But this particular rule, again, beyond all doubt sound in itself, is emphatically one more honoured in the breach than in the observance. One of the reasons for the termination of a mission is here stated to be a change in the rank of a diplomatic agent—even when a *chargé d'affaires en titre* is appointed minister resident. On the other hand, it is satisfactory to find that on the death of a diplomatic agent it is neither necessary nor desirable to admit the intervention of a colleague of the deceased, even if he be the representative of an allied power. Sir Ernest Satow, as has been seen, states elsewhere that it is not

usual to issue new letters of credence on the inauguration of a new president: in 1878 Bismarck refused to consider this necessary when Grévy succeeded to MacMahon, and Waddington remained in office as foreign minister, to the wrath (according to Lord Newton) of Gambetta and the radicals. The instances given here of the recall of a diplomatic agent at the request of the power to which he is accredited, and those of the refusal of such a request, are alike suggestive; and if the latter are taken mainly from the diplomatic history of the New World, it will not be uncharitable to seek the explanation of this fact in the greater measure of publicity obtaining there in the discussion of affairs of state. Among earlier cases, those of Throckmorton and L'Aubespine go back to the times of Queen Elizabeth. Burghley's moderation in the reproof administered by him to L'Aubespine for having been accessory to the plot against the queen's life may merit applause; it does not, however, appear that a dismissal followed. Had it taken place, there would have been no difficulty in giving the king of France the satisfaction as to his agent's offence to which Sir Ernest Satow thinks the agent's government may be held to be fairly entitled.

The second volume of this *Guide to Diplomatic Practice* is even more full of interest than the first; but it takes the historical reader over what is likely to be to him more familiar ground, a large portion of which has already been mapped out by previous writers and editors, most of whom receive due mention by Sir Ernest Satow in his useful bibliographical appendixes. I do not know why he has not given a fuller list of collections of treaties, from the standard volumes of Koch and Schoell to the useful selection recently put together by Mr. R. B. Mowat. Of course, however, Sir Ernest Satow's object is not to discuss the subject-matter of the treaties enumerated by him, but rather to analyse their schemes and methods of construction, so as to 'furnish models for the framework of such compacts' (ii. 192). Thus a certain barrenness of result was hardly to be avoided, as in the case of the peace of Westphalia itself, which, from the account given here, one would hardly guess to have had a bearing on the history of religion, and as to which this *Guide* does not even refer to Pütter's still invaluable treatise. The treaty of friendship and alliance between Bulgaria and Serbia of February 1912 is, by way of contrast, given at length. On the other hand, there is much to be learnt from this volume as to the meaning of the terms 'congress' and 'conference', between which it has surely become time for diplomatic usage to distinguish definitely. Thus those international gatherings from which it has become usual to derive the designation of a whole period of modern European history as 'the period of Congresses'—Aix-la-Chapelle, Troppau, Laibach, and Verona—are in the present work correctly described as 'so-called congresses' only; and in the case of the first named of these instances the character of a 'congress' was expressly disavowed by the four allied sovereigns who summoned the meeting, though it was also to be attended by a French plenipotentiary. To the congresses of Paris (1856) and Berlin (1878) no one would think of denying the appellation; but in the list of the chief conferences held from 1827 onwards Sir Ernest Satow thinks that there are some which might perhaps have been more appropriately termed



congresses. Among these he includes the two peace conferences of The Hague and the Algeciras conference, but not either the unfortunate Danish conference or the successful one on the Luxemburg crisis held three years afterwards.

Several terms incidentally occurring in this part of the work are carefully explained: such as *article de désintéressement*, the disclaimer by a state which is party to a treaty of a desire for any advantage for itself (including any increase of territory). And students will be grateful for the definitions of the words used to designate several kinds of international compacts—such as *declarations*, *agreements*, and *arrangements*. But here, again, there is in some instances a lack of international consensus: what in English is called an agreement is in French sometimes *arrangement* and sometimes *accord*. The use of the term 'protocol', originally 'a register into which public documents were stuck', has settled down into signifying a record of an agreement between the high contracting parties—but why 'a somewhat informal record'? Does this description, for instance, apply to Lord Clarendon's famous protocol of 1856? The word, however, is also used of the minutes of meetings of the plenipotentiaries at a congress or conference, which are more conveniently called a *procès-verbal*. (In a note to his account of the Second Geneva Conference (ii. 126) Sir Ernest Satow dwells on the importance of the functions belonging to the *rapporteurs* of parliamentary committees, familiar to French parliamentary life, and perhaps destined to have a future elsewhere.) *Compromis d'arbitrage* speaks for itself. *Modus vivendi*, as a diplomatic term, means a temporary or provisional agreement, sometimes made only by an exchange of notes. A less well known diplomatic term is *lettres reversales*, which seems ordinarily to imply the safeguarding of the previous rights and prerogatives of the one party by the other, in return for some special concession made by it.

I have no space left for dwelling on the section concerning ratification, and more especially on the reasons which may justify a state in declining to ratify a treaty to which it has been a party. But attention should be directed to the peculiar position in this matter of the United States, where the conclusion of a treaty lies with the executive, but the ratification with the senate. The distinction between 'adhesion' and 'accession' is yet another of the insufficiently settled points in diplomatic usage—on the showing (p. 281) of both Sir Ernest Satow and Professor Oppenheim.

But the least satisfactory of these variations of practice necessarily comes under notice in the course of the discussion, in the concluding pages of Sir Ernest Satow's text, of a subject of very high significance,—the functions of good offices and of mediation (for of arbitration, which mediation may at times comprehend, only a few concluding words are said here). The confusion between the two terms is the despair of students of diplomatic history; and it is small comfort to be told, by an authority like Dr. Pearce Higgins, that the difference is more theoretical than practical. In a passage which Sir Ernest Satow cites in contrast (pp. 291–2), Dr. Oppenheim tells us that 'the Power which proffers its good offices does not take part in the

negotiations which may follow'; to take such a part is mediation. To be sure, much care is needed in order to carry through this distinction in all instances, and in every stage of every such instance. This is shown, for example, in the case of President Roosevelt's 'good offices' between Russia and Japan, a more detailed account of which would no doubt repay careful study from this point of view. Sir Ernest Satow is convinced that the president well knew where to draw the line; so that Portsmouth was a direct antithesis to Nikolsburg, where Benedetti's task was, in a word, to obliterate the distinction. In December 1822, as Sir Ernest Satow reminds us in his concluding example, the French government, when rejecting the mediation with Spain proposed through Wellington, but suggesting at the same time that the British government should use its good offices by moderating counsels to Spain, illustrated the dictum of Martens that the difference between good offices and mediation is shown by the possibility of accepting the one while rejecting the other.<sup>1</sup>

A. W. WARD.

*The Work of St. Optatus, Bishop of Milevis, against the Donatists, with Appendix.* Translated into English with notes critical, explanatory, theological and historical. By the Rev. O. R. VASSALL-PHILLIPS, B.A. (London: Longmans, 1917.)

IT is an act of commendable courage to prepare and publish an English translation of a work so little read in its original language as the seven books of Optatus against the Donatists, with related documents. The paper and type are almost luxurious, and all concerned have co-operated in producing what is a most beautiful book. The translation has been tested at a number of points, and been found not only trustworthy, but on occasion even felicitous. Some errors have been noted: p. 68, for 'Anacetus' read 'Anicetus'; p. 97, for 'Theneste' read 'Theueste' (an error shared with Ziwsa, the latest editor of the original); p. 121, the *violentiam* of the original is not represented, also 'Bagaia' should be 'Bagai'; p. 201, 'Why is it that there is here no mention of water?' should be 'Is it because there is here no mention of water?'; 'twisted round' is no rendering for the doubtful *conligeres* ('gathered together'), and (p. 202) it is not justifiable to translate *oleo* by 'Sacraments'; p. 240, the plural *tractatus* is wrongly rendered as singular; p. 241, 'rudest' will hardly do for the strong *scabrosissimis* (the translator should have pointed out to the reader that the language here is suggested by the leprous skin of Naaman), nor 'inveterate' for *veternosus*, which means

<sup>1</sup> Although much care has evidently been taken with the printing of these volumes, and the spelling of older French authorities has been faithfully reproduced, it might be well for the next edition to revise the text carefully from the point of view of French accentuation. The opportunity might also be taken for removing instances of the incorrect use of the word 'replace'. 'Baron Wessenberg, *Geheimrat*' seems an insufficient titlature for a statesman of such distinction; but in any case *Legations-geheimrat* (ii. 109) is an impossible compound. 'Mons. Jaeger' (*ibid.*) does not seem to fit an Austrian chargé d'affaires in 1857. The spelling *Veniseolos* is unusual; but that of Liszt, as designating a great economist (i. 373) and not a great musician, is more out of the way.