

need to say more than that its clear intelligible outline, its accuracy and fairness, its freedom from unnecessary detail, and the manner in which recent investigations in archaeology, etc., are used to throw light upon points that puzzle beginners, render it the best short history that we have seen. A more considerable work is his "Introduction to English History,"—a series of essays in eleven chapters prefixed to Mr. Bass Mullinger's book upon the Authorities for English History. Of this work we shall only say here that no one can read it without obtaining a clearer knowledge of the changes that have gradually come over English life on all its sides. A full analysis has been prepared of it which will give our readers some notion of the value of the work. But Gardiner's rank as an historian will rest in the future upon the labour he has bestowed on a special period of English History, the reigns of James I and Charles I. The last two volumes are the first instalment of "the Fall of the Monarchy of Charles I." It is said that Professor Stubbs refused to continue his invaluable work upon the *Constitutional History of England down to the latest times*, because he felt it impossible to keep his judgment clear in writing of the events of the reign of Charles I. It is certainly a period of which it is hard to write coolly without taking sides. Mr. Green at least has failed to do so in his picturesque *Short History*. He is too manifestly a follower of Macaulay, John Forster, and others whom we may call the Reform Bill school of Historians. From such bias Professor Gardiner, in all his works, has shown himself admirably free: he is one of the best of the Scientific School, whose cause Professor Seeley advocated in an interesting, though one-sided, lecture, republished in the November *Macmillan*. Thus, Gardiner attributes to the Civil War the demoralization that followed the Restoration, and thus teaches us that the struggle which Pym began not only failed politically, but had a bad moral result. This may seem a depressing conclusion to arrive at, but taken with Professor Seeley's comment in the *Academy* will supply food for thought to students of more recent English history. He pronounces that "history is most instructive precisely when it teaches what we should never have guessed, and are least willing to believe—viz., that the best and most religious part of the nation may unite in a movement, and that the movement may end in utter failure and general demoralization." To those who are accustomed to regard Pym as the forerunner of modern Liberalism, and Strafford as the prototype of Toryism, Mr. Gardiner's presentation of facts will come like a shock. "Alone among his generation, his (Strafford's) voice was always raised for practical reforms. Pym and Hampden looked upon existing society as something admirable in itself, though needing to be quickened by a higher moral spirit, and to be relieved from the hindrances thrown in its way by a defective organization. Strafford regarded that society as full of abuses, and sought in the organization which was ready to his hand the lever by which those abuses might be removed." Thus, with our author, old friends appear with new faces—Strafford as the Liberal, and Pym as the Conservative. This may read like a paradox, but it is a refreshing change from the ordinary mode of interpreting history by the light of the struggles in the first half of our century. It will at least teach us the inapplicability of current political terms to by-gone times.