

assigned to the former by a treaty bearing the date 6 March 1823. At this point the history of Holland under its ancient counts may be said to culminate; the evils of disputed successions are to come upon it, followed by submergence in the wide domain of the dukes of Burgundy.

GEORGE EDMUNDSON.

*Epochs of Indian History. The Muhammadans, 1001-1761 A.D.* By J. D. REES, C.I.E., Fellow of the University of Madras, &c. (London: Longmans & Co. 1894.)

It is just this sort of book that does most harm to young students. Without being flagrantly wrong in the general course of events, it is full of small inaccuracies and loose statements, and cannot fail to encourage a corresponding looseness and inaccuracy in those who seek to learn Indian history from it. Mr. Rees has apparently compiled his 'epoch' from obsolete authorities, as may be judged by his treatment of proper names, such as 'Sir Acoh' for *Shirkah*: he was doubtless thinking of the crusading form *Siracon*. It is curious how easily a writer's knowledge of his subject and his indebtedness to various sources—not necessarily authorities—may be divined from his shifting orthography. Thus we find Mr. Rees speaking of 'Mulik Shah Suljuki' in one place and 'Málik Shah the Seljuk' in another; thus, *Bussora*, *Basra*, and *Basra* ring their changes, and *Bowides* on one page becomes *Buyades* or *Bouides* on another. All this is disturbing to the youthful babu, but when similar variations occur in the dates of important events, such as the first invasion of Sind or the conquest of Spain, the confusion becomes indeed worse confounded. There is a bad map of Mohammadan Asia in the volume, but the author can scarcely have glanced at it, or he would not have described Khorasan as 'the western province of Persia,' the conquest of which, wrongly dated, was 'followed by that of Transoxiana, when, for the first time in history, the crescent waved upon the banks of the Indus.' That the crescent should have 'waved upon' the Indus at the beginning of the eighth century is itself remarkable enough, when one considers that the emblem was unknown to the armies of Islam under the caliphate; but that it should have 'waved upon' the Indus in Transoxiana is even more singular. It is clear, however, that Mr. Rees's definition of this province is peculiar, for he expressly states that Transoxiana comprised Khorasan and Ghazni. By another strange confusion he states that when Godfrey took Jerusalem the kingdom of Roum was cut off from Syria, which is much as if he said that the taking of Constantinople cut off Servia from Austria. Syria was overrun, and Damascus and Jerusalem taken, according to Mr. Rees, by the caliph Abu-Bekr, whereas, in fact, that good man was then dead. The accession of Harun-er-Rashid is here placed at 781, instead of 786; the death of Alptigin at 975, instead of 963; Mahmud's separate invasions of India are reckoned at seventeen in one place and thirteen in another, and several of his successors' names and dates are wrong. A Muslim would shiver at such a profane blunder as 'Abul-Rashid;' and the orientalist may well take time to discover that 'Shiruijad' means *Shirzad*. Probably Mr. Rees has been badly served by his printers, but it is too much

to ascribe all the following to misprints: *Nur* (for *Nūh*, repeatedly); *Jāund* (*Jand*); *Tōghral* and *Tógral* (where the *o* or *u* is short); *Kuru Malik* in half a dozen head-lines, but *Kushri* in the text (for *Khusrū Malik*); *Prithur Raja* (for *Prithwi*); *Ghamo-ud-din* (for *Shams-ed-din*); *Anron* (for '*Amr*'), *Mangon* (for *Mangū*), *Zalfikar* (for *Zū-l-Fikār*), *Madhi* (for *Mahdi*), *Gomelli* (for *Gemelli Careri*), *Nadir Shah* (for *Nādīr Shāh*), *Chauth* and *chout*, *Seif-ud-Tui*, *Syed-bin-Abu-ul-cas*, &c. The avenger of the Afghan tragedy is even spelt Pollok. 'The spelling of proper names,' we learn from a prefixed note, 'is according to the system authorised by the government of India;' but it may be doubted whether Sir William Hunter will endorse this statement or be particularly gratified at the prominence given to his name in a book of so slipshod a character, which is also as mere literature curiously inept.

STANLEY LANE-POOLE.

*Geschichte der Normannen in Unteritalien und Sicilien bis zum Aussterben des normannischen Könighauses.* Von Dr. LOTHAR VON HEINEMANN, Privatdocent an der Universität Halle. Erster Band. (Leipzig: Pypffer. 1894.)

THE Norman conquest of Naples and Sicily is a neglected subject, though every historian of the empire or the papacy is obliged to touch it incidentally. Dr. Heinemann limits himself a little too strictly to Italian affairs, and his narrative suffers from the almost complete omission of any account of the Normans before their arrival in Italy. He begins with a general account of South Italy in the ninth and tenth centuries, and then describes successively the earliest Norman settlements, the conquest of Apulia, the quarrel with the papacy followed by alliance with it, the conquest of Sicily, the policy of Gregory VII, and the invasion of the Eastern Empire by Robert Guiscard. He brings down the present volume to Guiscard's death in 1085, and leaves for another the general results of the Norman Conquest and the continuation of the history to the invasion of Heinrich VI. Dr. Heinemann has worked for himself amongst the original writings, and given us a solid and serviceable piece of work.

H. M. GWATKIN.

*Über die Leges Anglorum saeculo XII. incunte Londoniis collectae.* Von F. LIEBERMANN. (Halle: Max Niemeyer. 1894.)

DR. LIEBERMANN here brings to justice a scoundrel who, if all that is said against him be true, deserves to hang on the same gallows with the false Ingulf and the author of the 'Mirror for Justices.' He is one of the great falsifiers of English history. His works have done much harm in the past. One by one they have been condemned, for his is the letter of Pope Eleutherius to King Lucius, his are the interpolations which deface some copies of the Conqueror's laws and the 'Leges Edwardi Confessoris.' What remained for Dr. Liebermann to do was, not to prove that these things are forgeries, but to prove that they all came from one and the same hand and to assign to their forger motives and a date. In brief, the story that he has to tell is this. Early in the thirteenth century some one compiled a