

devoted much time and thought to the study of the trials, chiefly, of course, for high treason, which are so conspicuous a feature in English history during the reigns of Charles II and James II. This has led him to the conviction that the popular opinion held by English people about Judge Jeffreys is exaggerated, and that with all his faults the devil was not quite so black after all as Macaulay painted him. His book is not, therefore, in any real sense of the word an attempt, to whitewash Jeffreys, and does not attempt to conceal his harshness, brutality, subserviency, and injustice. It is an attempt to correct exaggerations, not to rehabilitate a lost character, and belongs really to the growing literature of 'corrections of Macaulay' rather than to that of independent historical biography. Looked at from this point of view it is certainly worth reading. C.

Mr. Henry Harrison's *Place Names of the Liverpool District* (London, Elliot Stock, 1898) is an excellent little piece of work of a kind unfortunately not too common. The historian cannot afford to disregard the gleanings that may be gathered from place-names, but for lack of local knowledge he is often left without the key to unlock their meaning. If he could always turn to a monograph by one so well acquainted with the localities and so well equipped philologically as Mr. Harrison, his task would be immensely simplified; and we sincerely hope that his book may inspire others to do for their own districts what he has done for the hundreds of West Derby and Wirral. The treatment is concise, but due space is given to the much controverted Mersey and Liverpool (which, taking the old form Litherpool as original, he derives from Old Norse *hlithar-pollr*, 'the pool of the slope'), and to the alleged identification of Bromborough, in Wirral, with the Brunanburh of Athelstan's victory, which is very properly rejected. J. T.

Sir Courtenay Ilbert's work on *The Government of India* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898), although valuable to the student of history, is legal rather than historical, and must be judged by lawyers. The historical introduction, however, is a lucid outline of the constitutional history of British India. Historians of British India have usually all but ignored this aspect of their theme, and their readers have scarcely any notion of the process whereby a uniform administration of European origin came to supersede the division of authority between the native rulers, the company, and the crown. Sir Courtenay Ilbert divides the constitutional history of British India into three periods: the first from the incorporation of the East India Company in 1600 to the grant of the Diwani of Bengal, Bahar, and Orissa in 1765; the second from the grant of the Diwani to the assumption of the direct government of India by the crown in 1858; and the third from that change to our own time. The first is the purely commercial period, in which the constitution and powers of the company were defined chiefly by royal charters. The second is the period of quasi-sovereign power exercised by the company: its stages are marked by a series of statutes, occurring at intervals of twenty years from 1773 onwards. The third is the period of immediate royal authority, characterised chiefly by legislation on points of detail. The second of these periods is by far the most interesting, and occupies