

"Three heavy lots had fate, and the first lot is to marry a slave; the second, to be mother of a slave son; and the third, to obey a slave to the tomb. All these terrible lots have been laid on the woman of the Russian land." This is simple and direct, but to meet the requirements of the original metre, which in English seems unsuitable to the subject, it is thus rendered:

"Three grievous allotments had Fortune decreed:
Allotment the first, with a slave man to marry;
The second, a mother to be to his seed;
The third, until death his hard yoke to carry.
And all these allotments so grievous did life
On woman 'neath Russia's broad sky."

Perhaps we are hypercritical or have chosen badly, for there are other passages which could hardly be improved. Nevertheless, the translation, read as a whole, in spite of great excellences, leaves a very different impression from the original. And what avails verbal literalness or exactness of metre if the real truth—the impression on the feelings—which the words and the metre of the original tried to sharpen and define, is not only blunted, but changed to something other? Compare this with, for instance, Symonds's translations from Poliziano, and our meaning is obvious. Symonds knows Italy so well that, though his translations are not perfect, he has caught the indefinable spirit, and in reading them we feel that we are in Italy and not in England. And this indefinable spirit of the Russian landscape and folk seems to us to have evaporated from this daintily printed translation of Nekrasoff. Nevertheless, there is so much that is good that we would urge the anonymous translator to try his hand at Nikitin or Tolstoi, or some of the contemporary poets.

Memoirs of Arthur Hamilton, B.A., of Trinity College, Cambridge. Extracted from his Letters and Diaries, with Reminiscences of his Conversation. By his Friend Christopher Carr, of the same College. Henry Holt & Co. 1886.

NOTWITHSTANDING the matter-of-fact appearance of various details, and the attempt throughout to give an appearance of reality to Arthur Hamilton, B.A., we have a grave suspicion that he was not a real person, and that the person most like his ideal presentment is his pseudonymous biographer. The definiteness of certain dates, and the frankness with which some of Arthur's utterances are praised, are devices too transparent to prevent our seeing the author through the subject of his sketch. The object of the book is stated in the "Dedication" with all possible clearness, but it is probable that the dedication was written after the completion of the book; and as the sermon written before the text is chosen has often little connection with it—it was said of a Boston minister that if his text had the smallpox his sermon wouldn't catch it—so here there is very little connection between the object set forth in the dedication and the following pages.

The avowed object is to contribute something to a settlement of the division often existing at the English universities between the regular standards of belief and worship and the opinions of individuals. This Mr. Carr proposes to do by depicting the career of a person for whom "no one," he thinks, "can fail to have the profoundest sympathy." On the contrary, we do not imagine that the average British Philistine will have any sympathy with him whatever. He will consider him a "crank," if he has yet adopted this convenient verbal form. In Mr. Carr's book there is hardly a suggestion of the intellectual and moral difficulties which result in dissidence from the traditional standards. Arthur Hamilton is not a typical person. He is *sui generis*. He is no agnostic, and he has no liking for agnostics or their ways. There are only two or three pages in the book in which the problems of the Church take any visible form. These deal with

"grace," "the resurrection of the body," and "the Holy Spirit" in a very high and mighty fashion. Grace is influence, the resurrection of the body is the indestructibility of matter, the Holy Spirit is aspiration!

A secondary object of the book—to exhibit a character moulded by a philosophy of determinism—is as little carried out as its primary object. It does not generally appear how the deterministic view determines the man's action. Apparently his determinism is a stern-light, illuminating only his wake. It helps him to acquiescence in the event already happened. His belief in special providence is much stronger than that of the average churchman. When he is about to kill himself with prussic acid, he finds the phial that he has carried broken, and he desists from suicide.

A third object of the writer is evidently to enter a plea for reflective as opposed to *effective* character, and this object is made good. But the value of the book does not consist in this discrimination and defence. It consists in its portrayal of an exceptional character, which unites with much singularity and absurdity many admirable traits. It further consists in many charming bits of natural scenery, in many pungent sayings, and in many suggestive hints. The book, taken as a whole, is singularly formless and inconsequent, but in its desultory and excursive manner there is interest and charm. Some of its observations on moral, and educational, and social problems are remarkably provocative of meditation. The dissidence of the author from conventional moral precepts and ideals is much more characteristic than his dissidence from theological opinions, and there is a great deal of homely sense in some of his most startling phrases.

A few examples of his manner will bring this notice to a fit conclusion. Objecting to people who "always speak their mind about a thing," he writes, quoting from Arthur Hamilton: "The art of life consists in knowing exactly what to keep out of sight at any given moment, and what to produce—when to play hearts and diamonds, ugly clubs, or flat spades; and you must remember that every suit is trumps in turn." Contending that the line which you must take is not what you *feel* to be highest, but what you *recognize* to be so, he quotes: "You can't always expect to feel enthusiasm for the best; so be true not to your sensations, but your deliberate ideals. That is the highest sincerity—all the higher because it is so often called hypocrisy." His determinism nowhere expresses itself more genially than in the following words: "I often feel, when straining after happiness, just like the child who, anxious to get home, pushes against the side of the railway carriage which is carrying him so smoothly and serenely to the haven where he would be, while all he effects is a temporary disarrangement of particles."

Cent Ans de République aux États-Unis. Par M. le Duc de Noailles. Paris: Calmann Lévy; New York: F. W. Christern.

We took up this book with the feeling that an individual bearing such an exceedingly aristocratic and historical title would hardly have much enthusiasm to expend upon a great democracy, and we found this impression fully confirmed. The commentators upon the institutions of the United States may be divided into two classes, those who hold that their unquestioned material success has occurred *because* of democracy, and those who hold that it is *in spite* of democracy; while the same dividing line separates those who regard the serious defects which are manifesting themselves, and are of such

threatening import for the future, as the natural results of democracy, on the one hand, and of the fact, on the other, that the will and intelligence of the people are defeated and set at naught. Both agree, however, in attributing to the men of the Philadelphia Convention a degree of wisdom and insight amounting almost to inspiration. If the republic holds its own for another hundred years, the reputation of those men, and especially of their leaders, Washington, Hamilton, Madison, etc., will have reached a degree of resplendence such as in ancient Greece would have been expressed by deification, or in the Roman Church by canonization in the first rank. The prime object of the book before us seems to be to show that the principles on which government in the United States is ostensibly based—sovereignty of the people, equal and universal suffrage, delegation of powers, and rule of the majority—are nonsense; that, owing to natural conditions and to certain conservative traditions inherited from colonial times, and carefully enforced by the "constituents," who had little faith in people for whose reign they were preparing, water has for a time been made to run up hill, but that there are abundant signs that gravitation is again resuming its sway. Considering that the writer admits that he has never lived in or visited the country, the work is not badly done, and is very readable. Here is a characteristic sentence from the preface:

"Could he (De Tocqueville) foresee that, after a fratricidal struggle of four years, the most formidable war of modern times, the slaves, suddenly set free by a stroke of the pen and then invested with the plenitude of civil and political rights, would oppress the white race in the conquered South, so that 'America should be governed by Ethiopia'?"

On one page the Duke says that "the Old World has poured and continues to pour into the New an enormous contingent of human forces, which it has cost the latter nothing to produce;" and on another: "The judicious sense of the Anglo-Saxon race is submerged in part by the flood of German and Irish emigration, and in part by the rising tide of social and political demoralization." He adds that, notwithstanding the abundant means of subsistence, "pauperism is making frightful progress; and the claims of labor, accompanied by the same violence as in the Old World, have rendered necessary the same armed repression."

It is a compliment to the book to say that we should like to analyze each chapter in detail, but we can take only that on "The Limits of Legislative Power." In this chapter, perhaps the most forcible in the book, M. de Noailles dwells upon the danger of legislative usurpation. He points out that legislation reaches into every department of social and political life; that both the executive and the judiciary are and can be only its instruments; and, in a passage which seems as if written to describe the recent session of Congress, he says:

"And then, what a suspicious distrust in the Legislature with regard to the other depositaries of public power! Unless these resign themselves to a servile docility, the chosen of the nation imagine themselves insulted. The least impulse of opposition, the least sign of independence, irritates and wounds them; the use, even the most correct, which another organ of the Government dares to make of its least questionable right, is denounced by them to the general indignation as a violation of their privileges and an outrage of their dignity."

"In reading the discourses pronounced in the Convention at Philadelphia, the writings of the time, and the works of the most celebrated commentators, it is striking to see how much the fear of legislative encroachments preoccupied the minds of members."

The Duke quotes Madison in the *Federalist*, that "it is against the Legislature that the people, manifesting a well-grounded distrust, should exhaust the arsenal of political precautions." Not

only Madison, Hamilton, and Jay in the *Federalist*, but Kent and Story in their commentaries, developed this fear. Not only men of the school of Hamilton, John Adams, and Washington, but the most fervent apostles of popular sovereignty, the most determined partisans of the republic, held no other language. He then goes over the restrictions provided against this danger, and shows that the limitation of powers has been almost wholly neutralized by the "necessary and proper" clause. He dwells upon the President's veto and the two-thirds vote necessary to overcome it. He regards the two-chamber system as a safeguard in the same direction, and, like most foreign observers, is inclined to value the Senate very highly from its limited numbers and mode of election, not being aware that in respect of usurpation the Senate is as bad as or worse than the House. Perceiving that between two chambers without any leaders deadlocks are inevitable, he is inclined to admire the expedient of committees of conference, not being aware, again, that, of all the dangers which threaten the country, these secret committees of conference form perhaps the worst. In fact, M. de Noailles does not at all understand how strong his case is: that all expedients directed against the danger so much dreaded by the founders of the republic have failed, and that in the general Government, and in a far worse degree in the States, it has developed into a monster between which and free popular government there is a duel to the death.

What, then, is to be done? M. de Noailles remarks that the Ministers, or, as we call them, the Cabinet, do not appear in Congress, and that the theory of this is that it keeps the legislative and executive powers separate. But he says that they have frequent interviews with the standing committees, and if these parliaments on a small scale cannot change the Ministers, they have only too great means of annulling or corrupting them. Further on he says: "Despairing of improving the Legislature, which yet must be maintained, some publicists wish to introduce responsible Ministers, who would have the duty of enlightening, directing, and controlling the incapacities, the passions, and the corruptions of the body." He doubts, however, whether the result would be gained:

"Would the majority of the Representatives be contented with the legitimate control which belongs to it, and leave to the Ministers possessing its confidence the initiative necessary for governing? Or, on the other hand, would not the Cabinet be merely the passive instrument of the will of the majority, more than ever master of the executive placed in its hands? The reform would then end in grafting ministerial instability upon republican fickleness."

Here comes in the difference of fundamental view. The author regards the people as nothing, we as everything; and we cannot doubt that some way will be devised of bringing the will of the people to bear on its representatives.

Bibliographie Hellénique; ou description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés en grec par des grecs aux XVe et XVIe siècles. Par Émile Legrand. 2 vols., large 8vo. Paris: Ernest Leroux.

THIS admirable book, one of the most brilliant achievements of bibliography in modern times, can only be appreciated as it deserves by those who have had occasion to use the similar works hitherto published in Germany and in Greece. The best of the latter is the *Νεοελληνική Φιλολογία*, by Papadopoulos-Vretos, issued at Athens in 1854-57, and purporting to be a complete catalogue of the Greek books printed from 1453 to the revival of independent Greece. Now, for a space of a hundred and twenty-four years, 1467-1600, Vretos gives the titles of, or rather men-

tions, seventy-four books; M. Legrand, in the same space of time, catalogues about three hundred works. But the number of the citations is no criterion of their quality. Vretos saw but very few of the books he mentions; the titles he gives are mostly inaccurate, indeed, nothing better than arbitrary translations of the Latin titles which he found in Brunet's *Manuel du Libraire*. Moreover, being a very poor critic, Vretos often mistook one date for another, mentioned works which never existed, etc. M. Legrand's method is a quite different one. As often as he possibly could do so, he hunted up and examined with his own eyes the very rare books printed in Greece during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Any one who has devoted any time to a search of that kind, knows what labor and difficulties it involves. Not only are the titles reprinted *in extenso*, sometimes even in facsimile, but the prefaces and other introductory notices have been faithfully reproduced. Such an immense task would hardly have been achievable if M. Legrand had not benefited by the generosity of a learned Greek, Prince Mavrocordatos, who possesses one of the richest collections of Greek works in existence, and liberally put his treasures at the disposal of the French scholar. But more than that, when the manuscript was finished, no editor cared about printing it, Greek bibliography not pretending to be a very salable kind of literary matter. Prince Mavrocordatos, nothing daunted by this unexpected obstacle, charged himself with the truly enormous expense of printing the *'Bibliographie Hellénique'*, which is not only a masterpiece of bibliography, but a typographical marvel. We can only express the regret that such a book, which no student of modern literature should be deprived of, and which has completely renovated our knowledge concerning the revival of Greek scholarship in Europe, must very soon be out of print and inaccessible to many philologists, as only three hundred and twenty-five copies of it have been printed, about a hundred of which were given away and not put in sale. But we know that M. Legrand has already in store a large number of *addenda* and *corrigenda* to his great work, and we hope that a second edition will be issued on such conditions as to enable every learned Grecist to secure a copy of it.

We should give an insufficient idea of the *'Bibliographie Hellénique'* if we described it as a mere catalogue; it is a catalogue, an admirable catalogue, but it is a great deal more, and the title of the work does not do it full justice. M. Legrand has not mentioned one Greek writer without giving his biography, often accompanied by inedited documents, such as letters and various pieces, which throw new light on the abilities and exertions of the Greek refugees after the fall of Constantinople. All the ancient biographical essays on Chrysoloras, Gaza, Chalcondyles, Musurus, and many others may now be put aside as antiquated, and Boerner's *'De doctis hominibus grecis'* may share the fate of Vretos's *'Φιλολογία'*. M. Legrand knows more about the Greek scholars of the Renaissance than any of their Italian pupils ever cared to learn; his insatiable curiosity has restored life and reality to those curious representatives of Greek spirit which played so important a part in the revival of literature and scholarship. There is more accurate knowledge and useful matter in ten pages of M. Legrand's Introduction than in the two volumes which the once celebrated Villemain devoted to Lascaris. The age of fine phrases and literary novels has come to an end; M. Legrand's work, *primus inter pares*, shows how the problems of literary history must now be treated in accordance with the rules of sound criticism and the severe requirements of bibliographical accuracy.

A Record of Buddhistic Kingdoms, etc. By James Legge, M.A., LL.D., etc. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan. 1886.

WITH a considerable flourish of trumpets, Dr. Legge has brought before us his new translation of Fa-hien's travels. We hardly need remind our readers that so far back as A. D. 1836 M. Rémusat and others first issued a translation of this book, and that during many years their translation "held the field." M. Julien, in 1852, had hinted in his preface to the translation of the *'Si-yu-ki'* that Rémusat's translation was not altogether trustworthy, and this was found to be the case. Accordingly, in 1869, Mr. Beal published his *'Travels of Fa-hien'*, in which he corrected many of Rémusat's errors, and added notes to the text in elucidation of Buddhist terminology. This translation, although generally accepted as an advance on the preceding version, was severely criticised by some young students in China, who thought themselves competent for the task in virtue of their having a relay of native teachers at their side to direct them in their study of the text. Undoubtedly many of their strictures were well-grounded, and, had it not been for the animus exhibited, would have taken their right place in the advanced study of the work in question. But it was too plain that both Mr. Giles and his associate were bent on the extinction of Mr. Beal's character as a Sinologue, more than on any wish to elucidate the text of Fa-hien. And so matters rested until the publication of the *'Records of the Western World'*, one of Trübner's "Oriental Series," in 1884. In the introduction to this work, which is a translation of the *'Travels of Hsien Tsiang'*, Mr. Beal affords a revised translation of Fa-hien and Sung-yun. These translations embody the result of many years' study of Buddhist phraseology, and also of the system of Buddhist belief.

Dr. Legge now comes forward with his new version, framed on the Korean text of the Chinese original, which is undoubtedly an independent authority, and so far most useful for critical purposes. With regard to the translation itself, we can only say it has not advanced our knowledge of Buddhism. Dr. Legge is well known as a sound Chinese scholar, and therefore we will take no exception to the improvements and variations of his English version. But this is not the point. We wanted something more in elucidation of the spirit of the religion that led Fa-hien and others like him to brave the difficulties of their foreign travels, and risk their lives in prosecuting them. If the Buddhist religious system be altogether so frivolous as Dr. Legge seems to think, having no belief in "God, or the soul, or prayer, or worship," we want to know what was the exciting and supporting influence that carried these Buddhist pilgrims through their perils. Undoubtedly they believed in Buddha as a real savior. They recognized his goodness and purity, and they embraced his offers of deliverance from pain and troubles, on the conditions of discipleship and self-renunciation. There is a tone of depreciation (with the usual sentiment of pity for these "poor heathen") that disfigures Dr. Legge's book. He cannot rise to the belief that Buddhism, as a system, was preparatory to a higher and better revelation; that it cleared the way for the introduction of nobler truth; that in its place it "fulfilled itself," and would have been, if rightly understood, a vehicle for the introduction of Christianity throughout the East. Whether it may not yet be so in China and Japan, depends on the way in which the phenomenon of the Buddhist religion is treated by the thoughtful portion of Christendom. Our missionaries will have to alter their views, at any rate, before any healthy line of action in this direction can be expected.