

scheme of the reformed pronunciation of Latin, has presented a report which is printed in the *Academy* of March 6. They announce that they "have come to the conclusion that the classical pronunciation of Latin has now been sufficiently ascertained for the purpose of drawing up a scheme which may be reasonably regarded as permanent." They then proceed to give well-put directions, which, however, it is not worth while to reprint, as the method is in all its essentials familiar to our readers, being the same which has long been advocated by the *Nation* and in vogue for many years in America. The subject of quantity is treated very gingerly: "The short and long vowels in Latin differed [differ?] in duration as the first and second in 'aha,' 'steady.'" Again: "Every vowel has a quantity of its own, and the English practice of pronouncing all vowels in position before two consonants as if they were naturally short, is erroneous. The Romans said *sæta*, but *ræctus*, *tæctus*; *indoctus*, but *insula*, *insultus*." This is all very well as far as it goes. But this matter of quantity enters into the earliest instruction; of a boy who is not made to hear and to feel from the start that the Latin for "light" is *læuis*, and the Latin for "smooth" is *læuis*—of that boy it is safe to say that he will never be able to read Latin well. The average English schoolmaster, who probably has never heard of the present interesting German studies in 'Hidden Quantities,' may well lift up both hands and ask the practical question, "What am I to teach my boys? *æctus* or *actus*? *emptus* or *emptus*?" On this point the Committee might at least have laid down the familiar law that all vowels are long before *ns* or *nf*, and possibly have given a useful list of such words as have the vowel quantities before two consonants made out with perfect certainty.

—It would have been interesting to American readers if the Committee had said a word or two about the method of pronunciation now practised in England. But this obviously lay outside their province. A droll hint about present usage, however, is given: "*mensa*, *quinquevir*, *amatur*, *puer*, all have their finals pronounced alike." That the best English scholars have long since thrown over the English mispronunciation is no doubt true. An eminent American was taken some years ago by Professor Munro, the editor of 'Lucretius,' to dine in hall. It fell to Mr. Munro to say the Latin grace, which he did with the Latin pronunciation. Shortly after, when talk was lively, Mr. Munro quoted a passage from Livy with the English pronunciation, at which there was a roar of laughter. "Oh," said Mr. Munro, "I always use that method of pronunciation which I think will be most acceptable and most intelligible."

—Many a time have scholars wished that they had found a Stoic's library rather than an Epicurean's in Herculaneum. Then we should doubtless have been richer by some of those capital quotations with which the Stoics spiced their writings, whereas the Epicureans were too well content with their own gardens to rob the flowerbeds of the poets. Still, philosophers and palæographers find the Herculaneum rolls a fascinating study, and every now and then Gomperz brings out some of his wonderful restorations; every now and then some historian of philosophy works some scrap of the Herculaneum papyri into the Epicurean system. To this fascination we owe a handsome volume issued from the Clarendon Press, Oxford (New York: Macmillan), and entitled 'Fragmenta Herculaneensis,' edited with introduction and notes by Walter Scott, Fellow of Merton College, Oxford, and successor of the lamented Charles Badham in the chair of classics at Sydney, Australia. It consists of the Oxford copies of the Herculaneum rolls, together

with the texts of several papyri hitherto unpublished, accompanied with facsimiles. As the Oxford copies are sometimes more complete than the originals in their present state or in the published Naples facsimiles, the importance of the book is evident, and England is to be congratulated on having a son of her own to do such work, which is generally relegated to some indefatigable German. One of these rolls Mr. Scott proposes to call "On the Mode of Life of the Gods." It may be dimly gathered from the fragments that the easy-living Epicurean gods must have had a better time than a layman who should attempt to grapple with the contents of this volume. The Greek scholar, however, will find much to reward his study, and the lexicographer a number of undesirable words to add to his Liddell and Scott.

—Leopold Zunz, whose death at Berlin, at the age of nearly ninety-two years, is just announced, was one of the three famous students of rabbinical literature, all of this century, who may be said to have created what Jewish scholars often designate as the science of Judaism—meaning by that the systematic study of Judaism, not as found in the Bible, but as gradually developed by the rabbis, in Sanhedrim, school, and synagogue, from Syrian and Roman times down to our own. The two other scholars were S. J. Rapoport (1790–1867) and Abraham Geiger (1810–1874), both rabbis themselves. Zunz, who was born at Detmold, August 10, 1794, officiated for a few years as synagogue-lecturer at Berlin and Prague, and was also active as teacher and editor of a liberal political journal, but spent most of his long life in purely literary labors. All three were born critics; their knowledge was equally vast and their literary zeal equally ardent. Rapoport, who wrote only in Hebrew, was the most original and ingenious, Geiger the most brilliant, Zunz the most scrupulously painstaking and accurate. Rapoport labored with love for his subject, which he would clarify and preserve; Geiger with the ambitious impetuosity of a radical reformer; Zunz with the coolness of an inquirer bent solely on establishing historical truth. All of Zunz's writings have a permanent value, but his 'Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden' (Berlin, 1832), which is also important to Bible scholars, is monumental. His other chief publications are 'Die synagogale Poesie des Mittelalters' (1855), and 'Literaturgeschichte der synagogalen Poesie' (1865). He also edited a translation of the Bible, in which Arnheim, Fürst, and Sachs were his collaborators. A German coreligionist justly remarks of Zunz: "He leads the student through the mazes and intricacies of a widely scattered literature, with unsurpassed perseverance, with unswerving directness of purpose, with the accuracy of a powerful intuition; and he uses an elegance of diction which may be termed classical, and by which he invests even didactic and abstruse matters with the attractions of poetry."

MAINE'S POPULAR GOVERNMENT.—I.

Popular Government: Four Essays. By Sir Henry Sumner Maine. London: John Murray; New York: Henry Holt & Co. 1885.

SIR JOHN LUBBOCK, Mr. Ruskin, Mr. Swinburne, and others have given the world lists of good books—that is, books which ought to be read. As yet no one has produced a list of books which in fact have been read—of the works, that is to say, which, whatever their intrinsic merit, have as a matter of fact greatly influenced opinion. A book of influence may be a good book, a bad book, or a work which has gained a permanent place in the ranks of literature, or an ephemeral production of which the very name has long been forgotten. Its special characteristic, its *differen-*

tia, as logicians would say, is its having in fact turned the current or directed the tendency of men's thoughts. Locke's 'Civil Government,' Montesquieu's 'Esprit des Lois,' Godwin's 'Political Justice,' Sieyès's celebrated political pamphlets, Burke's 'Letters on a Regicide Peace,' Paley's 'Evidences of Christianity,' Malthus's 'Treatise on Population,' Goethe's 'Sorrows of Werther,' are writings which certainly have very little in common and are of the most unequal desert. One quality, however, and one only, places them in the same class: they are all books which have told on the feelings or on the intellectual convictions of mankind; they were in their day—as one or two of them are still—works of influence; they are each and all open to much criticism, but they each and all of them hit their mark; they each told upon the generation to whom they were addressed. The writer of a book of influence may have served or sometimes have disserved the world; he may often have done more harm than good; but he can always boast that mankind, whether made better or made worse, were at any rate made somewhat different by his labors. He at least never committed the deadly sin of hiding his talent in a napkin; he has somehow or other made such light as he had in him to give, visible to all the world.

It is easier in some respects to discern the writers of influence among the authors of a past generation than among the men of our own time. Yet a little consideration will show us that in our own day, as at all times, there have been authors both of great merit and of very slender acquirements who have exerted that mysterious, that almost personal power of influence, while there have been others who, sometimes owing to their defects and sometimes owing to their merits, have never been able to impress their ideas upon the world. The writer, moreover, of influence, now as at all times, may have the power to give a more or less lasting turn to men's ideas or feelings, or may be able to do no more than stimulate for a moment certain kinds of sentiments or convictions. There is something approaching to absurdity in mentioning in the same sentence Darwin's 'Origin of Species,' Strauss's 'Leben Jesu,' and 'Uncle Tom's Cabin,' yet the three books have each of them a fair claim to be reckoned works of influence. The essential difference between them is that the first has opened a new world of speculation, and has modified the thoughts of the age; that the second is not much more than the outward sign of the stage reached in a theological controversy which has already gone on for generations, and will probably not be closed till many more generations have lived and died; and that the third, though for a time it thrilled and interested the civilized world, can do so no longer. But this immense difference in the value of the three works does not prevent them from standing together among the class of books of influence, and being separated from books which, like Buckle's 'History of Civilization,' though at one time read and admired, never really altered the course of speculation or of feeling, or which, like Macaulay's splendid historical pictures, interest and always will interest any one who cares to read the story of great deeds told in grand language, but hardly exert an appreciable power over the theories or the conduct of mankind. The point, in short, to make clear to ourselves is, that the quality of influencing others is, with writers as with men of action, a special and peculiar gift, independent of the absolute and intrinsic merit of an author's work. It were the height of injustice or of stupidity to fancy that because a writer swayed the feelings or beliefs of his generation, he was therefore only a rhetorician who knew how to play on the feeling of his time. Montesquieu produced at least one work of influence, and Montesquieu, whatever his defects, can even

now be read with instruction no less than with pleasure. But it would be, on the other hand, simple folly to confound the talent for influencing the world with the quite different gift for discovering or enunciating the truth. Rousseau's works contain some things that are true, but it would hardly be now disputed that the small amount of useful truths which he may have impressed upon his contemporaries is far more than overbalanced by the mass of noxious and plausible fallacies to which his genius gave authority. These are, moreover, if Sir Henry Maine is to be believed, still current, and enjoy the repute which ought to belong only to sterling coin.

However this may be, all readers of Maine's 'Popular Government' will, especially if, like ourselves, they have studied our author's other works, be willing to admit that the latest and certainly by no means the least effective of Rousseau's critics belongs to that body of whom Montesquieu and Rousseau are equally members—the class, namely, of authors who can produce books of influence. His 'Ancient Law' marked an era in the legal studies of Englishmen. When it appeared just a quarter of a century ago, not one barrister in a thousand knew even the rudiments of the law of Rome; not one Englishman in ten thousand had even the dimmest conception of the deep mark made by Roman jurists on European speculation in law, in politics, and in theology. The idea, indeed, that law itself was a matter of more than technical or professional interest seemed a paradox to the great majority not only of intelligent readers, but of masterly writers on social and historical subjects. Macaulay was a lawyer, and displayed in one department the genius of a jurist. But no one would gather from Macaulay's history that the development of English law was nearly as important a factor in the progress of England as was the growth of English theology or of English literature. Macaulay belonged to the generation who had not learned from Maine the speculative importance of legal ideas. Since Maine's 'Ancient Law' appeared, every thinker or historian of average intelligence has become conscious of the fact that a nation's law is the record of a nation's genius. This notion, no doubt, was no novelty to Continental theorists, but it was, when Maine first began writing, a revelation to educated Englishmen. To have opened up a new line of thought to his countrymen is no small achievement for any author, and this feat is one which Sir Henry Maine has already performed at least once in his career. Nor is it at all unlikely that his 'Popular Government' will exert as great, if not as lasting, an effect on opinion as his 'Ancient Law.'

The book has been attacked, and is certainly on some points by no means beyond criticism. But the assaults of opponents who disagree with Maine's conclusions are in themselves a tribute to the power with which he expounds his opinions; and it does not need the proof derived from the controversy which 'Popular Government' has evoked, to show that the book has already produced an immense effect on that public opinion of educated men which, in every civilized country, and especially in England, sooner or later moulds the opinion of the whole nation. The aim of the work is, we take it, to prove or suggest that democracy, or, to use Sir Henry Maine's own expression, "popular government," is merely one form, and it may be a very transitory form, of human progress. That experience gives no guarantee for the stability or the success of democratic constitutions; that the very law of progress of which they are supposed to be the result is itself a very exceptional phenomenon, peculiar to certain ages and to certain peoples; that no careful thinker can feel any certainty how long the age of progress may endure, and

that the pæans which have hailed the advent of democracy are, to say the least, premature—that this, or something like this, is the general effect of Sir Henry Maine's book, will not be disputed by any intelligent reader. That 'Popular Government,' combined, no doubt, with the circumstances of the day, has already done a great deal to impress English readers with a belief that views such as those we have attempted to summarize have in them a large amount of truth, will not be denied by any one who observes the course of English opinion. The treatise is already a book of influence.

When this fact is admitted, two inquiries at once suggest themselves to intelligent curiosity: What are the sources of the influence which Sir Henry Maine has once and again exerted over his contemporaries? What, in the next place, is likely to be the permanence of his influence? Will he take rank with authors, such as Locke and Montesquieu, whose ideas have become a lasting contribution to the thoughts of the civilized world? or will his writings ultimately sink to the level of works, such, for example (to take a very extreme instance), as Godwin's 'Political Justice,' which, after exciting great attention, has long become, not only ancient, but, what is a very different thing, out of date?

Milton and Vondel: A Curiosity of Literature.

By George Edmundson, M.A. London: Tribner & Co. 1885.

THERE is no department of literary study more attractive to a learned mind, and none more beset with pitfalls, than this of authors' plagiarisms. The answer of genius has long been familiar in its unabashed claim to "take its own wherever it finds it"; but the list of those who have profited by high-handed appropriation of others' work, is so studded with famous names that one might well advise a young author not to seek originality, but, like the greatest of his craft, to look about for somebody "good to steal from," and rear his *monumentum ere perennius* on foundations already laid. Milton has been many a time violently attacked on this score, but with little effect, since the laws of the literary republic allow the imitation and incorporation of any ancient work, whether Hebrew or classic, and do not regard a similar obligation to the Italian or even the Spanish as an offence. It has been generally held, however, that writings in one's own tongue and those of one's foreign contemporaries are unfair game for such depredation. Now, Milton has been for many years vaguely accused of such indebtedness to Vondel, the most eminent of Dutch poets, but no real examination has been made in the case, excepting a cursory essay by Mr. Gosse, until the appearance of the very curious volume under review, in consequence of which it is most likely that the Shakspeare-Baconians will hereafter have a cousinly group in the Milton-Vondelians; and certainly these last will not be without excuse for their folly.

It seems a strange coincidence that two poets, each the most gifted in his own country, should have written at nearly the same time on the same themes, and have toned their works with the same theological and political color. Vondel's "Lucifer," "John the Baptist," "Adam in Banishment," "Reflections on God and Religion," and "Samson," published between 1654 and 1664, afford this parallel with the "Paradise Lost," "Paradise Regained," and "Samson Agonistes" of Milton. The author of this inquiry into the resemblances of the two series finds Milton's obligation to be unexpectedly close and large. He first shows by a citation from a letter of Roger Williams to John Winthrop that the former introduced Milton to a knowledge of the Dutch

tongue; he then proves with needless fulness the certainty of Milton's thorough acquaintance with Dutch affairs and men, among which Vondel and his books were in the first rank; he next reconciles the apparently conflicting points in the parallel chronology of the composition of the English poems with the publication of the Dutch ones; and finally devotes the body of his little treatise to a comparison of passages, the Dutch of the citations being added in the appendix; and he shows to his own satisfaction that Milton was indebted to Vondel for character-conceptions, plot-incidents, course and order of thought, distinct images, turns of fancy and ideas, and the mode of treatment of whole passages.

It would be impossible to compress this evidence, for its weight depends on the accumulation of instances. The student of literature will find it, indeed, a curiosity; but let him read with caution. For one thing, the translations are made into Miltonic verse, both in structure and phrase, and (while we do not question the exact fidelity of the rendering) something is to be deducted on that account. Again, not only does the practice of literature allow of appropriation from the Bible, the classics, and the Romance tongues, even to the extent of literal translation, but, apart from such direct borrowing, there is a large stock of imagery, sentiment, and rhetoric which is common property. If Milton had never read Vondel, yet in telling the same story about the same persons, in the same places, and drawing upon the same Biblical source for hell, heaven, Eden, the purposes of God, the manners, nature, and offices of the angels, and the biography of Adam and Eve, he would naturally have fallen into parallelisms; and from these, as, for example, that a standard is unfurled, a sword drawn, a messenger despatched, etc., nothing is to be argued as to plagiarism. So, too, from the mere use of such images as a ship under sail, an evening sun, towers of diamond, or others equally open to both authors, nothing is to be inferred to the detriment of either, though the special position of them in the text may sometimes prove a connection. But when every allowance has been made for what may have been derived from common sources, and under the most liberal construction of the rights of plagiary, the student will find it hard to resist the conclusion not only that Milton had read and pondered Vondel, but that his own work was fed from that source in a true sense. Taken by itself, a resemblance like the following unusual simile for the movement of the angelic host is slight:

"It quickly grew, and like a half-moon waxed,
Sharpening its points, and closed on us two horns." (Vondel.)

"The angelic squadron bright
Turned fiery red, sharpening in mooned horns
Their phalanx, and began to hem him round." (Milton.)

Or such a rhetorical point as this:

"John's shades and deserts, cell and prison shall
Change into light and paradise." (Vondel.)
"Eden raised in the waste wilderness." (Milton.)

Or even such an extraordinary circumstance as the change of Satan into the dragon form. But when there is a large number of these similarities, as here, one suspects that Milton's mind absorbed Vondel as intimately as it did Pindar. The evidence is perhaps most strong in the most unlooked for quarter, in the "Samson." Vondel's play is modelled exactly as Milton's in classical form; the time is the same; the details of the scene-setting are similar; the conduct of the story and striking passages of the thought and feeling are practically so closely related as to make the thesis of Milton's independence ridiculous. In the matter of phrasing take but one extract:

"The angel of my birth descending,
My dropping courage once more stayed." (Vondel.)
"Send thee the angel of thy birth to stand
Fast by thy side." (Milton.)