

Literary Associations, of similar nature to these, are as yet practically unknown, though gatherings take place now and then in commemoration of distinguished literary men, such as Shakespeare and Burns.

On August 10th, Scotland lost her Historiographer Royal, Dr. Hill Burton, best known by his *History of Scotland*, the only complete history that we have of the country. He was one of the busiest literary workmen of this century, and an historian who, if he cannot be placed in the first rank, stands high in the second. He was a critical writer, singularly free from national bias, and possessed an extensive acquaintance with his subject. The death of Edward John Trelawney on August 13th, at the age of eighty-eight, removes one of our last links with the literary era of the French Revolution. He was the intimate friend of Byron and Shelley, of whom he published *Recollections* in 1858, and *Records* twenty years later.

Professor Jowett's edition of Thucydides has appeared and has been received with something like a feeling of disappointment. As in the author's translation of the *Dialogues of Plato*, numerous inaccuracies have been discovered. Dr. Arnold, whose Thucydides is the edition most popular in England, was more at home in history, geography and archæology than in the domain of pure scholarship; and similarly the ability of Jowett's philosophical introductions, together with the interest of the translation as a piece of English, redeemed his edition of Plato in the eyes of critics. But historical criticism is not Professor Jowett's strong point. Notwithstanding all drawbacks, the new translation has been pronounced by far the best English version of Thucydides extant. It is emphatically the work of a master of English and of philosophical thought, and sets before us not, perhaps, an accurate translation of the text it proposes to make known, but the report, as it were, which one strongly marked individuality would give of what was said by another as strongly marked. A word about the original author. There are two really great Greek historians, but the difference in subject between Herodotus and Thucydides is as that between Gibbon and Clarendon. Herodotus and Gibbon take all nations within their historical ken. Thucydides and Clarendon confine themselves mostly to a single nation and a single period. Alike celebrated as portrait painters, the Greek was far ahead of the Englishman in accuracy and in the historical sense of proportion. Thucydides was the first who applied criticism to the legendary history of the past, and, while Herodotus has been justly termed the Father of History, it is Thucydides' merit to have been the forerunner of those who have tried to make history at once a critical and impartial study of events, of Lingard and Hallam, of Freeman and Stubbs.

The publication of two more volumes of J. Addington Symonds' work on the Renaissance in Italy suggests a question which is often put to students of history. We are constantly asked, "What is the Renaissance?" It is difficult to give a clear idea of the term. It is the name of a period rather than of an event, of a mental attitude which dates from the Crusades, but which was matured by the simultaneous occurrence of several important events. Among others were the discovery of the New World and the Old, which widened men's mental attitude, and the invention of printing which caused the popularisa-