

translated parts of Horace. Besides his satires, he published versions of Fontenelle's *Pluralité des Mondes* and the histories of Justin and Cornelius Nepos. He was for some time Russian ambassador at the courts of London and Paris. But more celebrated than these men was MICHAEL LOMONOSOFF (*q.v.*). He was an indefatigable writer of verse and prose, and has left odes, tragedies, didactic poetry, essays, and fragments of epics; without being a man of great genius he did much to advance the education of his country. He also made many valuable contributions to science. Basil Tatistcheff (1686-1750), a statesman of eminence, was the author of a Russian history which, although written in a confused style and hardly superior to a chronicle, is interesting as the first attempt in that field, which was afterwards so successfully cultivated by Karamzin, Solovieff, and Kostomarov. His work was not given to the world till after his death. There had been a slight sketch published before by Khilkoff, entitled the *Marrow of Russian History*. Basil Trediakovski (1703-1769) was but a poor poetaster, in spite of his many productions. He was born at Astrakhan, and we are told that Peter, passing through that city at the time of his Persian expedition, had Trediakovski pointed out to him as one of the most promising boys of the school there. Whereupon, having questioned him, the czar said, with truly prophetic insight, "A busy worker, but master of nothing." His *Telemakhida*, a poem in which he versified the *Télémaque* of Fénelon, drew upon him the derision of the wits of the time. He had frequently to endure the rough horse-play of the courtiers, for the position of a literary man at that time in Russia was not altogether a cheerful one.

From the commencement of the reign of Elizabeth Russian literature made great progress, the French furnishing models. Alexander Sumarokoff (1718-1777) wrote prose and verse in abundance—comedies, tragedies, idyls, satires, and epigrams. He is, perhaps, best entitled to remembrance for his plays, which are rhymed, and in the French style. It took the Russians some time to find out that their language was capable of the unrhymed iambic line, which is the most suitable for tragedy. His *Dmitri Samozvanets* ("Demetrius the Pretender") is certainly not without merit. Some of the pieces of Kniazhnin had great success in their time, such as *The Chatterbox*, *The Originals*, and especially *The Fatal Carriage*. He is now, however, almost forgotten. In 1756 the first theatre was opened at St Petersburg, the director being Sumarokoff. Up to this time the Russians had acted only religious plays, such as those written by Simeon Polotzki. The reign of Catherine II. (1762-96) saw the rise of a whole generation of court poets, many of whom were at best but poor writers. Everything in Russia was to be forced like plants in a hot-house; she was to have Homers, Pindars, Horaces, and Virgils. Michael Kheraskoff (1733-1807) wrote besides other poems two enormous epics—the *Rossiada* in twelve books, and *Vladimir* in eighteen; they are now but little read. Although they are tedious poems on the whole, yet we occasionally find spirited passages. Bogdanovich (1743-1803) wrote a pretty lyric piece, *Dushenka*, based upon La Fontaine, and telling the old story of the loves of Cupid and Psyche. Perhaps the elegance of the versification is the best thing to be found in it. With Ivan Khemnitzer begins the long list of fabulists; this half-Oriental form of literature, so common in countries ruled absolutely, has been very popular in Russia. Khemnitzer (1744-1784), whose name seems to imply a German origin, began by translating the fables of Gellert, but afterwards produced original specimens of this kind of literature. A writer of real national comedy appeared in Denis von Visin, probably of

German extraction, but born at Moscow (1745-1792). His best production is *Nedorosl* ("The Minor"), in which he satirizes the coarse features of Russian society, the ill-treatment of the serfs, and other matters. The colouring of the piece is truly national. He has also left some very good letters describing his travels. He saw France on the eve of the great Revolution, and has well described what he did see. Russian as he was, and accustomed to serfdom, he was yet astonished at the wretched condition of the French peasants. The great poet of the age of Catherine, the laureate of her glories, was Gabriel Derzhavin (1743-1816). He essayed many styles of composition, and was a great master of his native language. Many of his lyric pieces are full of fire. No one can deny the poet a vigorous imagination and a great power of expressing his ideas. There is something grandiose and organ-like in his high-sounding verses; unfortunately he occasionally degenerates into bombast. His versification is perfect; and he had the courage, rare at the time, to write satirically of many persons of high rank. His *Ode to God* is the best known of his poems in Western countries. We can see from some of his pieces that he was a student of Edward Young, the author of the *Night Thoughts*. Tawdry rhetoric, containing, however, occasionally fine and original thoughts, rendered this writer popular throughout Europe. Other celebrated poems of Derzhavin are the *Odes on the Death of Prince Mestcherski*, *The Nobleman*, *The Taking of Ismail*, and *The Taking of Warsaw*.

An unfortunate author of the days of Catherine was Radistcheff, who, having, in a small work, *A Journey to Moscow*, spoken too severely of the miserable condition of the serfs, was punished by banishment to Siberia, from which he was afterwards allowed to return, but not till his health had been permanently injured by his sufferings. An equally sad fate befell the spirited writer Novikoff, who, after having worked hard as a Novikoff, journalist, and done much for education in Russia, fell under the suspicion of the Government, and was imprisoned by Catherine. On her death he was released by her successor. The short reign of Paul was not favourable to literary production; the censorship of the press was extremely severe, and many foreign books were excluded from Russia. Authors and lovers of literature were liable to get into trouble, as we see by the experiences of the poet Kotzebue and pastor Seidler.

But a better state of things came with the reign of Alexander, one of the glories of whose days was NICHOLAS KARAMZIN (*q.v.*). His chief work is his *History of the Russian Empire*, but he appeared in the fourfold aspect of historian, novelist, essayist, and poet. Nor need we do more than mention the celebrated Archbishop PLATON Platon (*q.v.*). Ivan Dmitrieff (1760-1837) wrote some pleasing lyrics and epistles, but without much force. He is like some feeble British poets towards the close of last century, in whom the elegance of the diction will not atone for the feebleness of the ideas. He appears from his translations to have been well acquainted with the English poets. Ozeroff wrote a great many tragedies, which are but little read now. They are in rhyming alexandrines. His form belongs to the false classical school, but he occasionally handled native subjects with success, as in his *Dmitri Donskoi* and *Yaropolk and Oleg*. In Ivan Kriloff (1768-1844) the Russians found their most genial fabulist. His pieces abound with vigorous pictures of Russian national life, and many of his lines are standard quotations with the Russians, just as *Hudibras* is with ourselves. Long before his death Kriloff had become the most popular man in Russia. He resembled La Fontaine not only in the style of his verse but in his manner of life. He was the same careless, unpractical sort of person, and

showed the same simplicity of character. As Derzhavin was the poet of the age of Catherine, so Zhukovski (1783-1852) may be said to have been that of the age of Alexander. He is more remarkable, however, as a translator than as an original poet. With him Romanticism began in Russia. The pseudo-classical school, led by the French, was now dead throughout Europe. In 1802 he published his version of Gray's *Elegy*, which at once became a highly popular poem in Russia. Zhukovski translated many pieces from the German (Goethe, Schiller, Uhland) and English (Byron, Moore, Southey). One of his original productions, "The Poet in the Camp of the Russian Warriors," was on the lips of every one at the time of the war of the fatherland (*Otechestvennaia Voina*) in 1812. He attempted to familiarize the Russians with all the most striking specimens of foreign poetical literature. He produced versions of the episode of Nala and Damayanti from the *Mahabharata*, of Rustam and Zohrab from the *Shah-Namah*, and of a part of the *Odyssey*. In the case of these three masterpieces, however, he was obliged to work from literal translations (mostly German), as he was unacquainted with the original languages. The *Iliad* was translated during this period by Gnedich, who was familiar with Greek. He has produced a faithful and spirited version, and has naturalized the hexameter in the Russian language with much skill. Constantine Batiushkoff (1787-1855) was the author of many elegant poems, and at the outset of his career promised much, but sank into imbecility, and lived in this condition to an advanced age. Merzliakoff and Tzigonoff deserve a passing notice as the writers of songs, some of which still keep their popularity. As the poet of the age of Catherine was Derzhavin, and that of Alexander Zhukovski, so the next reign, that of Nicholas, was to have its representative poet, by the common consent of his critics the greatest whom Russia had yet seen. During his short life (1799-1837) Alexander Pushkin produced many celebrated poems, which will be found enumerated in the article devoted to him (see PUSHKIN). It may suffice to say here that he tried almost all styles of composition—the drama, lyric poetry, the novel, and many others. In Alexander Griboiedoff (1794-1829) the Russians saw the writer of one of their most clever comedies (*Gore of Uma*), which may perhaps be translated "The Misfortune of being too Clever" (lit. "Grief out of Wit"). The fate of Griboiedoff was sad; he was murdered in a riot at Teheran, where he was residing as Russian minister at the court of Persia. The poet is said to have had a presentiment of his fate and to have been unwilling to go. Pushkin, while travelling in the Caucasus, in the track of the army of Paskewitch, met the body of his friend, which was being carried to Tiflis for burial. The satirical powers of Griboiedoff come out in every line of his play; he was unquestionably a man of genius. A few words may be allowed to Ivan Kozloff (1774-1838), the author of some pretty original lyrics, and some translations from the English, among others Burns's *Cotter's Saturday Night*. He became a cripple and blind, and his misfortunes elicited some cheering and sympathetic lines from Pushkin, which will always be read with pleasure.

Since the death of Pushkin, the most eminent Russian poet is Lermontoff (1814-41); his life terminated, like that of his predecessor, in a duel. He has left us many exquisite lyrics, mostly written in a morbid and melancholy spirit. In quite a different vein is his clever imitation of a Russian bilina, "Song about the Czar Ivan Vasilievich, the Young Oprichnik, and the Bold Merchant Kalashnikoff." The poet was of Scotch extraction (Learmont), the termination being added to Russify his name. In one of his pieces he has alluded to his

Caledonian ancestors. His chief poems are "The Demon," "The Novice" ("Mtzi, a Georgian word), and "Hadji Abrek." He also wrote a novel, *A Hero of our Time*. He has faithfully reproduced in his poems the wild and varied scenery of the Caucasus and Georgia; from them he has drawn his inspiration—feeling, no doubt, that the flat grey landscapes of northern Russia offered no attractions to the poet. A genuine bard of the people, and one of their most truly national authors, was Koltzoff (1809-1842), the son of a tallow merchant of Voronezh. He has left us a few exquisite lyrics, which are to be found in all the collections of Russian poetry. He died of consumption after a protracted illness. Another poet who much resembled Koltzoff was Nikitin, born in the same town, Voronezh. His life was spent in poverty; his father was an incurable drunkard, and brought his family to the greatest distress. Nikitin, to support his relations, was obliged to keep an inn; this he was afterwards enabled to change for the more congenial occupation of a bookseller. He died in 1861. The novel in Russia has had its cultivators in Zagoskin and Lazhechnikoff, who imitated Sir Walter Scott. The most celebrated of the romances of Zagoskin was *Yuri Miloslavski*, a tale of the expulsion of the Poles from Russia in 1612. The book may even yet be read with interest; it gives a very spirited picture of the times; unfortunately, as is but too often the case with the writings of Sir Walter Scott himself, a gloss is put upon the barbarity of the manners of the period, and the persons of the novel have sentiments and modes of expressing them which could only have existed about two centuries afterwards. There is also too much of the sentimentalism which was prevalent at the time when the author wrote. Among the better known productions of Lazhechnikoff are *The Heretic* and *The Palace of Ice*. A flashy but now forgotten writer of novels was Bulgarin, author of *Ivan Vishigin*, a work which once enjoyed considerable popularity. The first Russian novelist of great and original talent was Nicholas Gogol (1809-1852). In his *Dead Souls* he satirized all classes of society, some of the portraits being wonderfully vivid; take, for example, that of Pliushkin, the miser. Being a native of Little Russia, he is very fond of introducing descriptions of its scenery and the habits of the people, especially in such stories as the *Old-fashioned Household*, or in the more powerful *Taras Bulba*. This last is a highly-wrought story, giving us a picture of the savage warfare carried on between the Cossacks and Poles. Taras is brave, but perhaps too much of a barbarian to be made interesting to Western readers. He reminds us of some of the heroes of the Cossack poet Shevchenko. Gogol was also the author of a good comedy, *The Reviser*, wherein the petty pilferings of Russian municipal authorities are satirized. In his *Memoirs of a Madman* and *Portrait*, he shows a weird and fantastic power, which proves him to have been a man of strong imagination. The same may be said of *The Cloak*, and the curious tale *Vii* ("The Demon"), where he gives us a picture of Kieff in the old days. He has very dexterously interwoven his tales with the traditions and superstitions of Little Russia. The fate of Gogol was sad; he sank into religious melancholy, and ultimately into imbecility. He made great efforts to destroy all his writings, and indeed burnt most of the second part of his *Dead Souls*; only fragments have been preserved. His *Confessions of an Author* is the production of a mind verging on insanity. He died in 1852, aged forty-two. Since his time the novel has been very much cultivated in Russia, the school culminating in Ivan Turgenieff, but it is the school of Thackeray and Dickens, not that of Balzac and George Sand. The Russians seem to affect especially the realistic

Trediakovski.

Sumarokoff.

novels of England. Among the most conspicuous of these writers was the celebrated Alexander Herzen, author of a striking romance, *Kto Vinovat?* ("Who is to Blame?"), which he published under the assumed name of Iskander. The public career of Herzen is well known. The freedom of his opinions soon embroiled him with the authorities. He was exiled to Perm, and, seizing the first opportunity which offered itself of passing the Russian frontiers, he spent the remainder of his life chiefly in France and England, and died at Geneva in 1869. His celebrated journal *Kolokol* ("The Bell") had a great circulation. A novelist of repute was Goncharoff, his two chief works being *A Common-place Story* and *Oblomoff*. Grigorovich has written *The Fisherman* and *The Emigrants*. Pisemski, another novelist of the realistic type, is the author of *The Man of St Petersburg* and *Lieski* ("The Wood Demons"). Other novelists of celebrity are Saltikoff, who writes under the name of Stchedrin, and whose *Provincial Sketches* published a few years ago made a great sensation and have been followed by *Letters to My Aunt* and other works; Dostoievski (d. 1881), author of *Poor People*, *Letters from the House of the Dead* (describing his impressions of Siberia, whither he was banished in consequence of a political offence), a powerful writer; and Ostrovski. We may also add Ryeshetnikoff, who takes his characters from the humbler classes; he died at the early age of thirty-nine. All these are disciples of the school of Dickens and Thackeray. Count A. Tolstoi, also celebrated as a dramatist, has written an historical novel entitled *Prince Severyani*. Count L. Tolstoi is author of a work of fiction describing the war of 1812, which has gained great celebrity in Russia, *Voina i Mir* ("War and Peace"). Novelists of the French school are Krestovski, Stebnitzki, and Boborikin. During 1885 a new writer of merit, Kozolenko, appeared, who describes Siberian life.

On September 4, 1883, died Ivan Turgenieff, aged sixty-four, the most eminent Russian novelist, and perhaps the only Russian man of letters universally known. His celebrity dates from his *Memoirs of a Sportsman*, in which he appears as the advocate of the Russian *muzhik* or peasant. He had witnessed in his youth many sad scenes at his own home, where his mother, a wealthy lady of the old school, treated her serfs with great cruelty. The poet devoted all his energies to procure their emancipation. This work was followed by a long array of tales, too well known to need recapitulation here, which have gained their author a European reputation, such as *Dvorianskoe Gnezdo* ("A Nest of Gentle People"), one of the most pathetic tales in any language, *Nov* ("Virgin Soil"), and others; nor can the minor tales of Turgenieff be forgotten, especially *Mumu*, a story based upon real life, for the dumb door-keeper was a serf of his mother's, and experienced her ill-treatment. His last two works were *Poetry in Prose* and *Clara Milich*.

In Belinski the Russians produced their best critic. For thirteen years (1834-1847) he was the Aristarchus of Russian literature and exercised a healthy influence. In his latter days he addressed a withering epistle to Gogol on the newly-adopted reactionary views of the latter.

Since the time of Karamzin the study of Russian history has made great strides. He was followed by Nicholas Polevoi, who wrote what he called the *History of the Russian People*, but his work was not received with much favour and has now fallen into oblivion. Polevoi was a self-educated man, the son of a Siberian merchant; besides editing a well-known Russian journal *The Telegraph*, he was also the author of many plays, among others a translation of *Hamlet*. Since his time, however, the English dramatist has been produced in a more

perfect dress by Kroneberg, Druzhinin, and others. In the year 1879 died Sergius Solovieff, whose *History of Russia* had reached its twenty-eighth volume, and fragments of the twenty-ninth were published after his death. This stupendous labour lacks something of the critical faculty, and perhaps may be described rather as a quarry of materials for future historians of Russia than an actual history. During 1885 the Russians have had to mourn the loss of Kostomarov, the writer of many valuable monographs on the history of their country, of which those on Bogdan Khmelnitzki and the False Demetrius deserve special mention. From 1847 to 1854 Kostomarov, who had become obnoxious to the Russian Government, wrote nothing, having been banished to Saratoff, and forbidden to teach or publish. But after this time his literary activity begins again, and, besides separate works, the leading Russian reviews, such as *Old and New Russia*, *The Historical Messenger*, and *The Messenger of Europe*, contain many contributions from his pen of the highest value. In 1885 also died Constantine Kavelin, the author of many valuable works on Russian law, and Kalatcheff, who published a classical edition of the old Russian codes. Ilovaiski and Gedeonoff have attempted to upset the general belief that the founders of the Russian empire were Scandinavians. Their opinions have been alluded to above (p. 87). A good history of Russia was published by Ustrialoff (1855), but his most celebrated work was his *Tzarsvovanie Petra Velikago* ("Reign of Peter the Great"); in this many important documents first saw the light, and the circumstances of the death of the unfortunate Alexis were made clear. Russian writers of history have not generally occupied themselves with any other subject than that of their own country, but an exception may be found in the writings of Granovski, such as *Abbé Suger* (1849) and *Four Historical Portraits* (1850). So also Kudriavtsov, who died in 1850, wrote on "The Fortunes of Italy, from the Fall of the Roman Empire of the West till its Reconstruction by Charlemagne." He also wrote on "The Roman Women as described by Tacitus." We may add Kareyeff, now professor at Warsaw, who has written on the condition of the French peasantry before the Revolution. Other writers on Russian history have been Pogodine, who compiled a *History of Russia till the invasion of the Mongols*, 1871, and especially Zabielin, who has written a *History of Russian Life from the most Remote Times* (1876), and the *Private Lives of the Czarinas and Cezars* (1869 and 1872). Leshkoff has written a *History of Russian Law to the 18th Century*, and Tchitcherin a *History of Provincial Institutions in Russia in the 17th Century* (1856). To these must be added the work of Zagoskin, *History of Law in the State of Muscovy* (Kazan, 1877). Prof. Michael Kovalevski, of the university of Moscow, is now publishing an excellent work on *Communal Land Tenure*, in which he investigates the remains of this custom throughout the world. Of the valuable history of Russia by Prof. Bestuzheff-Riumin (1872) one volume only has appeared; the introductory chapters giving an account of the sources and authorities of Russian history are of the highest value. It is the most critical history of Russia which has yet appeared. In 1885 Dubrovin published an excellent history of the revolt of Pugatcheff. The valuable work by Messrs Pipin and Spasovich, *History of Slavonic Literatures*, is the most complete account of the subject, and has been made more generally accessible to Western students by the German translation of Pech. The *History of Slavonic Literature* by Schafarik, published in 1826, has long been antiquated. Previous to this, a history of Russian literature by Paul Polevoi had appeared, which has gone through two editions. It is modelled upon Chambers's *Cyclopaedia of English Literature*. The account of

the Polish rebellion of 1863 by Berg, published in 1873, which gave many startling and picturesque episodes of this celebrated struggle, has now been withdrawn from circulation. It appeared originally in the pages of the Russian magazine, *Starina*.

Since the death of Lermontoff the chief Russian poet who has appeared is Nicholas Nekrasoff, who died in 1877. He has left six volumes of poetry, which in many respects remind us of the writings of Crabbe; the poet dwells mainly upon the melancholy features of Russian life. He is of that realistic school in which Russian authors so much resemble English. Another writer of poetry deserving mention is Ogariëff, for a long time the companion in exile of Herzen in England; many of his compositions appeared in the *Polar Star* of the latter, a medley of prose and verse, which contains some very important papers, including the interesting autobiographical sketches of Herzen, entitled *Blou i Dumî* ("The Past and my Thoughts"). Maikoff at one time enjoyed great popularity as a poet; he is a kind of link between the present generation and that of Pushkin, of whose elegance of versification he is somewhat of an imitator. Another poet of a past generation was Prince Viazemski, whose works are now being collected. Graceful lyrics have also been written by Mei, Fet (whose name would apparently prove Dutch extraction, Veth), Stcherbina, and, going a little farther back, Yazikoff, the friend of Pushkin, and Khomikakoff, celebrated for his Slavophile propensities. To these may be added Mdlle Zhadovskaia, who died a short time ago, Benediktoff, Podolinski, and Tutchëff. It will be seen that in Russia (as in England) lyrical poetry is almost the only form now cultivated. It is becoming more and more coloured with imitations of the *blini* and reproductions of the old Russian past, which is perhaps getting treated somewhat fantastically, as was the old Irish life in the Irish melodies of Moore. Occasionally Polonski contributes one of his exquisite lyrics to the *Viestnik Yevropi* ("European Messenger").

Excellent works on subjects connected with Slavonic philology have been published by Vostokoff, who edited the *Ostromir Codex*, mentioned above (p. 103), and Sreznevski and Bodianski, who put forth an edition of the celebrated codex used at Rheims for the coronation of the French kings. Since their deaths their work has been carried on by Prof. Grote (*Philological Investigations*), also many critical editions of Russian classics). Budilovich, now a professor at Warsaw, Potebnya of Kharkoff, and Baudoin de Courtenay, who, among other services to philology, has described the Slavonic dialect spoken by the Resanians, a tribe living in Italy, in two villages of the Julian Alps. The songs (*blini*) of the Russians have been collected by Zakrevski, Ribnikoff, Hilferding, Barsoff, and others, and their national tales by Sakharoff, Afanasieff, and Erlenvain. Kotliarevski, Tereshenko, and others have treated of their customs and superstitions, but it is to be regretted that no one as yet has made a complete study of the vexed question of Slavonic mythology. At the present time Stanislaus Mikutzki, professor at the university of Warsaw, is publishing his *Materials for a Dictionary of the Roots of the Russian and all Slavonic Dialects*, but, unfortunately, it represents a somewhat obsolete school of philology. The Early Russian Text Society continues its useful labours, and has edited many interesting monuments of the older Slavonic literature. Quite recently two valuable codices have been printed in Russia, Zographus and Marianus, interesting versions of the Gospels in Palaeoslavonic. They were edited by the learned Croat Jagić, who now occupies the chair of Sreznevski in St Petersburg. An excellent *Tolkovi Slovar Velikorusskago Yazika* ("Explanatory Dictionary of the Great Russian

Language"), by Dahl, has gone into a second edition. Alexander Hilferding published some valuable works on ethnology and philology, among others on the Polabes, an extinct Slavonic tribe who once dwelt on the banks of the Elbe. Although they have produced some good Slavonic scholars, the Russians have not exhibited many works in the field of classical or other branches of philology. Exception, however, must be made in favour of the studies of Tchubinoff in Georgian, Minayeff in the Indian, and Tzvetayeff in the old languages of Italy.

In moral and mental philosophy the Russians have produced but few authors. We meet with some good mathematicians, Ostrogradski among others, and in natural science the publications of the Society for Natural History at Moscow have attracted considerable attention.

Since the *Boris Godunoff* of Pushkin, which was the first attempt in Russia to produce a play on the Shakespearean model, many others have appeared in the same style. A fine trilogy was composed by Count A. Tolstoi on the three subjects, *The Death of Ivan the Terrible* (1866), *The Czar Feodor* (1868), and *The Czar Boris* (1869). Other plays of merit have been written by Ostrovski and Potiekhin.

Many excellent literary journals and magazines make their appearance in the country; among these may especially be mentioned the time-honoured *Viestnik Yevropi* ("Messenger of Europe"), which contains some of the most brilliant writing produced in the Russian empire. The *Istoricheski Viestnik* ("Historical Messenger") is full of curious matter, and does not confine itself merely to Russian subjects. It is edited by M. Shubinski, the author of some pleasant sketches on the manners of Russia in the old time. On the contrary *Starina* (the "Antiquary," if we may so freely translate the original name) is entirely Russian, and is a valuable repertory of documents concerning the history of the country, and memoirs, especially relating to the latter part of the 17th century. The highly interesting magazine *Drevnaia i Noviaia Rossia* did not protract its existence beyond six years, having come to an end in 1881. Many of the best Russian writers contributed to it; it contains much valuable material for the student of history. The *Russkii Arkhiv* is edited by M. Bartenieff, and has long been celebrated; some of the most important notes on Russian history of the 18th and 19th century have appeared in this journal. During the last few years extensive excavations have been made in many parts of Russia, and much has been done to throw light upon the prehistoric period of the country. A large "kurgan," called *Cherna Mogila*, or the Black Grave, was opened by Samokvasoff in the government of Tchernigoff and described in the pages of *Old and New Russia*. Explorations have been carried on on the site of Bolgari, the ancient capital of the Ugrian Bolgars on the Volga. One of the most active workers in this field was the late Count Uvaroff (d. 1884), who published a valuable monograph on the Stone Age in Russia, and many other important works.

A few words must be said on the literature of the Russian dialects, the Little and White Russian. The Little Russian is rich in *skazki* (tales) and songs. Peculiar to them is the *duma*, a narrative poem which corresponds in many particulars with the Russian *blina*. Since the commencement of the present century, when curiosity was first aroused on the subject of national poetry, the Little Russian *dumi* have been repeatedly edited, as by Maksimovich Metlinski and others. An elaborate edition (far surpassing the earlier ones) was commenced by Dragomanoff and Antonovich, but as yet only one volume and a portion of a second have made their appearance. Just as the *blini* of the Great Russians, so also these *dumi* of the Little Russians admit of classification, and they have been divided by their latest editors as follows:—(1) the songs of the *druchina*, treating of the early princes and their followers; (2) the Cossack period (*Kozachestvo*) in which the Cossacks are found in continual warfare with the

Polish *pans* and the attempts of the Jesuits to introduce the Roman Catholic religion; (3) the period of the Haidamaks, who formed the nucleus of the national party, and prolonged the struggle. The gradual break up of the military republic of these sturdy freebooters has already been described.

The foundation of the Little Russian literature (written, as opposed to the oral) was laid by Ivan Kotliarevski (1769-1838), whose travesty of part of the *Aeneid* enjoys great popularity among some of his countrymen. Others, however, object to it as tending to bring the language or dialect into ridicule. A truly national poet appeared in Taras Shevchenko, born at the village of Kirilovka in the government of Kieff, in the condition of a serf. The strange adventures of his early life he has told us in his autobiography. He did not get his freedom till some time after he had reached manhood, when he was purchased from his master by the generous efforts of the poet Zhukovski and others. Besides poetry, he occupied himself with painting with considerable success. He unfortunately became obnoxious to the Government, and was punished with exile to Siberia from 1847 to 1857. He did not long survive his return, dying in 1861, aged forty-six. No one has described with greater vigour than Shevchenko the old days of the Ukraine. In his youth he listened to the village traditions handed down by the priests, and he has faithfully reproduced them. The old times of Nalivaiko, Doroshenko, and others live over again. Like Gogol he is too fond of describing scenes of bloodshed. In the powerful poem entitled *Haidamak* we have a graphic picture of the horrors enacted by Gonta and his followers at Uman. The sketches are almost too realistic. Like Burns with the old Scottish songs, so Shevchenko has reproduced admirably the spirit of the lays of the Ukraine. All those familiar with his works will remember the charming little lyrics with which they are interspersed. The funeral of the poet was a vast public procession; a great cairn, surmounted with a cross, was raised over his remains, where he lies buried near Kanioff on the banks of the Dnieper. His grave has been styled the "Mecca of the

South Russian Revolutionists." He is the great national poet of the Southern Russians. A complete edition of his works, with interesting biographical notices—one contributed by the novelist Turgenieff—appeared at Prague in 1876. Besides the national songs, excellent collections of the South Russian folk-tales have appeared, edited by Dragomanoff, Rudchenko, and others. Many of these are still recited by the "tchumaki" or wandering pedlars. A valuable work is the *Zapiski o Yuzhnoi Rossii* ("Papers on Southern Russia"), published at St Petersburg in 1857 by Pantelimon Kulish. After he got into trouble (with Kostomarov and Shevchenko) for his political views, the late works of this author show him to have undergone a complete change. Other writers using the Little Russian language are Marko-Vovchok (that is, Madame Eugenia Markovich), and Yuri Fedkovich, who employs a dialect of Bukovina. Fedkovich, like Shevchenko, sprang from a peasant family, and served as a soldier in the Austrian army against the French during the Italian campaign. Naturally we find his poems filled with descriptions of life in the camp. Like the Croat Preradovic, he began writing poetry in the German language, till he was turned into more natural paths by some patriotic friends. A collection of songs of Bukovina was published at Kieff in 1875 by Lonachevski. At the present time Eugene Zelechowski continues his valuable *Dictionary of Little Russian*, of which about one half has appeared. This promises to be a very useful book, for up to the present time students have been obliged to rest satisfied with the scanty publications of Levchenko, Piskunoff, and Verchratzki. There is a good grammar by Osadza, a pupil of Miklosich.

In the White Russian dialect are to be found only a few songs, with the exception of portions of the Scriptures and some legal documents. A valuable dictionary was published a short time ago by Nosovich, but this is one of the most neglected of the Russian dialects, as the part in which it is spoken is one of the dreariest of the empire. Collections of White Russian songs have been published by Shein and others. For details regarding this and the other Russian dialects see SLAVS. (W. R. M.)

INDEX.

<p>Administration, 70. Ahmed Khan, 81. Alexander I., 100. Alexander III., 102. Alexander Nevski, 90. Alexis, 96. Andrew Bogoliubski, 89. Animals, 77. Anna, 98. Arakcheef, 101. Archaeology, 109. Area, 67, 72. Army, 72. Artels, 84. Austerlitz, battle of, 100. Basil, 91. Basil Shukli, 95. Batiushkoff, 107. Belinski, 108. Belini, 102, 107, 109. Birba, 81. Bogdanovich, 106. Bogoliubski, 89. Bojars, 81, 92, 95. Boris, 96. Borodino, battle of, 101. Boundaries, 67, 72. Catherine I., 98. Catherine II., 99. Charles XII., 97. Chetki-Minai, 104. Chronicles, 103. Church, 71, 81. Cities, 70. Class divisions, 82. Climate, 75. Communication, 86. Cossacks, 79.</p>	<p>Crime, 71. Crimea annexed, 100. Crimean War, 102. Cyril, 103. Daniloff, 103. Debt, 72. Derzavin, 106. Dmitri, 93, 94. Dmitrieff, 106. Dolgorukis, 93. Griboledoff, 107. Domostroi, 104. Drakula, story of, 104. Drama, 106, 109. Dami, 109. Education, 71. Elizabeth, 98. Emigration, 81. England, war with, 102. Ethnography, 78. European Russia, 72. Fauna, 77. Fedkovich, 110. Feodor I., 93. Feodor II., 95. Feodor III., 96. Fermor, 99. Field of Woodcocks, battle of, 91, 104. Finance, 72. Finland annexed, 100. Flora, 76. Forests, 76. Fortresses, 72. France, wars with, 100, 102. Frederick the Great, 99. Geography, 67, 72. Geology, 74.</p>	<p>Georgia annexed, 100. Gnedich, 107. Godunoff, 93. Gogol, 107. Golden Horde, 90. Goltzin, 97. Government, 70. Governments (provinces), 69, 71. Great Russians, 79. Griboledoff, 107. Herzen, 108. Historians, 108. History, 87-102. Ice, battle of the, 90. Igor, story of, 104. Industries, 84-86. Islands, 67. Ivan III., 91. Ivan IV. (the Terrible), 92. Jews, 79. Kamtemir, 105. Karaites, 79. Karamzin, 106. Khemnitz, 106. Kheraskoff, 106. Kniazhnin, 106. Knout, 91. Koltzoff, 107. Kostomarov, 103. Kotoshikhin, 105. Kozloff, 107. Kriloff, 106. Kriziamich, 105. Kubasoff, 105. Kutriavtsoff, 108. Külnersdorf, battle of, 99. Kurbaki, 104.</p>	<p>Ladislans, 95. Language, 110. Law codes, 96, 104. Lermontoff, 107. Lipetsk, battle of, 90. Literature, 102-110. Little Russians, 79. Lomonosoff, 106. Mallott, 109. Manufactures, 85. Mazepa, 97. Mecarius, 104. Meteorology, 76. Michael, 95. Mongolian race, 79. Mongol supremacy, 90. Mortality, 81. Napoleon's invasion, 100. National debt, 72. Navarino, battle of, 101. Navy, 72. Nekrasoff, 109. Nestor, 103. Nicholas, 101. Nihilism, 102. Nikitin (poet), 107. Nikitin (traveller), 103. Nikom, 82, 105. Nonconformists, 81. Novels, 107. Novgorod republic, 89, 91. Novikoff, 106. Ozeroff, 106. Paul, 106. Persia, war with, 101. Peter I. (the Great), 97. Peter II., 98. Peter III., 99. Philology, 109.</p>	<p>Physical features, 67, 72. Platon, 106. Plevna, siege of, 102. Poetry, recent, 109. Poland, partition of, 99. Poles, 75. Polevoi, 108. Polotski, 105. Poltava, battle of, 97. Population, 88, 81. Pososhkoff, 105. Postal service, 87. Printing, introduction of, 104. Procopovich, 105. Provinces, 69. Pskoff republic, 89, 91. Pugatcheff, 99. Pushkin, 107. Races, 68, 78. Raditscheff, 106. Railways, 87. Raskolniks, 81. Razin, 96. Religion, 71, 81. Revenue, 72. Rivers, 73. Romanoffs, 95. Romanticism, 107. Roumanian race, 86. Russian race, 78, 79. St Petersburg founded, 97. Sakhkoff, 99. Schools, 71. Scientific societies, 71. Sects, 81, 82. Serfdom, 82, 100. Shevchenko, 110.</p>	<p>Shukliks, 92, 95. Siberia, acquisition of, 93. Slavonians, 78. Soli, 75. Solovieff, 108. Sophia, regent, 96. Speranski, 101. Statistics, 69, 81. Steppe, 77. Suzdal principality, 89. Sweden, conflict with, 97. Sylvester, 104. Tales, 104. Tartars, 79. Tatistcheff, 106. Teutonic knights, 92. Tolstol, 108. Towns, 70. Trade, 86. Trediakovski, 106. Tundras, 75. Turco-Tartars, 79. Turgenieff, 108. Turkey, wars with, 97-102. Ulozhenie, 96, 104. Ustrialoff, 108. Vasilii, 91. Viazemski, 109. Village communities, 83. Visin, 106. Vital statistics, 81. White Russians, 79. Yarovski, 105. Zadonstchina, 104. Zagoskin, 107. Zhukovski, 107. Zorndorf, battle of, 99.</p>
---	--	--	---	---	--

RUSTCHUK (РУСТУК), a city of Bulgaria, Turkey in Europe, on the south bank of the Danube, opposite Giurgevo, at the point where the river receives the waters of the Lom, a fine stream from the northern slopes of the Balkans. Since 1867 it has been connected by rail (139 miles) with Varna. The town was nearly destroyed by the Russian bombardment from Giurgevo in 1877, and the military works have since been dismantled in terms of the treaty of Berlin. Its position on the river frontier of Turkey long made it a place of strategic importance. In 1871 the population was about 23,000 (10,800 Turks, 7700 Bulgarians, 1000 Jews, 800 Armenians, 500 Gipsies,

800 Wallachians and Serbs, 400 Western Europeans), and in 1881 it was returned as 26,163.

In the time of the Romans Rustchuk was one of the fortified points along the line of the Danube. In the *Tabula Peutingeriana* it appears as Prisca, in the *Antonine Itinerary* as Serantaprista, in the *Notitia* as Seragintaprista, and in Ptolemy as Priste Polis. Destroyed by the barbarian invasion, the town recovered its importance only in comparatively modern times. In 1810 it was captured by the Russians, and on his departure next year Kutusoff destroyed the fortifications. In 1828-29 and again in 1853-54 it played a part in the Russo-Turkish War, and in 1877, as already mentioned, it was nearly destroyed.

RUTH, BOOK OF. The story of Ruth, the Moabitess, great-grandmother of David, one of the Old Testament

Hagiographa, is usually reckoned as the second of the five Megilloth or Festal Rolls. This position corresponds to the Jewish practice of reading the book at the Feast of Pentecost; Spanish MSS., however, place Ruth at the head of the Megilloth (see CANTICLES); and the Talmud, in a well-known passage of *Baba Bathra*, gives it the first place among all the Hagiographa. On the other hand the Septuagint, the Vulgate, and the English version make Ruth follow Judges. It has sometimes been held that this was its original place in the Hebrew Bible also, or rather that Ruth was originally reckoned as an appendix to Judges, since it is only by doing this, and also by reckoning Lamentations to Jeremiah, that all the books of the Hebrew canon can be reduced to twenty-two, the number assigned by Josephus and other ancient authorities. But it has been shown in the article LAMENTATIONS (q.v.) that the argument for the superior antiquity of this way of reckoning breaks down on closer examination, and while it was very natural that a later rearrangement should transfer Ruth from the Hagiographa to the historical books, and place it between Judges and Samuel, no motive can be suggested for the opposite change. That the book of Ruth did not originally form part of the series of *Propheta priores* (Judges-Kings) is further probable from the fact that it is quite untouched by the process of "prophetic" or "Deuteronomistic" editing, which gave that series its present shape at a time soon after the fall of the kingdom of Judah; the narrative has no affinity with the point of view which looks on the whole history of Israel as a series of examples of divine justice and mercy in the successive rebellions and repentances of the people of God.¹ But if the book had been known at the time when the history from Judges to Kings was edited, it could hardly have been excluded from the collection; the ancestry of David was of greater interest than that of Saul, which is given in 1 Sam. ix. 1, whereas the old history names no ancestor of David beyond his father Jesse. In truth the book of Ruth does not offer itself as a document written soon after the period to which it refers; it presents itself as dealing with times far back (Ruth i. 1), and takes obvious delight in depicting details of antique life and obsolete usages; it views the rude and stormy period before the institution of the kingship through the softening atmosphere of time, which imparts to the scene a gentle sweetness very different from the harsher colours of the old narratives of the book of Judges. In the language, too, there is a good deal that makes for and nothing that makes against a date subsequent to the captivity, and the very designation of a period of Hebrew history as "the days of the judges" is based on the Deuteronomistic additions to the book of Judges (ii. 16 sq.) and does not occur till the period of the exile. An inferior limit for the date of the book cannot be assigned with precision. It has been argued that, as the author seems to take no offence at the marriage of Israelites with Moabite women, he must have lived before the time of Ezra and Nehemiah (Ezra ix.; Neh. xiii.); but the same argument would prove that the book of Esther was written before Ezra, and indeed "a disposition to derive prominent Jewish families from proselytes prevailed to a much later date," and finds expression in the Talmud (see Wellhausen-Bleek, p. 205). The language of Ruth, however, though post-classical, does not seem to place it among the very latest Old Testament books, and the manner in which the story is told is as remote from the legal pragmatism of Chronicles as from the prophetic pragmatism of the editor of the older histories. The tone of simple piety and graciousness

which runs through the narrative, unencumbered by the pedantry of Jewish legality, seems to indicate that the book was written before all the living impulses of Jewish literature were choked by the growing influence of the doctors of the law. In this respect it holds in Hebrew prose writing a position analogous to that of the older *Chokma* in Hebrew poetry. But the triumph of the scribes in literature as well as in law was not accomplished till long after the time of Ezra.

Wellhausen in Bleek, 4th edition, p. 204 sq., finds the clearest indication of the date of Ruth in the appended genealogy, Ruth iv. 18-22; compare his remarks in *Prolegomena*, p. 227 (Eng. tr., pp. 217 sq.). Salma (Salmon), father of Boaz, is a tribe foreign to old Judah, which was not "father" of Bethlehem till after the exile, and the names of Salma's ancestors are also open to criticism. But this genealogy is also found in Chronicles, and is quite in the manner of other genealogies in the same book. That it was borrowed from Chronicles and added to Ruth by a later hand seems certain, for the author of Ruth clearly recognizes that Obed was legally the son of Mahlon, not of Boaz (iv. 5, 10), so that from his standpoint the appended genealogy is all wrong.

The design of the book of Ruth has been much discussed and often in too narrow a spirit; for the author is an artist who takes manifest delight in the touching and graceful details of his picture, and is not simply guided by a design to impart historical information about David's ancestors, or enforce some particular lesson. Now the interest of the story, as a work of art, culminates in the marriage of Boaz and Ruth, not in the fact that their son was David's ancestor, which, if the book originally ended with iv. 17, is only mentioned in a cursory way at the close of the story. Had the author's main design been to illustrate the history of the house of David, as many critics think, or to make the point that the noblest stock in Israel was sprung from an alien mother (Wellhausen), this design would certainly have been brought into more prominence. The marriage acquires an additional interest when we know that Ruth was David's great-grandmother, but the main interest is independent of that, and lies in the happy issue of Ruth and Naomi from their troubles through the loyal performance of the kinsman's part by Boaz. Doubtless the writer meant his story to be an example to his own age, as well as an interesting sketch of the past; but this is effected simply by describing the exemplary conduct of Naomi, Ruth, Boaz, and even Boaz's harvesters. All these act as simple, kindly, God-fearing, people ought to act in Israel.

There is one antique custom which the writer follows with peculiar interest and describes with archeological detail as a thing which had evidently gone out of use in his own day. By old Hebrew law, as by the old law of Arabia, a wife who had been brought into her husband's house by contract and payment of a price to her father was not set free by the death of her husband to marry again at will. The right to her hand lay with the nearest heir of the dead. Originally we must suppose, among the Hebrews as among the Arabs, this law was all to the disadvantage of the widow, whose hand was simply part of the dead man's estate; but, while this remained so in Arabia to the time of Mohammed, among the Hebrews the law early took quite an opposite turn; the widow of a man who died childless was held to have a right to have a son begotten on her by the next kinsman, and this son was regarded as the son of the dead and succeeded to his inheritance so that his name might not be cut off from Israel. The duty of raising up a son to the dead lay upon his brother, and in Deut. xxv. 5 is restricted to the case when brothers live together. In old times, as appears from Gen. xxxviii., this was not so, and the law as put in the book of Ruth appears to be that the nearest kinsman of the dead in general had a right to "redeem for himself" the dead man's estate, but at the same time was bound to marry the widow. The son of this marriage was reckoned as the dead man's son and succeeded to his property, so that the "redeemer" had only a temporary usufruct in it. Naomi was too old to be married in this way, but

¹ The religious pragmatism lacking in the original is in part supplied by the Targum (i. 5, 6).