# MODERN

# LANGUAGE NOTES.

---

A. MARSHALL ELLIOTT,

*MANAGING EDITOR.*

JAMES W. BRIGHT, HUGO K. SCHILLING,

HENRY ALFRED TODD,

*ASSOCIATE EDITORS.*

---



VOLUME XIV

1899

BALTIMORE: THE EDITORS.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

## ORIGINAL ARTICLES.


Walker, J. Charles, The Infinitive with Subject Accusative in Marguerite de Navarre..... 1-8
Ford, J. D. M., *Sedere*, **Essere* and *Stare* in the Poema del Cid. I..... 8-20
Franklin, V. P., Tennyson's use of "*es*" in Blank Verse..... 20-22
Hart, J. M., Schlutter's Old-English Etymologies..... 22-31
Wiener, L., The Etymology of Buttress..... 32
Rowe, F. E., Spenser's Short Similes..... 32-47
Branner, John C., Some Old French Place Names in the State of Arkansas..... 75-80
Gay, L. M., Anglo-French Words in English. 80-85
Ford, J. D. M., *Sedere*, **Essere* and *Stare* in the Poema del Cid. (Conclusion)..... 85-90
Hempl, George, Linger and Lungern, Long and Verlangen..... 90-93
Warren, F. M., The Island of Avalon..... 93-95
Magill, Edward H., The International Correspondence..... 96-102
Geddes, Jr., James, Variations in French Pronunciations. I..... 102-108
Borchling, Conrad, Studies about the Younger Titurel..... 129-150
Allen, Philip S., The Fourth Annual Meeting of the Central Division of the Mod. Lang. Association of America..... 150-161
Geddes, Jr., James, Variations in French Pronunciations. (Conclusion)..... 161-172
Grandgent, C. H., A Neglected Eighteenth Century Orthoepist..... 172-181
Browne, Wm. Hand, Pundelan..... 181
Baker, T. S., The Sixteenth Annual Meeting of the Mod. Lang. Asso'n of America.. 193-204
Gerber, A., The Homunculus-Helena Theory of the Helena Drama and its Antecedents..... 204-215
Williams, R. O., A Prepositional Hitch..... 215-220
Schelling, Felix E., Notes on Lyrical Poetry. 220-228
Thorndyke, A. H., The Pastoral Element in the English Drama before 1605..... 228-246
Wood, Francis A., Understand, Guess, Think, Mean, Semasiologically Explained..... 257-262
Heller, Otto, Goethe and Wordsworth..... 262-265
Eaton, Horace, A Source for the Towneley "*Prima Pastorum.*"..... 265-268
Coar, J. F., The Parcae in Goethe's Faust, Part ii, Act 1, Scene 3..... 321-328
Allen, Philip, Wilh. Müller and Italian Popular Poetry..... 329-331
Emerson, O. F., The Legend of Joseph's Bones in Old and Middle English..... 331-334
Eggert, C. A., On the Title and Subtitle of Molière's Misanthrope..... 334-352
Kuhns, Oscar, Dante's Influence on English Poetry in the Nineteenth Century..... 352-371
Bright, James W., Two Notelets on Shakespeare..... 371-374
Furst, Clyde, Concerning Sidney Lanier..... 393-410
Shepard, William P., The Dimensions of Malebolge..... 410-413
Segali, J. B., Estimate of Béranger by Goethe 412-425
Allen, Philip, Martin Opitz and Wilhelm Müller..... 425-427
Rennert, Hugo A., Gregorio Silvestre and aud *Residencia de Amor*..... 457-465
Hempl, George, The Semasiology of ἐπίσταμαι, verstehen, understand, unterstehen, gestehen, unternehmen, undertake, etc..... 465-468
Goebel, Julius, Zu Goethes Hundertfuenfzigstem Geburtstag..... 468-477
Alden, Raymond Macdonald, The Time Element in English Verse..... 478-494


## REVIEWS.


Van Noppen, L. C., Vondels Lucifer. [*C. Alphonso Smith*]..... 47-55
Kluge, F.,-Lutz, F., English Etymology. [*F. A. Wood*]..... 55-62
Gebhardt, August, Th. Thoroddsen, Geschichte der Islaendischen Geographie. [*H. Schmidt-Wartenberg*]..... 62-63
Baskervill, W. M.-Harrison, Jas. A., Anglo-Saxon Prose Reader for Beginners. [*J. B. Henneman*]..... 108-117
Brandes, George, William Shakespeare, a Critical Study. [*E. M. Tappan*]..... 117-120
Jessopp, Augustus, John Donne, sometime Dean of St. Paul's. A. D. 1621-1631. [*C. B. Furst*]..... 121-124
Harcourt, L., German for Beginners. [*Conrad Bierwirth*]..... 124
Bachmann, A., Mittelhochdeutsches Lesebuch. [*H. C. G. von Jagemann*]..... 181-184
Doumic, René, Etudes sur la Littérature Française. [*Hugo P. Thieme*]..... 185-191
Burt, A. W., A Manual of Elementary Phonetics. [*Edwin S. Lewis*]..... 246-250
Spiers, I. H. B., La Siège de Paris. [*E. S. Lewis*]..... 250-252
Cohn, A.,-Woodward, B. D., Voltaire's Prose. [*E. S. Lewis*]..... 252
Henning, Geo. N., La Question d'Argent. [*E. S. Lewis*]..... 252-254
Madge, H. D., Leaves from the Golden Legend. [*Pierce Butler*]..... 254-255

Brandl, Alois, Quellen des Weltlichen Dramas in England vor Shakespeare. [*F. I. Carpenter*]..... 268-280
Guerber, H. A., La main malheureuse. [*E. S. Lewis*]..... 280-282
Fontaine, C., Le chien du capitaine. [*E. S. Lewis*]..... ..... 282-284
Beck, Geo. A. D., La fille du député. [*E. S. Lewis*]..... ..... .... 284-287
Hunt, Th. W., English Meditative Lyrics. [*Charles E. Hart*]..... 288-290
van Hamel, A. G., Het Zoeken van "l'âme française" in de Letterkunde en de Taal van Frankrijk. [*M. T. Minckwitz*]. 290-311
Marriage, M. E., Poetische Beziehungen des Menschen zur Pflanzen- und Tierwelt im heutigen Volkslied auf hochdeutschem Boden. [*Philip S. Allen*]..... 311-313
Lee, Sidney, A Life of William Shakespeare. [*E. M. Tappan*]..... 313-316
Canfield, Arthur G., French Lyrics. [*H. P. Thieme*]..... 374-377
Brush, Murray Peabody, The Isopo Laurenziano. [*K. McKenzie*]..... ..... 377-382
Breymann, Hermann, Die Phonetische Literatur von 1876-1895. [*A. Rambeau*]..... 382-384
Michaelis, H.,-Passy, P., Dictionnaire Phonétique de la langue française. [*A. Rambeau*]..... 384-390
Beers, Henry A., A History of English Romanticism in the Eighteenth Century. [*Wm. H. Hulme.*]... . ..... 427-440
Hancock, A. E., The French Revolution and the English Poets. [*Wm. H. Hulme.*]..... 427-440
Sauer, August, Euphorion, Zeitschrift für Litteraturgeschichte. [*B. W. Wells.*] 440-443
Cameron, A. G., Selections from Edmond and Jules de Goncourt, [*L. M. Gay.*]..... 443-448
Walther, Johannes, Allgemeine Meereskunde. [*H. C. Bierwirth.*]..... 448-450
Evans, Sebastian, The High History of the Holy Grail. [*W. A. Nitze*]..... 494-499
Vietor, W., Deutsches Lesebuch in Lautschrift: Erster Theil. [*C. H. Grandgent*]..... ... 499-500
Thieme, Hugo P., The Technique of the French Alexandrine. [*F. M. Warren*].. 500-502
Francke, K., Glimpses of Modern German Culture. [*C. von Klenze*]..... 502-505
Winchester, C. T., Some Principles of Literary Criticism. [*Th. W. Hunt*]..... 505-507
Oliver, Thos. E., Jacques Miet's Drama "La Destruction de Troye la Grant." [*F. M. Warren*]..... 507-509
Wiener, Leo, The History of Yiddish Literature in the Nineteenth Century. [*I. M. Casanowicz*]..... ..... 509-515

CORRESPONDENCE.

Child, C. G., Maiden, Molden, Milde..... 63-64
Brown, Wm. H., Average..... 64
Wilson, R. H., Marguerite de Navarre..... 124-127
Taylor, Lucien E., Note to La Mare au Diable. 127-128
Galloo, E., Eugénie Grandet..... 128
Renault, Raoul, Some Old French Place-Names in the State of Arkansas..... 191-192
Hugienin, Julian, An Interpolation in the Towneley Abraham Play..... ..... 255-256
Hart, J. M., Allotria..... 316-317
Schlutter, Otto B., Anglo-Saxon Glosses..... 317-319
Huss, H. C. O., Schiller und Goethe..... 390
Schlutter, O. B., The Old English *āgniden*.... 391
Cook, Albert S., Phoenix 56..... ..... 450-451
Pollard, Alfred W., Dr. Furnivall's 75th Birthday..... 452-454
Phelps, Wm. Lyon, Donne's "Anyan"..... 515-516
Marden, C. C., Tomar Las de Villadiego..... 516-517
Reed, Edw. B., Notes on Lyric Poetry..... 517
Browne, Wm. Hand, Tote..... 517

BRIEF MENTION.

319-320, 391-392, 518-520.

OBITUARY.

454-456

# Index to Volume xiv, 1899.


**vgnlden**, The Old English —..... .... 196
Alden, R. M. — The Time Element in English Verse..... .. ..... 239–247
Alexandrine, The Technique of the French — (see Thieme and Warren).... ..... ..... 250–251
Allen, P. S., The Fourth Annual Meeting of the Central Division of the Mod. Lang. Asso'n of America..... 75–81
— Marriage: Poetische Beziehungen des Menschen zur Pflanzen- und Tierwelt im heutigen Volkslied auf hochdeutschem Boden..... 156–157
— Wilh. Müller and Italian Popular Poetry..... 165–166
— Martin Opitz and —..... ..... 213–214
Allotria..... ..... ..... 158–159
Anglo-French Words in English..... . ..... 40–43
— Saxon Prose Reader for Beginners in Oldest English (see Baskervill-Harrison, Henneman). 54–59
Anglo-Saxon Glosses..... 159–160
Arkansas, Some Old French Place Names in the State of —..... 33–40
— " " " " " "... 96
Avalon, The Island of —..... ..... ..... 47–48
Average..... ..... 32

**Bachmann, A.**, Mittelhochdeutsches Lesebuch (see von Jagemann)..... ..... 91–92
Baker, T. S., The Sixteenth Annual Meeting of the Mod. Lang. Asso'n of America..... 97–102
Baskervill, W. M.,-Harrison, Jas. A., Anglo-Saxon Prose Reader for Beginners in Oldest English (see Henneman)..... 54–59
Beck, A. D., Ohnet's La fille du député (see Lewis). 142–144
Beers, Henry A., A History of English Romanticism in the Eighteenth Century (see Hulme) 214–220
Béranger, An Estimate of — by Goethe..... ..... . 206–213
Bierwirth, H. C., Harcourt: German for Beginners. 62
— Sterling: Walther's Allgemeine Meereskunde... 224–225
Borchling, Conrad, Studies about the Younger Tituel..... ..... 65–75
Brandes, George, William Shakespeare, A Critical Study (see Tappan)..... 59–60
Brandl, Alois, Quellen des weltlichen Dramas in England vor Shakespeare (see Carpenter)... 134–140
Branner, John C., Some Old French Place Names in the State of Arkansas..... 33–40
Breymann, H., Die phonetische Literatur von 1876–1895 (see Rambeau)..... ..... 191–192
Bright, J. W., Two Notelets on Shakespeare..... 186–187
Brown, C. S., The Later English Drama (see Hunt)..... 160
Browne, Wm. H., Average..... 32
— Pundelan..... 91
— *Tote*..... ..... .. 259
Brush, M. P., The Isopo Laurenziano (see Kenneth McKenzie)..... 189–191
Burt, A. W., A Manual of Elementary Phonetics (see Lewis)..... ..... ..... 123–125
Butler, Pierce, Madge: Leaves from the Golden Legend..... ..... . ..... 127–128
Buttress, The Etymology of —..... 16

**Cameron, A. G.**, Selections from Edmond and Jules de Goucourt (see Gay)..... ..... 222–224
Canfield, A. G., French Lyrics (see Thieme)..... 187–189
Carpenter, F. I., Brandl: Quellen des weltlichen Dramas in England vor Shakespeare..... 134–140
Casanowicz, I. M., Wiener: The History of Yiddish Literature in the Nineteenth Century. 253–258
Child, C. G., Maiden, Moder, Milde..... 32
Cid, *Sedere*, **Essere*, and *Stare* in the Poema del —..... ..... 4–10; 43–45
Coar, J. F., Parcae in Goethe's Faust, Part ii, Act 1, Scene 3..... .... 161–164
Cohn, A.,-Woodward, B. D., Voltaire's Prose (see Lewis)..... 126
Cook, Albert S., Phoenix 56.. ..... 225–226
**Dante's** Influence on English Poetry in the Nineteenth Century..... ..... 352-371 ~~176–186~~
Donne, John, Sometime Dean of St. Paul's, A. D. 1621–1631 (see Jessopp and Furst)..... 61–62
—'s "*Anyan*"..... 258
Dottin, Georges, Glossaire des parlers du Bas Maine (see Grandgent)..... 196
Doumic, R., Études sur la Littérature Française (see Thieme)..... ..... 93–96
Dowden's Lyrical Ballads ..... 196
Dramas in England vor Shakespeare, Quellen des Weltlichen —..... ..... 134–140
Dumas' La Question d'argent (see Henning and Lewis)..... ..... 126–127

**Eaton, Horace**, A Source for the Towneley "Prima Pastorum."..... 133–134
Eggert, C. A., On the Title and Subtitle of Molière's Misanthrope..... 167–176
Eighteenth Century Orthoepist, A Neglected —... 86–91
Emerson, O. F., The Legend of Joseph's Bones in Old and Middle English..... ..... 166–167
Enault's Le Chien du Capitaine (see C. Fontaine and Lewis)..... 141–142
English, Schlutter's Old—Etymologies..... 12–16
— Etymology, (see Kluge, Lutz, and Wood)..... 28–31
— Anglo-French Words in —..... ..... 40–43
— The Pastoral Element in the — Drama before 1605..... 114–123
— Meditative Lyrics (see Hunt and C. E. Hart).. 144–145
— The Later — Drama (see Brown, C. S., and Hunt)..... 160
— The Legend of Joseph's Bones in Old and Middle — ..... 166–167
— Dante's Influence on — Poetry in the Nineteenth Century..... 176–186

English, The Old — *ägniden*..... 196
— Romanticism in the Eighteenth Century (see Beers and Hulme)..... 214–220
— The French Revolution and the — Poets (see Hancock and Hulme)..... 220
— The Time Element in Verse ..... 239–247
**Essere*, *Sedere*,—and *Stare* in the Poema del Cid... ..... 4-10; 43-45
Euphorion, Zeitschrift für Litteraturgeschichte (see Sauer and Wells)..... 220-222
Evans, Sebastion, The History of the Holy Grail (see Nitze)..... 247–249

**Faust,** The Parcae in Goethe's —, Part ii, Act i, Scene 3..... 161–164
Fontaine, C., Le Chien du Capitaine (see Lewis).. 141–142
Ford, J. D. M., *Sedere*, **Essere* and *Stare* in the Poema del Cid.. ..... 4–10; 43–45
Francke, Kuno, Glimpse of Modern German Culture (see Von Klenze)..... 251–253
Franklin, V. P., Tennyson's Use of "ss" in Blank Verse..... 10–11
French, Some Old — Place Names in the State of Arkansas..... 33–40
— " " " " " " "..... 96
— Anglo — Words in English..... 40–43
— Variations in — Pronunciations. I ..... 51–54
— " " " (Conclusion)..... 81–86
— Etudes sur la Littérature Française (see Doumic and Thieme)..... 93–96
— Lyrics (see Canfield and Thieme).. ..... 187–189
— Dictionnaire phonétique de la langue Française (see Michaelis-Passy and Rambeau)..... 192–195
— The Technique of the — Alexandrine (see Thieme and Warren)..... 250–251
Furnivall's 75th, Birthday, Dr. — ..... 226–227
Furst, C. B., Augustus Jessopp: John Donne, Sometime Dean of St. Paul's, A. D. 1621–1631..... 61–62
— Concerning Sidney Lanier..... 197–205

**Galloo, E.,** Eugénie Grandet..... 64
Gay, L. M.,Anglo-French Words in English..... 40–43
— Cameron, Selections from Edmond and Jules de Goncourt..... 222–224
Gebhardt, August, Thoroddsen Th., Geschichte der isländischen Geographie (see Schmidt-Wartenberg)..... 31–32
Geddes, Jr., James, Variations in French Pronunciations. I.... ..... 51–54
— " " " " (Conclusion).. ... 81–86
Gerber, A., The Homunculus-Helena Theory, and the Evolution of the Helena Drama and its Antecedents..... 102–108
German for Beginners (see Harcourt and Bierwirth). 62
— Glimpses of Modern — Culture (see Francke and von Klenze)..... 251–253
Goebel, Julius, Zu Goethes Hundertfünfzigstem Geburtstag. .... ..... 234–239
Goethe and Wordsworth..... 131–133
— The Parcae in -- Faust, Part ii, Act 1, Scene 3. 161–164
— Schiller and —..... 195
— An Estimate of Béranger by —..... 206–213
— Zu — Hundertfünfzigstem Geburtstag..... 234–239
Golden Legend, Leaves from the — (see Madge and Butler)..... 127–128
Goncourt, Selections from Edmond and Jules de — (see Cameron and Gay)..... 222–224
Grandet, Eugénie..... 64
— A Neglected Eighteenth Century Orthoepist.... 86–91
Grandgent, C. H., Dottin: Glossaire des parlers du Bas Maine..... 196
— Vietor: Deutsches Lesebuch in Lautschrift: Erster Theil..... 250
Guerber, H. A., La Main Malheureuse (see Lewis). 140–141
Guess, Understand, — Think, Mean, Semasiologically Explained..... 129–131

**Hancock, Elmer,** The French Revolution and the English Poets: A Study in Historical Criticism (see Hulme)..... 220
Harcourt, L., German for Beginners (see Bierwirth). 62
Harrison, Jas A.-Baskervill, W. M., Anglo-Saxon Prose Reader for Beginners in Oldest English (see Henneman)..... 54–59
Hart, C. E., Hunt: English Meditative Lyrics.... 144–145
Hart, J. M., Schlutter's Old-English Etymologies. 11–16
— Allotria..... 158–159
Heller, Otto, Goethe and Wordsworth..... 131–133
Hempl, Geo., Linger and Lungern, Long and Verlangen..... 45–47
— The Semasiology of ἐπίσταμαι, verstehen, understand, unterstehen, gestehen, unternehmen, undertake, etc..... 233–234
Hench, George Allison, Obituary..... 237–228
Henneman, J. B., Baskervill-Harrison: Anglo-Saxon Prose Reader for Beginners in Oldest English .... ..... 54–59
Henning, Geo. N., Dumas' La Question d'argent (see Lewis)..... 126–127
Holy Grail, The History of the — (see Evans and Nitze)..... 247–249
Homunculus-Helena Theory (The), and the Evolution of the Helena Drama and its Antecedents. 102–108
Hugienin, Julian, An Interpolation in the Towneley Abraham Play..... 128
Hulme, Wm. H., Beers: A History of English Romanticism in the Eighteenth Century. 214–220
— Hancock: The French Revolution and the English Poets. A Study in Historical Criticism. 220
Hunt, Th. W., English Meditative Lyrics (see C. E. Hart)..... 144–145
— Brown, C. S.: The Later English Drama..... 160
— Strunk: Dryden's Essays on the Drama..... 160
Huss, H. C. O., Schiller and Goethe..... ..... 195

**International** (The) Correspondence..... 48–51
Isländischen Geographie, Th. Thoroddsen, Geschichte der — (see Gebhardt and Schmidt-Wartenberg)..... 31–32
Isopo (The) Laurenziano (see Brush and McKenzie). 189–191
Italian Popular Poetry, Wilh. Müller and —..... 165–166

**von Jagemann, H. C. G.,** Bachmann: Mittelhochdeutsches Lesebuch..... 91–92
Jessopp, Augustus, John Donne, Sometime Dean of St. Paul's, A. D. 1621–1631 (see Furst)... 61–62

**von Klenze, C.,** Francke: Glimpses of Modern German Culture..... 251–253

Kluge, F.,-Lutz, F., English Etymology (see Wood)..... 28-31
Kuhns, Oscar, Dante's Influence on English Poetry in the Nineteenth Century..... 176-186

**La Marc au Diable**, Note to —..... 64
Lanier, Sidney, Concerning—..... 197-205
Lee, Sidney, A Life of William Shakespeare (see Tappan)..... 157-158
Lewis, E. S., Burt: A Manual of Elementary Phonetics..... 123-125
— Spiers: Sarcey's Le Siège de Paris..... 125-126
— Cohn-Woodward: Voltaire's Prose..... 126
— Henning: Dumas' La Question d'argent..... 126-127
— Guerber: La Main Malheureuse..... 140-141
— Fontaine, C., Enault's Le chien du Capitaine... 141-142
— Beck: Ohnet's La fille du député..... 142-144
Linger and Lungern, Long and Verlangen..... 45-47
Lutz, F.-Kluge, F., English Etymology (see Wood)..... 28-31
Lyric Poetry, Notes on —..... 110-114

**Madge**, H. D., Leaves from the Golden Legend (see Butler)..... 127-128
Magill, Edward H., The International Correspondence..... 48-51
Maiden, Molder, Mildc..... 32
Malebolge, The Dimensions of..... 205-206
Marden, C. C., Tomar las de Villadiego..... 258-259
Marguerite de Navarre, The Infinitive with Subject Accusative in —..... 1-4
— ..... 62-64
Marriage, M. E., Poetische Beziehungen des Menschen zur Pflanzen- und Tierwelt im heutigen Volkslied auf hochdeutschem Boden (see Allen)..... 156-157
McKenzie, Kenneth, Brush: The Isopo Laurenziano..... 189-191
Mean, Understand, Guess, Think, —, Semasiologically Explained..... 129-131
Michaelis, H. et P. Passy, Dictionnaire phonétique de la langue française (see Rambeau)..... 192-195
Millet's Jacques, Drama "La Destruction de la Traye" (see Oliver and Warren)..... 254-255
Minckwitz, M. T., van Hamel: Het Zoeken van "l'ame française" in de Letterkunde en de Taal van Frankrijk..... 145-156
Mittelhochdeutsches Lesebuch (see Bachmann and von Jagemann)..... 91-92
Mod. Lang. Association of America, Sixteenth Annual Meeting of the —..... 97-102
— The Fourth Annual Meeting of the Central Division of the —..... 75-81
— The Tenth Annual Meeting of — of Ohio..... 260
Molière's Misanthrope, On the Title and Subtitle of —..... 167-176
Müller, Wilh., and Italian Popular Poetry..... 165-166
— Martin Opitz and —..... 215-214

**Nitze, W. A.**, Evans: The History of the Holy Grail..... 247-249

**Ohnet's**, La fille du député (see Beck and Lewis).. 142-144
Oliver, T. E., Jacques Milet's Drama, "La Destruction de la Troye" (see Warren)... ..... 254-255
Opitz, Martin and Wilhelm Müller..... 213-214

**Parcae** (The) in Goethe's Faust, Part II, Act 1, Scene 3..... 161-164
Passy, Paul, Michaelis, H. et —, Dictionnaire phonétique de la langue française (see Rambeau)..... 192-195
Pastoral Element (The) in the English Drama before 1605..... 114-123
Phelps, Wm. Lyon, — Donne's "Anyan."..... 258
Phoenix 56..... 225-226
Phonetics, A Manual of Elementary — (see Burt and Lewis)..... 123-125
Phonetische (Die) Literatur von 1876-1895 (see Breymann and Rambeau)..... 191-192
Pollard, Alfred W., Dr. Furnivall's 75th, Birthday. 226-227
Prepositional (A) Hitch..... 108-110
Pundelan..... 91

**Rambeau, A.**, Breymann: Die phonetische Literatur von 1876-1895..... 191-192
— Michaelis-Passy: Dictionnaire phonétique de la langue française..... 192-195
Reed, Edw. B., Notes on Lyric Poetry..... 259
Renault, R., Some Old French Place-Names in the State of Arkansas..... 96
Rennert, H. A., Gregorio Silvestre and his Residencia de Amor..... 229-233
Rowe, F. E., Spenser's Short Similes..... 16-24

**Sarcey's** Le Siège de Paris (see Spiers and Lewis). 125-126
Sauer, August, Euphorion, Zeitschrift für Litteraturgeschichte (see Wells)..... 220-222
Schelling, F. E., Notes on Lyric Poetry..... 110-114
Schiller and Goethe..... 195
Schilling, H. K., Obituary of George Allison Hench..... 227-228
— The North German-American Teachers' Association..... 259
— Boll: Spyri's Rosenresli..... 259
— Bernhardt: Frommel's Studentengeschichte "Eingeschneit."..... 260
— Bernhardt: Baumbach's Waldnovellen..... 260
— Bernhardt: Stille Wasser..... 260
— Schmidt: Wildenbruch's Der Letzte..... 260
— Wells: Sudermann's Der Katzensteg..... 260
— Rhoades: Freytag's Aus dem Jahrhundert des grossen Krieges..... 260
— Fossler: Rossegger's Die Schriften des Waldschulmeisters..... 260
Schlutter's Old-English Etymologies..... 11-16
— Anglo-Saxon Glosses..... 159-160
— The Old-English *ägniden*..... 196
Schmidt-Wartenberg, H., Gebhardt, A.: Th. Thoroddsen: Geschichte der isländischen Geographie..... 31-32
*Sedere*, **Essere* and *Stare* in the Poema del Cid. 4-10; 43-45
Segall, J. B., An Estimate of Béranger by Goethe. 206-213
Shakespeare, William, A Critical Study (see Brandes and Tappan)..... 59-60
— A Life of — (see Lee and Tappan)..... 157-158
— Two Notelets on —..... 186-187
Shepard, Vm. P., The Dimensions of Malebolge... 205-206
Silvestre, Gregorio, and his Residencia de Amor... 229-233
Smith, C. A., Van Noppen: Vondel's Lucifer..... 24-28
Spenser's Short Similes..... 16-24

Spiers, I. H. B., Sarcey's Le Siège de Paris (see Lewis)..... 125–126
*Stare, Sedere, *Essere,* and — in the Poema del Cid..... 4–10; 43–45
Sterling, S. A., Allgemeine Meereskunde, by Johannes Walther (see Bierwirth)..... 224–225
Strunk, Jr., William, Dryden's Essays on the Drama..... 160

**Tappan, E. M.,** Brandes: William Shakespeare, A Critical Study..... 59–60
— Lee: A Life of William Shakespeare..... 157–158
Taylor, L. E., Marguerite de Navarre..... 62–64
— Note to La Mare au Diable..... 64
Tennyson's Use of "ss" in Blank Verse..... 10–11
Thieme, H. P., Doumic: Études sur la Littérature Française..... 93–96
— Canfield: French Lyrics..... 187–189
— The Technique of the French Alexandrine (see Warren)..... 250–251
Think, Understand, Guess, —, Mean, Semasiologically Explained..... 129–131
Thorndyke, A. H., The Pastoral Element in the English Drama before 1605..... 114–123
Thoroddsen, Th., Geschichte der isländischen Geographie (see Gebhardt and Schmidt-Wartenberg)..... 31–32
Titurel, Studies about the Younger —..... 65–75
Tote —..... 259
Towneley Abraham Play, An Interpolation in the —. 128
— "Prima Pastorum," A Source for the —..... 133–134

**Understand,** Guess, Think, Mean, Semasiologically Explained..... 129–131

**van Hamel, A. G.,** Het Zoeken van "l'âme française" in de Letterkunde en de Taal van Frankrijk (see Minckwitz)..... 145–156
Van Noppen, L. C., Vondel's Lucifer (see C. A. Smith)..... 24–28
Vietor, W., Deutsches Lesebuch in Lautschrift: Erster Theil (see Grandgent)..... 250
Villadiego, Tomar las de. —..... 258–259
Voltaire's Prose (see Cohn-Woodward and Lewis). 126
Vondel's Lucifer (see Van Noppen and C. A. Smith)..... 24–28

**Walker, J. Charles,** The Infinitive with Subject Accusative in Marguerite de Navarre..... 1–8
Walther, Johannes, Allgemeine Meereskunde (see Sterling and Bierwith)..... 224–225
Warren, F. M., The Island of Avalon..... 47–48
— Thieme: The Technique of the French Alexandrine..... 250–251
— Oliver: Jacques Milet's Drama "La Destruction de Troye la Grant."..... 254–255
Wells, B. W., Sauer: Euphorion, Zeitsctrift für Litteraturgeschichte..... 220–222
Wiener, L, The Etymology of Buttress..... 16
— The History of the Yiddish Literature in the Nineteenth Century (see Casanowicz)..... 253–258
Williams, R. O., A Prepositional Hitch..... 198–110
Wilson, R. H., Marguerite de Navarre..... 62–64
Wood, F. A., Kluge-Lutz: English Etymology.... 28–31
Woodward, B. D.-Cohn, A., Voltaire's Prose (see Lewis)..... 126
Wordsworth, Goethe and —..... 131–133

**Yiddish,** Literature, The History of — in the Nineteenth Century (see Wiener and Casanowicz). 251–258

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

**Baltimore, January, 1899.**

## *THE INFINITIVE WITH SUBJECT ACCUSATIVE IN MARGUERITE DE NAVARRE.**

In no respect does French syntax of the sixteenth century differ more widely from that of to-day than in the use of the infinitive. In the time of Marot, the simple infinitive could still be used as a substantive, it could have a subject accusative, and could also be employed as a substitute for the imperative much more extensively than to-day.[1] In certain constructions where the infinitive with *de* is now required, the infinitive alone could be used: for example, as object of certain verbs; as modifier of nouns and adjectives; after *que* in comparisons, etc. So the infinitive with *de* was often used where modern usage requires either the simple infinitive, the infinitive with *à*, or the present participle. In rare cases the infinitive with *à* is found where we should now use the infinitive with *de*, or the present participle with *en*. Also *pour* with the infinitive was often written where present usage would demand a purpose, causal, or conditional clause with *que*. The object of this paper, however, is to give the results of an investigation of the writings of one of the well-known writers of the sixteenth century, Marguerite de Navarre, with reference to one, only, of these uses of the infinitive, and perhaps the most interesting one, its use with subject accusative.

Although Marguerite is generally more conservative of old forms and constructions than other writers of her time, this particular construction, being then *à la mode*, is scarcely more common in her writings than in those of her contemporaries.[2] It is found: (1) where we now have a complementary infinitive merely; (2) with factitives where the infinitive with dative is now used; (3) and also, as in Latin after verbs of knowing, saying, believing, etc.

### *a.* The Subject Accusative a Reflexive.

In constructions like, "Je *désire être* heureux," "Il *croit avoir* raison," etc., in which the infinitive is now regarded as complementary merely, a subject accusative—a reflexive of the same person and number as the subject of the principal verb—was sometimes used in Classical Latin and is found in French as late as the seventeenth century. For example, we find in Cicero: "Cupio *me esse clementem*" (Cat. i. 2) for the more usual "Cupio *esse clemens*," and in seventeenth century French: "Cette chanson gaillarde qu'elle *se* confessait *avoir* chantée ailleurs" (Mme de Sév.), instead of: "Qu'elle *confessait avoir* chantée," simply.

Three examples of this usage have been noted in Marguerite de Navarre: Elle *se* monstrant *auoir* pitié de luy, à sa requeste, meit sa main gantée sur son coeur . . . (H, iii. 93). C'est ceste voix que Saint Jehan *se* dit *estre* . . (D P. 249). Qui fut homme de conscience comme elle *s*'estimoyt *estre* . . . (H. iii. 85). It may be noted that this construction is still admissible with *estimer* and *trouver*.

### *b.* The Subject Accusative Omitted.

The construction exemplified in: "Je *désire être* heureux," "Il *croit avoir* raison," etc., was in the sixteenth century extended to many cases where modern usage demands a *que*-clause. The following examples will illustrate this usage in Marguerite: Je *voy* n'*avoir* accusateur que . . . (that is, Je *vois que je n'ai*, etc.) (M. i. 58). À Barcelone ou son mary

* Texts used and corresponding abbreviations.

D. P. *Les Dernières Poésies de Marguérite de Navarre.* Éd. Lefranc, Paris, 1896.

H. *L'Heptaméron des Nouvelles de Marguérite d'Angoulême, Royne de Navarre.* Éd. Dillaye, 3 vols., Paris, 1879.

L. D. *Marguérite d'Angoulême, Son Livre de Dépenses (1540-1549).* Éd. La Ferrière, Paris, 1841.

Let. *Lettres de Marguérite d'Angoulême, Sœur de François I., Reine de Navarre.* Éd. Génin, Paris, 1841.

M. *Les Marguérites de la Marguérite des Princesses.* Éd. Felix Frank, 4 vols, Paris, 1873.

N. Let. *Nouvelles Lettres de la Reine de Navarre adressées au Roy François I., son Frère.* Éd. Génin, Paris, 1842.

1 Cf. Modern Italian in this respect, also such expressions in Modern French as, Voir *page 4*, S'Adresser *au bureau*, etc.

2 Cf. Benoist, *La Syntaxe Française entre Palsgrave et Vaugelas*, Paris 1877. p. 112; also Darmesteter et Hatzfeld, *Le Seizième Siècle en France*, Paris, 1878, § 204.

auoit autresfois *ordonné estre enterré*—(that is, *qu'on l'enterrât*) (H. i. 144).

*c.* With Factitives and Verbs of Hearing, Seeing, etc.

In modern French such constructions as : je *l'*ai fait *venir*, je *l'*ai vu *partir*, je *l'*ai entendu *chanter*, etc., are as truly examples of the infinitive with subject accusative as is the following from Cicero: "Sæpe hoc *majores* natu *dicere* audivi. . . . " (Mur. 28). This construction has existed in French from the earliest times, and as late as the sixteenth century it was perfectly regular even when the infinitive had an object. For example, we find in Meigret[3] the following sentences given as model constructions : "Je voe *Pierre boere* le vin, je *l'*ey vu *boere* le vin, je *le* voyoe *boere* le vin." Even to-day the accusative is not uncommon after *voir* and *entendre* in such cases, though the dative is *de rigueur* after *faire* : cf. Daudet, "C'était étourdissant d'entendre *ces deux Tarasconnais célébrer* . . . les splendeurs de," etc.[4]

The following examples with *faire* and *voir* have been noted in Marguerite : Estant au lit, il fist *sa femme lire* La Passion. . . . (D. P. 264). J'ay bien veu *des femmes faire* le signe de la croix en oyant dire des parolles. . . (H. iii. 62). Le gentil homme fut courroucé de veoir *sa femme* le *congnoistre* [that is, le *re*connaître] (id. iii. 110). But cf.: Car Dieu en eulx *leur* a fait souvent *dire*. . . . (D. P. 214).

This construction was extended to verbs of *being* and *having* after *faire* and *voir*; numerous examples are found in Marguerite: Peu d'amour faict *l'homme estre* joyeulx . . (D. P. 34). D'animal *le* faict *estre* vray homme . . . (id. 303). La pluspart des grans d'Espaigne desiroient fort de voir *Madame estre* leur princesse. . . . (N. Let. 187). Voyant *sa femme* tant saige . . . *auoir* esté delaissées de luy. . . . (H. i. 82). Il se contente de voir *toutes choses* vous *estre* données de Dieu. . . . (Let. 406). Voyant *mon innocence*, *Ma vraye amour*, *Avoir* pour recompence Un tel adieu. . . . (D. P. 363). Car je ne vis oncques *homme avoir* une mellieure voulonté que luy. . . . (N. Let. 187). Je ne vis jamais *personne avoir* une si grande joye . . . (id. 25). Cf. also: M. i. 31, 70; H. i. 23, 156; H. ii. 64, 97; H. iii. 202, 240.

*d.* After Verbs of Thinking, Knowing, Saying, etc.

The most common of the Latin constructions of the infinitive with subject accusative, that of indirect discourse after verbs of thinking, knowing, saying, etc., was foreign to Old French, and was only introduced into the language by the *savants* during the Renaissance. Although it was received with favor by the literary people, it made no headway with the masses, and after one or two centuries fell into disuse, except in two constructions where it is occasionally used to-day.

According to Benoist,[5] the infinitive with subject accusative is no longer a French construction. He says :

"Au xvi. siècle l'infinitif pouvait se construire comme l'infinitif latin, c'est-à-dire avec un sujet ; ce tour de phrase est complétement tombé en désuétude."

Diez,[6] however, sanctions the use of the construction when the subject is a relative as in : "Les mêmes effets *que* nous avons dit *appartenir* à cette maladie."

Haase[7] speaking of this construction says :

"Bei den Verben des Denkens und Sagens ist diese Konstruction gewöhnlich nur statthaft, wenn der Akk. ein Relativ ist, doch findet sie auch, wenn der Akk. ein Pron. pers. ist, z.B: on *l'*estime *être* sage, chacun *s'*estime *être* sage u.a. Immerhin wird die Sprache solche Saetze lieber meiden."

Such examples of the use of this construction as the following, make it still more difficult for us to accept the sweeping statement of Benoist, quoted above : "Tout cela pour le grand patriote [Guillaume Tell] *que* tous savait n'*avoir* jamais existé."[8]

"Lequel *se* trouve n'*avoir* point de verbe à lui propre. . . . "[9]

Marguerite like her literary contemporaries[10]

3 *Le Tretté de la Langue Francoeze.* Ed. Foerster, Heilbronn, 1888. See p. 98.

4 *Tartarin sur les Alpes.*

5 *L. c.*, p. 112.

6 *Gram. der Rom. Sprachen*, 3 vols. Bonn, 1856. See Vol. iii, p. 240.

7 *Franz. Syntax des xvii. Jahrh.* Leipzig, 1888. See § 89 Anm.

8 Daudet, *l. c.*

9 Littré, *s. v.* qui, No. 12.

10 Cf. Benoist, *l. c.*, p. 113.

was very fond of this Latin construction. In the ten volumes of her works studied, I have noted one hundred and twenty-nine examples, after thirty different verbs or verbal expressions as follows: after *voir*, nineteen examples;[11] after *dire*, fifteen; after *penser*, fourteen; after *savoir*, ten; after *connaître*, ten; after *estimer*, nine; after *croire*, six; after *cuyder*, *juger*, *promettre*, and *sentir*, four examples each; and one or two examples after each of several other verbs. Twenty-one different infinitives were found with subject accusative,—*être* occurring almost three times as often as all the others; *être* was found ninety-three times; *avoir*, seventeen; *venir*, four; and the following once each: *augmenter*, *causer*, *connaître*, *se consentir*, *couvrir*, *devoir*, *habiter*, *mourir*, *plaire*, *porter*, *prêcher*, *pouvoir*, *rendre*, *regner*, and *souffrir*.

(1) *The Subject Accusative a Personal Pronoun.* Fourteen examples of this construction have been found in Marguerite, occurring after the verbs *croire*, *cuyder*, *déclarer*, *désirer*, *estimer*, *dire*, *juger*, *sentir*, and *voir*. The construction is not yet obsolete, as appears from what has been stated above, though it has been little used since the sixteenth century:

Je *le* croy *estre* parfaite guerison. . . . (N. Let. 93). En ferme foy ne te pouvois lasser Et declairer *toy* rien et *Dieu* tout *estre*. . . . (D. P. 404).

For other examples see: M. ii. 123; M. iv. 28; H. i. 244; H. ii. 258; H. iii. 87; N. Let. 30, 247; D. P. 264.

(2) *The Subject Accusative a Relative Pronoun.* This construction has been noted sixteen times in Marguerite after the verbs: *assurer*, *confesser*, *connaître*, *dire*, *douter*, *écrire*, *penser*, *prier*, *promettre*, *savoir*, *soutenir*, *voir*, and *vouloir*. Like the preceding one, it is still used occasionally, and will be sufficiently well illustrated by the following examples:

*Lequel* je connais [that is, sais] ne souffrir que pour aimer la parole de Dieu . . (N. Let. 99). La fiance *que* vous dictes *auoir* en moy . . (H. i. 113). Vne damoiselle *qu'*elle doubtoit se *porter* quelque amitié . . (H. iii. 162). Tout ce *que* i'ay pensé vous *plaire* . . (H. i. 111). Selon *que* le Cardinal de Bellay m'escripvist *estre* vostre vouloir . . (N. Let. 126).

11 Cf. under *c* above.

For other examples see: Let. 95, 138, 202, 256, 264, 319, 320, 321, 380; N. Let. 77, 131, 163, 186, 251; H. i. 44, 137, 160; H. ii. 211; H. iii. 114, 141, 146, 159; D. P. 200, 360; M. i. 35; M. iii. 11.

(3) *The Subject Accusative a Demonstrative, Possessive, or Indefinite Pronoun.* This construction which has apparently fallen into complete disuse occurs in Marguerite in the following examples: Cuydant *le nostre estre* vray . . (D. P. 31). D'or et d'argent . . . monstrant n'*estre* pas chiche *ceulx* qui les ont donnez si beaulx et riches . . (id. 152). Sachant ne leur *estre* donné *Rien* qui ne fust par le Tout ordonné . . (id. 254). [Le Roy] ne fault à l'article d'en sentir *tout venir* du tout puissant . . (Let. 174). C'est l'aise que j'ay de savoir *la vostre* [santé] *augmenter* au travail . . (N. Let. 217). Cf. also D. P. 257.

(4) *The Subject Accusative a Noun.* The infinitive with a subject noun in the accusative, which all authorities agree has fallen into complete disuse, was the most common of all these constructions in the sixteenth century, Marguerite uses it sixty-five times after twenty-two different verbs as follows:

*Avouer.*—J'aduoue *le tort estre* mien . . (H. i. 139).

*Assurer.*—Je vous ousse plus que jamais asseurer *la santé* de Madame . . . *estre* telle que vous la desirez et . . (N. Let. 73).

*Douter*(se).—Parlamente qui se doubtoit *le debat estre* à ses despens, leur dist . . (H. iii. 215).

*Confesser.*—Nous confessons *ce peché estre* tel Que . . (M. iii. 180).

*Connaître.*—(Ils) connoistront *leur malice* n'*avoir* seu[su] faire ingnorer verité à l'esprit que . . (N. Let. 77). Je congnuz bien *ma gloire estre* tournée . . (M. i. 31). Cognoissant *la mere* n'*estre* si seuere que le pere . . (H. iii. 235). Cf. also D. P. 283; M. ii. 182; Let. 266; N. Let. 46, 101.

*Croire.*—(Je) croyois *vostre contentement* De mon ennuy *couvrir* le sentiment . . (D. P. 20). Il eut faict conscience de croyre *vng homme estre couché* avecq . . (H. iii. 115). Cf. also M. iii. 20, 200.

*Cuyder.*—Quelque iour après que la gentil homme cuydoyt *les parolles* du prince *estre* mises en obly [note the passive] (H. iii. 68).

Cf. also H. ii. 194.

*Dire.*—Dites *Dieu* seul *estre* beau . . (M. i. 88). L'aveugle fol, qui telle vie meyne, Dit *la plus layde estre* la belle Helene . . (D. P. 168). (L'homme) Enfin dira . . . De court plaisir *venir long repentir* . . (id. 170). Cf. also D. P. 209, 223, 232; M. iv. 103.

*Estimer.*—Elle feyt estimer *sa faulte estre* vertu . . (H. ii. 52). Si vous estimez *sottise estre* simplicité . . (id. iii. 4). Cf. also M. i. 34; H. ii. 265; H. iii. 94.

*Être certain.*—Je suis certain . . . n'*estre* qu'un *Ton filz et toy* . . (M. i. 125).

*Experimenter.*—Vous auez experimenté *ma volunte estre* esgalle à la vostre . . (H. iii. 201).

*Juger.*—Homme duquel on pouoit iuger *la nature* . . *estre* plus serviteur de Bachus que . . (H. iii. 221). Doit on juger *un homme estre sailli* Hors de raison? (H. iii. 182). Je jugerois *mon amy* tous les coups *avoir* le droit . . (id. iv. 237).

*Lire.*—*Bethleem* avons lu trestous *estre* le lieu de son enfance . . (M. ii. 108).

*Montrer.*—Vous voulez *la* monstrer *estre* vice . . (H. ii. 133). La larme luy venoit à l'œil, monstrant *l'esprit* n'*estre* empesché D'aymer son Dieu . . (D. P. 281).

*Penser.*—En vous pensons *regner melancolie* . . (M. iv. 108). Car je pensoys *tout le povoir* d'enfer Ne *povoir* rompre ou lascher tant de fer . . (D. P. 130). Pensant *la femme estre* plus variable . . (id. 360). Cf. also N. Let. 46; Let. 154.

*Promettre.*—En trouua vne . . . dont la parolle estoit si doulce & agreable, qu'elle promectoit *le visaige* & *le cueur estre* de mesme . . (H. ii. 61). Promectans *la iournée* presente *denoir* estre aussi belle que nulle des passées . . (H. ii. 244).

*Savoir.*—Si sçay-je bien *ma force* n'*estre* telle que . . (D. P. 19). Le Turc sachant *ses predications Causer* partout grandes esmotions . . (id. 256). Saichant *la maladie* de Madame *avoir esté* plus grande que . . (Let. 225). Cf. also N. Let. 265.

*Sentir.*—Je sents bien *le mal estre* mortel . . (M. i. 141). [Je] sentoys bien *le trespassement* maistre En durant *estre* . . . glorieulx . . (D. P. 416).

*Souffrir.*—Ne souffrez pas *l'ennemy* . . . *avoir* ceste puissance . . (M. i. 52).

*Trouver.*—Vous trouuerez *le conseil* que [je] vous donne *estre* venu de celle qui . . (L. D. 163).

*Voici*[12].—[Il] ne fut pas demie heure auecq elle que uoicy *venir le mary* . . (H. i. 69).

*Voir.*—Cf. under *c* above.

J. Charles Walker.
*Cornell University.*

---

## *Sedere*, **Essere AND Stare IN THE POEMA DEL CID.*

### I.

The following article presents the substance of several reports delivered in the École des Hautes-Études, Paris, 1897–1898, in the Old-Spanish seminary of M. Morel-Fatio. To him and to Professor Sheldon of Harvard University the writer is indebted for many suggestions. It is hoped that the article will be found useful in hinting at the possible correction of verses in the *Poema del Cid*, which Cornu has not yet amended.

Modern Spanish possesses two verbs which perform the functions of the single verb copulative and substantive of the Classical Latin. These are *ser* and *estar*. *Estar*, in all its moods and tenses, represents etymologically the Latin STARE. *Ser*, in some of its moods and tenses, derives from the Latin ESSE, or rather from the Vulgar Latin *ESSERE; in others, it takes its forms from SEDERE. Thus we have to deal with three Latin verbs as the source of the two Spanish verbs.

In modern Spanish, *estar*, much weakened in signification, shows only a slight reflection of the original sense of STARE, as in *estar en pié;* while the forms of *ser* that proceed from SEDERE preserve no trace of the primary meaning *to sit, to be seated.* In general, *ser* and *estar* now perform quite similar duties, their individual employment being determined only by the consideration of permanency and transiency. It was not wholly thus in the older language of the *Poema del Cid*, which we may take to represent Spanish of the twelfth century—modified, no doubt, in some

12 Cf. also Châteaubriand, *Génie du Chris.*, iii. 4. "Cependant les tonnerres se taisent et *voici venir une voix:* 'Écoute, Ô toi Israël!'" and Dante, *Inferno*, iii, "Ed *ecco* verso noi *venir* per nave *Un vecchio bianco* per antico pelo." . . . .

respects by a scribe of the fourteenth century. In that older language, *ser* (in so far as it was really the verb substantive and copulative) and *estar* were employed in much the same way as nowadays; but we find that SEDERE, far from becoming entirely the verb substantive and copulative, survived in forms having now the original sense *to sit*, *to be seated*, and again a weakened sense akin to that of the enfeebled STARE.

We shall first consider the forms and syntax of the descendants of *ESSERE and SEDERE.[1]

## SĔDĒRE.

### INF.

*ser*, vv. 251, 2208, 2569, 3114, 3359, 3399, 3468, 3519; *sser*, v. 1667.

### PRES. PART.

*seyendo*, v. 2153.

### PAST PART.

[ ]

### FUT. INDIC.

1. *sere*, vv. 73, 74, 231, 1038, 2266, 2502, 2794, 3081, 3351, 3477.
2. [ ]
3. *sera*, vv. 129, 979, 1063, 1076, 1133, 1686, 2365, 2417, 3028.
   *ser* les *ha*, v. 3359.
4. *seremos*, vv. 1411, 1862, 2162, 2195, 2552, 2728.
5. *seredes*, vv. 158, 2049, 2715, 2716.
6. *seran*, vv, 86, 825, 2194, 2343, 2463, 2973.
   *ser* uos *han*, v. 251.

### COND.

1. [ ]
2. [ ]
3. *serie*, vv. 82, 519, 526, 1403, 1471, 1575, 2741, 2753, 3018, 3460, 3607.
4. [ ]
5. [ ]
6. *serien*, vv. 2349, 2470, 2491, 2616.
   *seryen*, v. 116.

### INDIC.

### PRES.

1. [ ]
2. [ ]
3. [ ]
4. [ ]
5. [ ]
6. [ ]

## *ESSERE.

### INF.

[See SEDERE.].

### PRES. PART.

[See SEDERE.].

### PAST PART.

[See SEDERE.].

### FUT. INDIC.

[See SEDERE.].

### COND.

[See SEDERE.].

### INDIC.

### PRES.

1. *so*, vv. 156, 248, 270, etc.
2. *eres*, vv. 361, 2619, 2669, etc.
   *heres*, v. 2618.
3. *es*, vv. 91, 137, etc.
4. *somos*, vv. 14, 672, etc.
   *somo*, v. 3521 (?).
5. *sodes*, vv. 79, 103, etc.
6. *son*, vv. 17, 63, etc.

[1] The edition of the *Poema del Cid* used was that of K. Vollmöller, Halle, 1879.

IMPF.

1. [ ]
2. [ ]
3. *sedie*, vv. 1053, 1220, 1566, 2030, 2059, 2239, 3553.
   *seye*, v. 2278.
   *sey*, v. 1840.
4. [ ]
5. [ ]
6. *sedien*, vv. 1001, 3595.
   *seyen*, vv. 122, 2532.

PRET.

1. [ ]
2. [ ]
3. *souo*, v. 907.
4. [ ]
5. [ ]
6. *souieron*, v. 2823.

IMPER.

2. [ ]
5. *sed*, vv. 1652, 1949, 2138, 3118 (singular sense).
   " vv. 315, 702, 1123, 1903, 2179, 3525 (plural sense).

SUBJ.

PRES.

1. *sea*, vv. 1034, 1054.
2. [ ]
3. *sea*, vv. 118, 180, etc.
   *ssea*, v. 132.
4. *seamos*, vv. 1941, 3139.
5. *seades*, vv. 108, 284, 1687, 3575.
6. *sean*, vv. 128, 1259, etc.

IMPF.

1. [ ]
2. [ ]
3. *souiesse*, v. 1787.
4. [ ]
5. [ ]
6. [ ]

FUT.

1. [ ]
2. [ ]
3. [ ]
4. [ ]
5. [ ]
6. [ ]

PLUPERF.

1. [ ]
2. [ ]
3. [ ]
4. [ ]
5. [ ]
6. [ ]

IMPF.

1. [ ]
2. [ ]
3. *era*, vv. 39, 352, 416, etc.
4. [ ]
5. [ ]
6. *eran*, vv, 171, 173, 506, 1215, etc.

PRET.

1. *fue*, v. 1062.
   *fu*, vv. 1934, 2494, 3129.
2. *fust*, v. 358.
   *fuste*, v. 3318; *ffusted*, v. 3365=*fuste*+*te*.
3. *fue*, vv. 109, 111, etc.
   *ffue*, vv. 1506, 3703.
4. [ ]
5. *fuestes*, vv. 71, 266, 2457.
6. *fueron*, vv. 523, 786, etc.

IMPER.

[See SEDERE.].

SUBJ.

PRES.

[See SEDERE].

IMPF.

1. [ ]
2. [ ]
3. *fuesse*, vv. 61, 1253, 1815, 2487, 2958; *ffuesse*, 2957.
   *fosse*, v. 2137.
   *fos*, v. 3590.
4. *fuessemos*, v. 2760.
5. *fuessedes*, v. 2046.
6. *fuessen*, vv. 164, 2981, 3355, 3555.
   *fossen*, v. 2001.

FUT.

1. [ ]
2. *fueres*, v. 3566. (?)
3. *fuere*, vv. 92, 223, 1276, 1364, 1911, 3349.
   *fuer*, v. 1382.
4. *fueremos*, vv. 1409, 2732.
5. *fueredes*, vv. 1039, 1696.
6. *fueren*, vv. 1356, 1358, 2105.

PLUPERF.

1. [ ]
2. [ ]
3. *fuera*, vv. 1312, 2533.
4. [ ]
5. [ ]
6. [ ]

### Forms of *essere.

It is seen that *essere has given no infinitive (and consequently no future or conditional), no present participle, no past participle, no imperative and no present subjunctive. In the indicative mood it is represented by a present, an imperfect and a preterite tense; in the subjunctive mood, it has yielded an imperfect, a future and a pluperfect tense.

1. Indic. pres. The second and third sing. and the third pl. forms are irregular. The Lat. es has not survived, as its form would have been confounded with the third sg. *Eres* seems to be the future ĕris, but the sense transferral is difficult to understand.[2] The *h* of the single case of *heres* is perhaps only a scribal device for separating the initial vowel of one word from the final vowel of the preceding word, rather than an example of an *ungekehrte Schreibung* as A. Gassner terms it.[3] The absence of diphthongization in *eres* and *es* may be due to their usually atonic position in the sentence. *Sodes* represents *sutis, made on the analogy of sumus and sunt and substituted for estis. Perhaps the influence of sedetis>*seedes*, *sedes* had something to do with this substitution; cf. *Appollonio* 272, 3: *Quando vos sedes muerta*, and other instances of *seedes*, *sedes* in Berceo and the *Rimado de Palacio*, cited by Gassner.[4] *Somo*, v. 3521, is a mere mistake for *somos;* that is, *ondrados somo*[*s*] *nos*, where the scribe forgot one *s*. Lidforss in his edition of the poems[5] has restored the *s*.

2. Indic. impf. The failure of ĕ to diphthongize in *era*, *eran*, is explicable only as in the case of *eres*, *es*.

3. Indic. pret. On these preterite formations, see Gassner, *loc. cit.*, p. 181 ff.; Meyer-Lübke, Vol. ii, p. 343. In the first sing. *fu* may indicate that *fue* was accented on its *u*. Lidforss emends to *fu*[*i*] in all the instances; Cornu[6] reads *fu*[*i*] for v. 1934. In the second sing., *fuste* seems the true form, which has lost its *e* before the following vowel *a* in v. 358. The *d* of *ffusted* represents the previously intervocalic *t* of the enclitic pronoun *te*.

4. Subj. impf. *Fosse*, the apocopated *fos*, and *fossen*, by the side of forms with the diphthong *ue*, show a dialect element in our poem.[7] Gassner[8] treats the *fos* of v. 3590 as the indic. pret. third sg.=*fo*+*se;* but the context shows it to be the subj. impf., as Koerbs rightly terms it.[9]

5. Subj. fut. The second sing. *fueres* must be erroneous in v. 3566, as the sense demands the second pl. Gassner[10] would read *fuerdes*, Lidforss proposes *fueredes*. *Fuer* 1382 and *fueren* 1356, in assonance in a laisse in *o*, show the same dialect peculiarity as *fosse*, etc.

6. Subj. pluperf. In v. 1409 Janer wrongly reads *fueramos*. *Fuera*, in both instances of its occurrence, appears to have the force of the indic. pluperf., which tense it represents etymologically.

### Forms of sedere.

The moods and tenses which *essere has failed to yield, but which sedere has supplied to the verb substantive and copulative, are the infinitive, the present participle, the indicative future, the conditional, the imperative and the present subjunctive. Sedere has also given the past participle, but the form does not occur in the *Cid*.

1. Inf. The *ss* of *sser*, found only once, is a scribal device to indicate that the *s*, though it here follows a vowel and, from the point of view of sentence phonetics, has an intervocalic position, still retains its voiceless value, for, in Old Spanish, a single *s*, between vowels had a voiced sound.[11] Gorra[12] is not justified in deriving *ser* from *essere. The initial es- would not be lost in Spanish.[13] We know, moreover, from one of our earliest Spanish documents,

2 Meyer-Lübke, *Grammatik d. rom. Sprachen*, Vol. ii, § 214. A Vulgar Latin *rses,—*es*+the usual ending for the second sg. pres., would be intelligible. The rhotacism to *eres* seems hardly possible, however.

3 *Das altspan. Verbum*, Halle, 1897, p. 92.

4 *Ibid.*, p. 95.

5 *Acta Universitatis Lundensis*, anno 1895, tom. xxxi.

6 *Beiträge zu einer künftigen Ausgabe des P. del Cid.*, *Zeitschrift f. r. Philol.*, Vol. xxi, p. 461 ff.

7 Cf. F. Koerbs, *Untersuchung der sprachlichen Eigentümlichkeiten des P. del Cid*, Frankfurt am Main, 1893, p. 57.

8 *Loc. cit.*, p 183. 9 *L. c.*, p. 56. 10 *L. c.*, p. 189.

11 Cf. R. J. Cuervo in *Revue hispanique* for March, 1895, p. 50.

12 *Lingua e letteratura spagnuola*, Milan, 1898, p. 152.

13 The real descendant of *essere is seen in the half-learned *esser* of the *España sagrada* xlviii, 260; cf. Gassner, p. 198.

the Glosses printed by Priebsch[14] that the Latin ESSE was so unintelligible to the popular mind as to necessitate a gloss. The glossing word is SEDERE, and the context shows that the sense in the passage in question is merely that of the substantive verb.[15]

SEDERE became regularly *seer*, and, by contraction, *ser*. It is surprising that only the contracted form should occur in the manuscript of the *Cid*, while *séér* is found in Berceo, *S. Domingo*, 204, 3; 252, 2; 282, 1; etc.; *S. Millan*, 1, 2; 23, 2; etc.; *Alexandre*, 1, 3; 31, 1; etc., and the form *seyer* is the customary one in the *Appollonio*, 6, 1; 11, 2; 72, 2; etc. Cornu considers that *séér* was the original form in the *Cid*, and introduces that dissyllable in his emendations;[16] for example,

v. 2208, Sabor abriedes de *se[e]r* e comer en el palaçio.
3114, . . . . . Venid, Cid Campeador
*Se[e]r* en aquesto escaño. . . . . .
3319, Por *se[e]r* [ellas] rreynas.
3519, E *se[e]r* segudador.

And similarly in vv. 2569 and 3359.

2. PRES. PART. *Seyendo* comes from SEDENDUM, through **sediendo* and **sedyendo*.

3. INDIC. FUT. As in French and Italian,[17] so in Spanish the indic. fut. and the conditional are based on SEDERE, and not on *ESSERE. The divided future, rather common in Old Spanish, occurs twice in the *Cid*.

4. COND. The *y* of *seryen*, v. 116, does not necessarily indicate a consonantal value and, therefore, an accentuation *seryén*. The *y* is written with a full vocalic value in *yr*, v. 3507; *ynfantes*, vv. 3558, 3568, 3591, etc.; *oyr*, v. 3507; *myo*, etc., and such it probably has here. The *Cid* affords no indication of the accentuation *ié*, *ién* argued for by Hanssen,[18] as the weakened ending of the impf. and cond. does not occur in assonance. It is to be noted, however, that *prendia*, v. 275, and *queria*, v. 276, both of the third person, occur in a laisse in *ía* and in assonance with *vida*, *complida*, etc. The very weakening of the *a* to *e* seems contrary to the idea that the accent rested on the last vowel of the diphthong, as does also the fact that in modern Spanish the *i* still bears the stress. So, in the *Cid*, we may have the diminishing diphthong *íe*, which in the verse counted as but one syllable, the value which Cornu gives it in his emendations of vv. 1471 and 3460, and one which it certainly has in Berceo, *S. Domingo* 93, 2; 114, 4; etc., *S. Millan*, 62, 2; 70, 4; etc., *Alexandre*, 7, 2; 83, 4; 95, 3; etc.

5. IMPER. The *Cid* has only the second pl. *sed* from SEDETE, used as the singular of politeness in vv. 1652, 1949, 2138, 3118, and as a true plural in the other cases. *Sed* is a contraction of *séed*, which we find in Berceo, *S. Domingo*, 448, 1; 379, 3 (*séét*), *S. Millan*, 480, 3 (*séét*), *Alexandre*, 219, 4 and 689, 3 (*séét*). Cornu restores the dissyllabic form in his emendations of vv. 702, 1123, 1903, 2179, 3118, 3525.

6. SUBJ. PRES. The Spanish forms point to SĔDEAM rather than *SIAM, since *i* in hiatus remains in Spanish, for example, VIAM, *via*. Meyer-Lübke seems to cling to *SIAM for Spanish, although he admits SEDEAM for Portuguese.[19] The following *y* of the Lat. etymon is responsible for the non-diphthongization of *e* in *sea*.[20]

The conjugation of SEDERE is fairly complete and includes, in addition to the forms supplied to the verb copulative and substantive, an indic. impf., an indic. pret., and a subj. impf. In the *Cid*, the absence of an indic. pres. and of a subj. fut. is only fortuitous, those tenses being found elsewhere. Thus Berceo has in the indic. pres., sing. first *seo*, *S. Domingo*, 757, 2; *S. Millan*, 147, 4; second *siedes*, *S. Millan*, 146, 2; third *siede*, *S. Domingo*, 150, 2; pl. first *sedemos*, *S. Domingo*, 152, 3 and *seemos*, *S. Millan*, 317, 1; second *seedes*, *S. Millan*, 435, 1; third *sieden*, *S. Domingo*, 303, 1. The *Appollonio* has *sseyo* 316, 2; 515, 1; *seye* 505, 2; *seyemos* 279, 4, *sedes* 272, 3, etc. For the subj. fut., Gassner[21] has found the form *soviere* in the *Fueros de Medinaceli*, 124.

14 *Zeitschr. f. rom. Philol.*, Vol. xix, pp. 1–40: *Altspanische Glossen*.

15 *L. c.*, p. 6, ESSE: SEDERE.—(Mulier quoque que p. ac. ceperit quantosquumque concipere vel parere d. tantorum homicidiorum ream se *esse* cognoscat.)

16 *Zeitschr.*, Vol. xxi.

17 Cf. Cornu, *Romania* vii, 367; Paris, *Romania* ix, 174; J. A. Fontaine, *The History of the Auxiliary Verbs in the Romance Languages*, Lincoln, 1888, p. 33, and see *per contra* Gorra, *l. c.*, p. 154, Meyer-Lübke, *Gramm.*, Vol. ii, § 317.

18 Hanssen, *Sobre la pronunciacion del diptongo* IE *en la época de Gonzalo de Bercee*, Santiago de Chile, 1895.

19 *Gramm.* Vol. ii, 256, 257.

20 Cf. Baist in *Grundriss der rom. Philol.*, Vol. i, p. 696.

21 *L. c.*, p. 189.

7. INDIC. IMPF. See, in general, Gassner, pp. 149 ff. and Koerbs, p. 54. The forms with *d* are only semi-popular. Instead of *sey*, Lidforss would read *sey*[*e*] in v. 1840. As in the cond., only the weak ending *-ie* occurs and the *Cid* offers no proof of a rising diphthong *-ié* rather than a diminishing *-ie*.

8. INDIC. PRET. SEDIT, through the analogy of HABUIT became *SEDUIT, which is the basis of our forms. The vowel *o* also shows the influence of HABUI which becomes *ovi*, *ove*.[22]

9. SUBJ. IMPF. Follows the same principle as the pret.

SYNTAX OF FORMS FROM **Essere* AND *Sedere*.

Naturally, in the moods and tenses in which it has entirely supplanted *ESSERE, SEDERE is employed with all the senses of the verb substantive and copulative. Thus, it forms:
(1) the passive voice, as, for example,

v. 3359, Lo que les fiziemos *ser* les *ha retraydo*.
1034, E si uos comieredes don yo *sea pagado*.
2569, El Çid que nos curiaua de assi *ser afontado*.
1063, Non *sera olbidado*.
1123, *Apareiados* me *sed* a cauallos e [a] armas.[23]
519, Por quanto *serie conprada:*

(2) the compound tenses of verbs of motion, for example,

v. 2349, Non *serien* alli *legados*.

And (3) it denotes, in a general way, the existence of the subject, or predicates characteristic and inseparable qualities of the subject; for example,

v. 2153, Avn *bivo seyendo* de mi ayades algo.
3339, Por *ser reynas* de Nauarra e de Aragon.
979, Non *sera verdad*.
504, Quisquier que *sea d'algo*.
1903, *Sed* buenos *messajeros*.

But the descendants of SEDERE in the infin., the fut., the cond., the pres. part., the imper., and the pres. subj. are not all restricted to the use as verb substantive and copulative. In several cases they possess, *as do all sixteen examples of the forms from* SEDERE *in the moods and tenses where it has not replaced* *ESSERE, a sense entirely that, or quite close to that, of the Latin SEDERE=*to be seated, to sit*, or they are roundly employed as both the ancient and modern language uses *estar*.

22 Cf. Gassner, *l. c.*, p. 168.

23 Cornu: Apareiados seedme a cauallos e [a] armas. Restori: Propugnatore xx, parte seconda, p. 159: *sedme*.

The preservation of the original sense of SEDERE=*to sit*, which modern Spanish expresses by a derivative of the pres. part. SEDENTEM—AD- *SEDENTARE—*a- sentar*, is seen in:

v. 3114, El rey dixo al Çid: venid aca *ser* Campeador *En aquesto escanno*.
1052, Comiendo va el conde, Dios que de buen grado! Sobrel *sedie* el que en buen ora nasco.
1001, Las armas avien presas e *sedien sobre los cauallos*.
3118, *Sed en uuestro escanno* commo rey e sennor.

A slight weakening of the primitive sense is seen in:

v. 2030, Hynoios fitos *sedie* el Campeador,

while a further weakening, which brings it fully upon the ground occupied by the enfeebled *estar*, is visible in the following cases, where it denotes residence or a temporary situation, or acts as the auxiliary of the pres. part. in the periphrastic conjugation:

v. 2278, En Valençia *seye* Myo Çid.
1566, El *sedie* en Valençia curiando e guardando.
2502, En Valençia *sere* yo.
2823, Alli [=en Santesteban] *souieron* ellas fata que sannas son.
1220, Quando su senna cabdal *sedie* en somo del alcaçar.
3595, Do *sedien* en el campo fablé el rey don Alfonso, (Perhaps=*sat*).
907, Ahi [that is, on the *poyo*, where he was encamped] *sono* Myo Çid conplidas xv. semanas.
1652, Mugier, *sed* en este palaçio.
2208, Sabor abriedes de *ser* e de comer en el palaçio.
3018, Y [=á la corte] *serie* essa noch.
2162, *Seremos* a las bodas.
1787, Mando Myo Çid Ruy Diaz que fita *souiesse* la tienda. (Here *souiesse* marks the temporary element in the pitching of the tent).

In the periphrastic conjugation, it is found in:

v. 1840, El rey don Alfonsso *sey* se *santiguando*.
122, Rachel e Vidas *seyen*-se *conseiando*.
2532, Vassallos de Myo Çid *seyen*-se *sonrrisando*.
2059, *Catandol sedie* la barba que tan aynal creçiera.
2239, A la puerta de la eclegia *sedie*llos *sperando*.
3553, *Sedie*los *castigando* el Conde Garçi Ordonez.
1287, En estas nuevas todos *sea* [perhaps=todo ssea] *alegrando*. (Here Lidforss emends to *se van alegrando*.)

Otherwise, in the language of the *Cid*, as in modern Spanish, *estar* is employed in this periphrastic conjugation. In all the cases last given, except perhaps v. 1287, there seems to be a remnant of the original sense, *to sit*, or, at least, the weakened sense, *to stay*. So, in v. 1840 it seems that the King is really seated, and that the meaning is: 'The King, Don Alfonso, seated on his throne, was making the

sign of the cross.' Similarly, in v. 2059, the context would imply the meaning to be: 'From his throne where he [the King] was seated, he regarded his [the Cid's] beard which had grown so rapidly.' The intermediate stage, preceding the actual formation of the periphrastic conjugation, is furnished by:

v. 1566, El *sedie* en Valençia *curiando* e *guardando*
(He *staid* in Valencia *attending* to his affairs, etc).

From this juxtaposition of *sedie* and the pres. part., to the use of *sedie* as auxiliary, the transition is easy and natural.

STARE.

INF.

*estar*, vv. 637, 1304, 2017.

PRES. PART.

*estando*, vv. 351, 903, 2032, 2311, 3174, 3482.

INDIC. FUT.

[ ]

COND.

[ ]

INDIC.

PRES.

1. *esto*, v. 2854.
2. *estas*, vv. 8, 330.
3. *esta*, vv. 294, 497, 623, 722, 792, 1058, 1243, 1297, 1398, 1406, 1494, 1621, 2126, 2342, 2456, 2512, 2853, 2892.
4. [ ]
5. *estades*, vv. 271, 1655.
6. *estan*, vv. 305, 385, 541, 606, 964, 1392, 1484, 1618, 1672, 1746, 2038, 2218, 2305, 3089, 3123, 3622.

IMPF.

1. [ ]
2. [ ]
3. *estaua*, vv. 2, 154, 239, 485, 868, 1537, 1827, 2431, 2929.
   *esteua*, v. 2439.
4. [ ]
5. [ ]
6. *estauan*, vv. 100, 1601.

PRET.

1. [ ]
2. [ ]
3. *estido*, v. 3629.
4. [ ]
5. [ ]
6. [ ]

IMPER.

[ ].

SUBJ.

[ ]

FORMS OF *stare*.

*Esteua* once as against *estaua* nine times, and *estido*, v. 3629, alone present difficulties. Gorra[24] cites *esteua* and *esteuan* as true Old Spanish forms, but Gassner terms *esteua* a mere mistake[25] and considers the *estevan*, which he finds only in the *Fuero Juzgo*, a Leonese form under the influence of the Portuguese perfect *esteve*. The natural development of STĔTIT would be *estiedo*, found in the *Alexandre*, 546, 2. The *i* of *estido* is not due to a reduction of the diphthong but to the analogy of a 1 st. pers. **estide*. As FECIT gave *fizo* under the influence of *fiz* from FECĪ, so STETIT gave *estido* under the influence of *ESTIDE from STETĪ.[26]

J. D. M. FORD.

*Harvard University.*

## *TENNYSON'S USE OF 'SS' IN BLANK VERSE.*

TENNYSON is quoted by his son as having said, "I never put two 'ss' together in any verse of mine." A writer in the March *Scribner's Monthly* has an interesting study of this feature of the poet's art, in which he cites several instances where "Homer was nodding." I was interested enough to count the instances, in *six* of the *Idylls of the King*, and found *ss* used fifty-two times. This fact causes one to inquire, what did this greatest master of the art of poetry in the nineteenth century mean by "*never*"? Is not an author the best critic of his own work? However, Thomas Wentworth Higginson once wrote me that, after many years of literary study, he was not able to decide as to his best writings. That Tennyson *knew* whether or not it was *his usage* to put *ss* together, all students are inclined to admit; that he was not in his dotage and for a time forgot his method, all believe; that his poetic ear was so delicate as to appreciate, to the fullest extent, the subtle power of every English sound, his best critics aver. Where

24 *L. c.*, p. 155.

25 *L. c.*, p. 127. Lidforss has corrected the form to *estaua*.

26 Gassner, p. 157. It is seen that the conjugaton of STARE is defective in the *Cid*. SEDERE performs the functions of STARE in the fut., vv. 2502, 2162; in the cond., v. 3018; in the imper., v. 1652; in the pres. subj., v. 1287; in the impf., subj. v. 1787.

then can be found an explanation of this apparent inconsistency ?

I asked a Professor of English Literature, whose scholarly studies of Tennyson's art are well-known, how he would reconcile the two. His reply was to the effect that the *son must be mistaken* as to the purport of what his father said ; for it was impossible to believe that Tennyson was not fully aware of the laws of artistic poetry, and that such a poet selected the best sound to express his exact meaning. I am certain that Tennyson used the *ss* purposely, and because these sounds expressed the finest shade of meaning. However, it is not surprising that poets differ in regard to the laws of their art ; they have as much right to disagree as doctors. William Dwight Whitney says in his lecture on "The Origin of Language,"

"We must beware of approximating in any degree to that wildest and most absurd of the many vagaries respecting language, the doctrine of the natural and inherent significance of articulate sounds."

Yet Dr. Tolman, of the University of Chicago, in a scholarly study of "The Expressive Power of English Sounds," published in the *Atlantic Monthly*, for April 1895, says,

"I believe that every English sound has some special expressive force. Also, since a sound may have many striking characteristics, it may have more than one natural expression."

I made a comparative study of Tennyson's use of *ss* and Milton's and Matthew Arnold's. The results are interesting. It will be noticed that Matthew Arnold uses the *ss* most frequently, sometimes twice in the same verse.

From the *Idylls of the King*.

Instances where two *ss* are put together.

In *Launcelot and Elaine*.

In verses 196, 202, 343, 344, 448, 576, 590, 720, 735, 831, 971, 1002, 1008, 1096, 1314, 1399. A total of sixteen times in fourteen hundred and eighteen verses.

In *The Holy Grail*.

In verses 78, 97, 152, 162, 311, 508, 547, 551, 559, 561, 593, 675, 713. A total of thirteen times in nine hundred and sixteen verses.

In *Pelleas and Ettarre*.

In verses 432, 433, 462. A total of three times in five hundred and ninety-seven verses.

In *The Last Tournament*.

In verses 42, 46, 181, 223, 326. A total of five times in seven hundred and fifty-six verses.

In *Guinevere*.

In verses 78, 129, 175, 290, 300, 335, 348, 435, 510, 540, 570. A total of eleven times in six hundred and ninety-two verses.

In *The Passing of Arthur*.

In verses 265, 271, 273, 342. A total of four times in four hundred and sixty-nine verses.

From *Milton's Paradise Lost*.

Instances where two *ss* are put together.

In Book i. In verses 13, 78, 176, 205, 206, 207, 246, 287, 339, 344, 388, 406, 472, 479, 495, 513, 572, 630, 641, 685, 705, 712, 754. A total of twenty-three times in seven hundred and ninety-eight verses.

In Book ii. In verses 33, 101, 154, 164, 291, 417, 466, 632, 678, 692, 844, 871, 1011, 1046. A total of fourteen times in ten hundred and fifty-five verses.

From Arnold's *Sohrab and Rustum*.

Instances where two *ss* are put together.

In verses 2, 8, 29, 92, 97, 99, 100, 103, 143, 144, 146, 234, 266, 315, 317, 319, 332, 340, 376(2), 377, 387, 399, 406, 415, 422, 425, 440, 450, 462, 471, 489, 495, 496, 505, 508, 520, 524, 538, 559, 572, 601, 605, 613, 616, 638, 644, 648, 653, 668, 669, 676, 678, 683, 688, 696, 703, 704(2), 715, 716, 718, 725, 728, 765, 792, 839, 864, 874, 882, 884. A total of seventy-one times in eight hundred and ninety-two verses.

From *Balder Dead*.

In Part i, in verses 13, 17, 41, 125, 148, 159, 227, 235, 289, 323. In Part ii, in verses 43, 68, 75, 132, 215, 280, 288, 289, 301, 331. In Part iii, in verses 14, 146, 151, 158, 161, 193, 224, 270, 273, 313, 314, 339, 357, 429, 432, 437, 456, 467, 469, 478, 529, 530. A total of forty-two times in eleven hundred and eighty-four verses.

VIOLA PRICE FRANKLIN.

*Lincoln, Neb.*

## *SCHLUTTER'S OLD-ENGLISH ETYMOLOGIES.*

FOR sometime past O. B. Schlutter has been filling page upon page of various philological publications with his so-called explanations of Old English word-forms. His remarks are usually in the vein of savage criticism directed at Hall's *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, Sweet's

*Dictionary*, and Sweet's *Old English Texts*. I have not been able to examine critically all Schlutter's papers; only the following, MOD. LANG. NOTES, June, 1896, November and December, 1896, May, 1898; *Anglia* xix, 101–116. These are quite enough, however, for judging Schlutter's method.

For the reader's convenience, I make the following introductory explanation. I=NOTES, June, 1896. II=NOTES, November, 1896. III=NOTES, May, 1898. IV=*Anglia*, xix. Under each of these headings, the special references are to *columns* (in the case of the *Anglia*, to *pages*).

I.

1. Col. 322: "There is no documentary evidence justifying such an entry as [Hall's] *eorðcrypel*, 'earth-creeper,' 'paralytic, palsied man;' it is simply an invention of Mr. Sweet, etc." Identical with this is Schlutter's utterance, *Anglia* xix, 102: "Vollständig aus der Luft gegriffen ist der ansatz *eorðcrypel*, 'paralytic' (*O.E.T.* p. 574 *a*)."

Indeed! What becomes, then, of the Lindisfarne entries in Cook's *Glossary;* of the Rushworth entries in the Bosworth-Toller? Whether Sweet was justified in his interpretation of *applare*, *eorscripel*, *Corpus* 187, is a question apart from this paper; I am neither attacking nor defending Sweet, but merely demonstrating the tenuity of Schlutter's knowledge.

2. Col. 326: *helpendbær*, "a word for which there is no documentary evidence, but which is only a bad conjecture of Wülker for *helpendrap*, which he did not understand, as pointed out by Sievers." What Sievers really said (*E. Stud.* viii, 159; the reference is not given by Schlutter) is:

"Ein *helpendbær* ist nicht überliefert (müsste auch *-bære* heissen), aber von Junius-Lye für unsere Stelle conjicirt und ist von da aus den üblichen Weg über Bosworth zu Wülcker gegangen."

3. Col. 327: *de scurris=of ðelum*, in correction of Wülker-Wright, 385/3. Schlutter actually claims this for himself; see also NOTES, May, 1898, col. 299:

"I have previously shown in this journal that *descurris hofðelum* is contraction of *de scurris of ðelum*. I am now also able to point out the passage to which the gloss refers. It is . . . ii Reg. 6.20."

This is assuredly strong. Anyone might have read, in 1891, in *Anglia* xiii, 322, these words, by Sievers, upon the Cleopatra glosses: "Ausserdem sind glossen zum alten testament, einerseits zu den büchern der Könige, andererseits zum Pentateuch, excerpiert." Further, p. 326: "[Wülker-Wright] 385/3 *Descurris: hofðelum;* lies *De scurris: [h]of ðelum* (= *pylum*)."

4. Col. 328: The interpretation of Wülker-Wright 403/21: *fiscalis rædegafellicum*, is also taken bodily from Sievers, *Anglia* xiii, 327, without a word of acknowledgement! And again in NOTES, May, 1898, col. 299! Will Schlutter also claim for himself the tracing of the gloss to Sulpicius Severus?

5. Col. 329: *per cola þurh sticceo*, Wülker-Wright 487/16. Another 'loan' from Sievers, *E. Stud.* viii, 161.

6. Col. 330, note 20. Here Schlutter, left to his own devices, actually confounds the well-known *wæl* 'slaughter, bodies of the slain,' with *wōl* 'pestilence,' as used in *Orosius* (34/15; I have supplied the reference).

7. Cols. 331, 332; also *Anglia* xix, 105. Here Schlutter undertakes to explain *hālstan*, *healstan*, *helsta*, *-hylsten*. This explanation I am unable to follow. He seems to regard the *h*-forms as parasitic for *āl-* 'fire.' If so, I wish him joy. As an old Philadelphian, however, I must rebel against the note to *Anglia* xix, 106: "So spricht man auch in Philadelphia von 'sauern flecken (kutteln)' als 'peppery pot.'" The Philadelphia street-cry is "Pepper pot, Smoking hot," and means a potage containing a generous amount of red peppers.

8. Cols. 333, 334. The explanations here given of *heg-þresi* (repeated *Anglia* xix, 104) and of *lesca* are another 'loan,' this time from Steinmeyer, *Zs. f. deut. Alterthum*, xxxiii, 244, note 1,

9. Col. 344, note 26. What does Schlutter mean by "Here belongs also, I believe, the *iesne ł ðea=servus* of Prolog. Matt. North. Gosp. Matt., 19, 22?" Where is such a passage to be found? And why the "here"? Surely Schlutter would not have us connect *iesen*, 'kidney, intestine,' with *esne* 'servant.' Yet apparently he does! For, *Anglia* xix,

103, he puts in line *ieseu* and *esue*, explaining the letter as meaning originally *virilia*, *pubes*. Perhaps I am not up to date, for I have always regarded *esue* as the Gothic *asueis*, which Uhlenbeck connects with Gothic *asans* 'erntezeit.'

II.

1. Col. 409: "a past participle noun, formed by means of the suffix *-si* (*-se*), much in the manner as *to-ðouden-se*, 'swelling' (which Hall exhibits as *toðoudeure* 'tumore') occurring in the *De Consuetudine Mouachorum* (*Anglia* xiii, 1084)."

Why this ungracious fling at Hall, as if he had tampered with his text? Logemann prints *tumore inflatus to þoudenre to blawen*, without comment, and the Bosworth-Toller prints it as a participial form under *to-þindau*. Evidently it is nothing more than the p. p. fem. dat., agreeing with the preceding *ofermōdignysse*. Further, I would ask Schlutter where he gets his *-se* suffix in O.E.? A glance at Kluge, *Stammbildungslehre* §§ 46, 47, ought to convince him that *-se* is Netherlandish, not English!

2. Col. 410. The elucidation of *fahame* 'flour' as identical with *fām* 'foam' (the whole is iterated *Anglia* xix, 111, 112) seems to me a *locus classicus*. How to etymologize *fahame*, I admit frankly that I do not know; but that it has nothing to do with *fām*, I am quite certain. Has Schlutter, a born German, never heard of *feim*, M. H. G. *veim*, or noted Brugmann's **spoi̯-mā*, Lat. *spūma*, O.H.G. *feim* (ii, pp. 140, 164, first ed.)? Further, I would ask him where he gets his *fawjan* 'to winnow,' outside of Schade's dictionary, and how a hypothetical **fawjáu* could by any possibility yield O.E *faha-me?* Let him construct the intermediate links in this marvelous chain of evolution.

3. Col. 410: "read therefore [Wülker-Wright 122/39; Schlutter misprints 129/39] *earede fæt*, as already pointed out by Sievers." Sievers has done much for the clearing-up of these glossaries; still, *suum cuique!* This particular ray of light came, not from Sievers, but from Kluge, *Anglia* viii, 450.

4. Col. 413, note 43; also *Anglia* xix, 108. Why should we be asked to change *wudumer*, *wydumer* 'echo' to *wiðermer*, in analogy to the German *widerhall?* Is *-mer* 'sound'? Is Schlutter ignorant of the fact that the earlier form of *wudu* is *widu?* The *wydumer* in the *Erfurt Gloss* is parallel with *Sealwyda* in *Chronicle* (A) 878, Earle, p. 80. The etymology *wudumær uympha sylvestris* was good enough for Grimm, *Mythology* iii, 128.

5. Col. 414: *iuuihte*, Wülker-Wright 450/21, Schlutter would emend to *iucnihte*. But *iucuiht* 'cliens,' 'retainer,' is scarcely the proper gloss for *municipales;* much better is the change proposed by Sievers, *Anglia* xiii, 330: "*in rihte* oder *iurihte*."

6. Cols. 414, 415. The emendation of *uuderumete* to *under mete*, Wülker-Wright 479/3, belongs to Sievers, *Anglia* xiii, 330; his name is not mentioned.

7. Col. 415. Schlutter's proposal to change *to wermete* to *to wæstme*, Wülker-Wright 479/23 (also 353/31?) is gratuitous and preposterous. The word is obviously *wer-met(e)*, and is properly defined in the Bosworth-Toller with 'a man's measure.'

8. Col. 415: "*gripu*, sf., 'kettle, caldron,' which Hall took from Leo's dictionary without giving due credit for it." Indeed! How does Schlutter *know* that Hall took the word from Leo? Did not Leo himself take it from Grein? Is one under perpetual obligation to mention such a standard source? As for Schlutter's attempt to change *gripu* into *griþu* on the strength of Danish *gryde*, it is enough to say that the Danish *gryde*=Swedish *gryta*=Icelandic *grýta*, hence the Danish *d* is for intervocalic *t* and is not for Germanic *þ*.

9. Cols. 415–418. Another dreary waste of words, through which I am unable to see my way. What can Schlutter mean by changing *bōgas* 'boughs' to *hogas*, then equating with *hōcas* 'hooks.' Besides, is *lēac* 'leek' a "climbing plant" (col. 417)? Must *crop* (col. 416, note 48) be emended to *cnop?* I fear that Schlutter knows not Chaucer's "tender croppës."

10. Col. 419: "*gecwis*, I dare say, is a noun formed from the root *cweð-*, *cwið-*, in the same manner as *æs* from *æt-ti*, etc." Is there any doubt that *cwis(s)* is from *cweþ-ti-*, or rather from *qet-ti-*? See Kögel, *P. B. Beiträge* vii, 178. By the way, where does Schlutter get his "root" *cwið-*?

III.

1. Cols. 294, 295: "Sweet . . . gives us no

hint of the fact that there are only two glosses to vouch for the existence of the word itself [*ācdrenc*]." Of course Sweet gives no such hint, for the all-sufficient reason that the two glosses in question are *not* the only vouchers for the existence of the word. If Schlutter will turn to *Leechdoms* iii, 292/23, he may read: "wiđ raucka. Nim atena gratan 7 unflid 7 acdrenc god togedra," translated by Cockayne: "For hreaking. Take groats of oats and sour cream and good oakdrink together." I suspect that *god* is a scribal error for *ğdo*, that is, *gedō*, and that we are to translate ". . . and oakdrink; put (them) together." At any rate Schlutter's emendation to (*h*)*āt drenc*, or *ātrdrenc*, will not fit into this passage.

2. Col. 295. Will Schlutter give the *intermediate* steps by which *agleddę go* may be constructed into *aględdigan*, 'to cause to glide (*glīdan*)? I do not say that he is wrong; but I should like to see him demonstrate that he is right.

3. Col. 296. Schlutter's remarks upon *galmulam. molegnstycci* are to me wholly unintelligible, quite as bewildering as Sweet's 'piece of curd.' The word *molegn* is good Old English, the modern 'mullein'; see Skeat, *Etym. Dict.*, and Cockayne, *Leech.* iii, 339 *a*. The *-sty*[*cci*], *Corpus* 953 offers some difficulty; why should one speak of 'mullen-piece,' instead of 'mullein-stalk'? Possibly *stycci* was originally the gloss for another word. At all events, Schlutter's evolution *κλάσμα μύλου>clasma mylu>calsmamilu>galmalum* will scarcely pass among Latinists. See Nettleship, (Cambridge) *Jour. of Phil.* xiii, 262: *galmum*, *galmula*, *galmilla*. In Osbern (*Panormia*) p. 262, *galmula* is glossed as=*herba illa quae similis est porro:* in the *Epinal Glossary* we have *galmum molegn; galmilla limmolegn.*" In other words, Nettleship accepted *galmum galmilla* as Latin without any *salto mortale* to *clasma*.

4. Cols. 296–298. I take back what I said a while ago; *this* is the *locus classicus*. Here we get, in rare confusion, *ām*, an iron instrument of some sort (conceived as (*h*)*ām*), *ōm* 'mildew,' Icelandic *eimr* 'ashes' ("which may stand for (*h*)*eimr*")—as if Icelandic were given to murdering its 'haitches,'—the familiar verb *a-mérian*, and *hāma* 'womb.' Truly, one knows not whither to turn in this confusion of wealth. Noreen, *Abriss*, pp. 95, 134 explains the Icelandic form *eim-yria*, 'heisse Asche,' as *eim* and *yria*, earlier *ysia;* O.H.G. *eimuria*, O.E. *ǣmerge* 'embers.' Yet, forsooth, this consensus of English, German, Scandinavian forms without *h-* we must garnish with *h-*, in order to bring the whole into line with *καμάρα*, *κάμινος*. Schlutter's view of *ōm*, 'mildew, rust,' as=*ām*, is flatly untenable; *ō* here is Germanic *ē*, Sievers § 68. The word is never written *ām* in English texts, to the best of my knowledge, but usually *óm*, *ómm*, and *oom*. Schlutter corrects Sweet for making *brondoom Corp.* 1757 "a compound out of what the glossator surely wished to be kept separate." This is contrary to Napier, *Academy*, Aug. 24, 1889, p. 119, who explains the compound as "rust produced by burning, the so-called hammer-or smithy-scales." But there is worse yet in this *locus classicus*. *Elene* 1310, 1311:

Þurh ofnes fyr eall geclæ̆nsod,
amered and gemylted: swā bið þāra manna
æ̆lc, etc.

with the alliteration unmistakably on *m*, Schlutter would drag into deadly parallel with *æ̆merge*, *æ̆myrge*, 'embers,' the accent on *æ̆m-*! In other words, he does not know the verb *mérian*, *a-mérian*, 'to test, purify,' discussed years ago by Paul, *P.B.B.* vi, 66, Sievers *P. B.B.* ix, 287 and § 400 Anm. 1. What is he going to do with such texts as *examinasti, þu ameredest Blick. Gl.* 253 *b; igne examinatum, fyre amearad Ps. Vesp.* 11/7; *igne examinatur, mid fyre bið amearad Ps. Vesp.* 65/10? The uncompounded *mergan*, *merian*, *Sol. and Sat.* 55, was duly recorded in Grein. Can he not see that the idea of burning is contained in the accompanying *igne*, *mid fyre?* On the other hand, what are we to think of a critic who is unable to scan a simple line in the *Elene?*

5. Col. 299: "Sweet should not have explained *cofa* as meaning chamber, nor *cofincel* . . . as meaning little chamber." I commend to Schlutter's consideration: *in cubilibus regum, on cyninga cofum, Ps.* Thorpe, civ, 26; *ðā wæs culufre eft of cofan sended, Genesis* 1464. Was Noah's dove sent from the bake-oven?

6. Col. 299: "Is *cirice-rān* 'church robbery' quoted in Sweet's *Dictionary* an actual word?" Then follows the conjecture that *on cyric renan*, Wilkins *Leg. An. S.* p. 122, may be a clerical slip for *on cyricreaū=on cyricreafum*. Alas, why, in this year of grace 1898, lean upon the antiquated Wilkins! A glance at Schmid, pp. 545, 643, would have taught our critic that *rān* 'rapina' is genuine, a Danish loan. See Vigfusson, *Icel. Dict.;* also Lund, *Ordbog til de gamle danske Landskabslove*.

7. Col. 302. Schlutter propounds the naïve question: "Now, cannot *afor* later on have developed to *æfre*, *efre?*" Merely adding that the word in question is *āfor* 'biting,' O. H.G. *eibar*, Sievers *P.B.B.* v, 71, anm. 4, I leave the answer to the reader.

8. Col. 302. Schlutter rejects Sweet's *hlos(e)* 'sheepfold,' which he evidently supposes to rest solely upon the authority of *Corp.* I advise him to consider *Gerefa*, *Anglia* ix, 261 [x]: *scipena behweorfan and hlosan eac swa*, and especially Napier, *Crawford Charters* p. 70, note 48.

## IV.

1. P. 102. Schlutter's language in discussing Sweet's *cōc* 'cook' is distressingly ambiguous. If it is merely an argument against Sweet's interpretation of *Corp.* 620, *Erf.* 287, doubtless the objection is well taken. But if Schlutter means, and apparently he does, that *cōc* 'cook' is not found in O.E., he is in flat error. See *koka*, *Past.* 311/5, 6, 11; Wülker-Wright 98/12 (*Ælfr. Coll.*); *Ælfr. Gr.* 316/3, and the word 'cook' in Murray.

2. P. 105, note 2: "*leip*=ags. *hlaf* wird ja mit *κλίβανος* in etymologischen zusammenhang gebracht." Not by any authority known to me; see the long discussion of Gothic *hlaifs* in Uhlenbeck.

3. P. 106: "Es ist klar, dass wir es in *orceas* [*Corp.* 1080] mit einem adjektiv zu thun haben, dessen *or-* dem *in* and *ceas* dem *-mnnes* entspricht." Undoubtedly it is clear; but Schlutter should have had the gratitude to credit his clearness of insight to Zupitza's note in the *Academy*, July 7, 1888, p. 11.

4. P. 107, Why should the diminutive of *pund* be *pyntel?* English is not German in confounding *d* and *t*. The word *pyntel* is not connected with *pund*. Leo's explanation, 209, is the most acceptable so far; though possibly *pyntel* may be a scribal slip for *pyncel*.

5. P. 108. Here Schlutter treats *wēas* 'by chance' as "mehr als zweifelhaft." Let him consider *Past.* 198/22, Cosijn i §62, and the Bosworth-Toller.

6. P. 109: "Sollte . . . *efesian* eine ableitung von *efen* 'eben' sein?" No! See the verb in the Bosworth-Toller, and the noun "eaves" in Murray-Bradley, or Sievers *P.B.B.* ix, 211, §93, 1, Johansson, *P.B.B.* xv, 239.

7. P. 109. Schlutter is uncertain as to the existence of Sweet's *fin* 'heap.' His scruples will be removed by the following texts: *of ðære fine Chart.* Birch no. 378 p. 518/41; *on cynges limfine*, ib.; *strue* (congerie), *wudufine Haupt Gl.* 464 *a* /30 (see also *wudu-fin* in the Bosworth-Toller).

8. Pp. 110, 111. Here we are invited to change the well authenticated form *þōden* 'whirlwind' to *wōden*, because "überall die *rabies venti* ausgedrückt werden soll!" Is the *ðodne*, *ðodene* of *Past.* (128) 129/17, the *turbo ðoden* of *Ælfr. Gr.* 37/10, thus to be tinkered? See Bosworth-Toller.

9. P. 112. In addition to the confusion of *fahame* 'flour' and *fām* 'foam,' already discussed II no. 2, Schlutter actually considers *smeodoma* 'fine flour' (the *eo* is evidently a breaking of *ĕ*) as formed from the participle of the weak verb *smēagean* (note the *ēa*) by means of the suffix *-ma!*

10. P. 114. Where would Schlutter get his *heahðu?* Germanic **hauhiþā* yields O.E. *hiehðu* or *hēhðu*, according to dialect. A *hē(a)hðu* is possible only in a late text whose scribe had lost the distinction between *ē* and *ēa;* scarcely in the tenth-century Ms. Harl. 3376.

11. P. 115: "*O.E.T.* p. 566 *a* folgert Sweet ein *byrde* aj. 'of high rank' aus *Erf.* 1153 *byrdistrae*, etc." Sweet did nothing of the sort! As editor of the *Orosius* he was familiar with the phrase *se byrdesta* 18/19 (Ohthere's Narrative, which he introduced in the first ed. of his *Reader*, 1876). Sweet is undoubtedly wrong in his treatment of *Erf.* 1153, "but that is another story." Schlutter's connection of *bred* 'brett' with *b(r)yrd* 'point' is plainly untenable. To his remark: "Wenn aber der

glossator die masculinform *bractearius* durch die femininform *byrdistrae*='brettlerin' wiedergab," I would answer that in O.E. the termination *-estre* is by no means restricted to women, see Kluge, *Stammbildung*, § 50.

12. P. 116, note. Schlutter's attempt to connect *b(r)yrd* 'point' with *beard* 'beard,' is—to quote his own expression—"vollständig aus der Luft gegriffen." Why waste paper and printer's ink upon such a chimera? Surely no scholar is likely to admit that the Icelandic language has retained the *r* after the *b* in *broddr* and dropped it in *-barðr*, *borð*.

I have discussed only four of Schlutter's papers, and even these four I have not exhausted; several other papers I have left untouched, life being too short for everything. The conscientious reader may decide for himself whether this self-constituted judge possesses the primary qualifications for such an office. My own utterance would be: What is good in these papers is not new; what is new is not good.

There remain at least two moral obliquities to be noticed.

First, why has Schlutter, studiously it would seem, withheld the names of the real scholars from whom he got his only tenable views?

Second, why this *sæva indignatio* against Sweet? Easy enough it is to condemn Sweet's perversity of method. For example, the so-called Glossary to his *O.E.T.* is the most exasperating composition known to me; it is wrongly conceived and badly executed. Still, after all that we may say, we are forced to exclaim: What would be our knowledge of Old English without Sweet's untiring and unselfish labors? When a veteran editor like Steinmeyer rises in his wrath, *Zs. f. deut. Alt.* xxxiii, 248 note, and bitterly upbraids Sweet for ignoring the results of German scholarship, we feel that the wrath is both justified and tonic. But your indignation at second hand provokes the retort of the Erster Jäger to the Wachtmeister:

> Wie er räuspert und wie er spuckt,
> Das habt ihr ihm glücklich abgeguckt.

J. M. Hart.

*Cornell University.*

## *THE ETYMOLOGY OF BUTTRESS.*

In the *Oxford Dictionary* the etymology suggested for this word with its many readings is: "perh. a. O.F. *bouterez* nom. sing. (or pl.?) of *bouteret*, 'flying-buttress,' 'arc-boutant' (Godef.); app. f. *bouter* to push, bear against." Unfortunately one very important reading of the sixteenth century which might have helped to get at its etymon is omitted, namely, *botreulx*. The latter occurs in the title of a book by William Salesbury printed in 1550: *Battery of the Pope's Bottereulx, commonly called the High Altar* (St. Anthony à Wood), and in Higgins' edition of Huloet's dictionary, 1572: "botreulx or butrese of a bricke wall wrought for a helpe, or staye, or a proppe." These forms suggest a derivation from O.F. *boterel* which in addition to 'crapaud' has also the meaning of excrescence, 'pustule' (Godefroy); *bouteril* 'bouton, nombril' and *bouterelle* in the sense of 'bouterolle' are evidently variations of the same word. In the *Oxford Dictionary* is also given a word *buttrelle* (The meeres and buttrelles with whiche they desseuered theyr porcions of lande, 1546 Langley), to which the remark is attached: "? Mistake for Buttal." But it seems to be a variation of *buttress* according to the etymology which I suggest and probably means here 'a wall.' The relation of *buttress* to *bouterelle*, *bouterolle*, is the more probable when we consider the other meaning for *buttress* given in Minsheu: " F. Boutoir, L. Ferramentum concisorium," in which it entirely coincides with F. *bouterolle*.

L. Wiener.

*Harvard University.*

## *SPENSER'S SHORT SIMILES.*

No one is capable of making a fair literary estimate of Spenser until he has given particular attention to one abounding source of variety, vividness, and beauty. Spenser's use of the simile is so characteristic, and it plays so important a part in his poems that it is well worthy of a close examination. The conditions of the sixteenth century are clearly reflected in the similes of the *Faery Queen*. It is natural for a poet, appreciating the influence of the powerful events of his own time

upon the minds of the people, to refer to these events in illustrating points that he wishes to present in a forcible manner to his readers. Spenser's life coincides with the glorious reign of Elizabeth, when the Renaissance had reached the fullness of its development. There was an awakening of interest in Classical learning, an establishment of schools, and an increase of wealth and refinement. The restless curiosity of this age lead, not only to inventions, bnt also, to discoveries, exploration, and travel. The people were reading the descriptions of Indians, published by Americo Vespuccio, and narrations of the wonderful civilizations of Mexico and Peru, brought to light by Cortez and Pizarro. Travellers, on returning from voyages, gave marvelous accounts of the strange people and the abundance of gold and silver in the newly discovered country. In literature, the results of these adventures appeared in the publications of Hakluyt and others. This age was marked by the destruction of Catholic power and the establishment of Protestantism. Men were stirred by philosophical and theological writings. The translations from the Classical writers became more numerous. Essays, histories, stories, and dramas took a prominent place for the first time in literature.

The kind of education that a poet receives has a definite influence on the similes that he will use. Spenser's early education was received at the Merchant Taylor's School. He entered Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, as a sizar, in 1569. He received his degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1573, and that of Master of Arts in 1576. His character as an earnest student while at Cambridge is referred to by Camden in his *History of Queen Elizabeth;* by Sir James Ware, in his edition of Spenser's works; and by Fuller, in his *Worthies of England.* Spenser is believed to have gone to northern England both before and after finishing at Cambridge. He held various public offices in Ireland from 1580 to 1598. Among his contemporaries were Raleigh, Camden, Hooker, Sidney, Bacon, Shakspere, Lyly, and the Earl of Essex. Lancelot Andrews, Edmund Kirk, and Gabriel Harvey were his most intimate college friends. In 1579, during the time spent in Sidney's friendship, Spenser was brought into contact with the most brilliant society of his day and enjoyed court favor. We know definitely that he had begun his *Faery Queen* in 1580, three books of which were finished by 1589. Raleigh was so delighted with the new poem that he brought Spenser to England and presented him to the queen. In 1595, Spenser made his second visit to England for the purpose of publishing the second three books of the *Faery Queen.* On this visit to London, he was hospitably received by the Earl of Essex, who was then at the zenith of his fame. He probably returned to Ireland in 1597, where he remained until he was driven out by the rebellion.

In this essay I have attempted a broad treatment of Spenser's short similes—those ranging in length from three verses, to twenty-seven verses, and within the limits of the first and second books of the *Faery Queen.*

Spenser's similes on animals show that he did not escape the tainting influence of euphuism, so prevalent in his day. There are no fewer than thirty similes concerning animals alone. These are made more interesting by the great variety of animals used—the lion, boar, eagle, dog, bull, bear, gnat, fly, fowl, sheep, lamb, hawk, ram, hind, snake, falcon, tiger, bug, bittern, and the crocodile.

Spenser shows his euphuistic tendency in his fondness for the lion. I find as many as six uses of it. He compares a man crying out in pain to a roaring lion:

> "The cruell wound enraged so sore,
> That loud he yelled for exceeding pain;
> As hundred ramping Lyons seemed to rore,
> Whom ravenous hunger did thereto constraine."

(*F. Q.* I, xi, xxxvii, 1–4; and also I, x, xxvii, 8–9 and xxviii, 1–3.) The groaning of a spirit is compared to the moans of a lion (*F. Q.* II,i, xlii, 5–7). Spenser was fond of comparing men's prowess to that of a lion:

> "But Guyon, in the heat of all his strife,
> Was wary and closely did awayt
> Avauntage, whilest his foe did rage most rife:
> Sometimes athwart, sometimes he strook him strayt,
> And falsed oft his blowes t'illude him with such boyt.
> Like as a Lion, whose imperiall powre
> A prowd rebellious Unicorn defyes,
> T'avoide the rash assault and warthful stowre
> Of his fiers foe, him to a tree applyes,
> And when him ronning in full course he spyes,
> He slips aside; the whiles that furious beast

His precious horne, sought of his enimyes,
Strikes in the stocke, ne thence can be releast,
But to the mighty victor yields a bounteous feast."

(*F. Q.* II, v, ix, 5–9; x, 1–9.) The same simile is used in two other instances (*F. Q.* II, viii, xl, 5–9; and II, ix, xiv).

Homer was fond of such similes. In the *Iliad* we find forty; in the first two books of the *Faery Queen*, about two thirds as long as the *Iliad*, we find only six. Here as there it is used at the crisis of contests: cf. *F. Q.* I, xi, xxxvii, 1–4; II, v, ix, 5–9, and x, 1–9; I, viii, xl, 5–9; *Iliad*, iii, l. 22; v, l. 53; etc.).

The fact that Spenser was thoroughly converted to euphuism shows itself again in the predominance of the similes on wild animals over those on tame animals, and the remarkable number of different wild animals that he calls into service. Those on the lion have been cited above. He used the bear in two illustrations:

"So mightely the Briton Prince him rouzed
Out of his hold, and broke his caytive band;
And as a Beare, whom angry curres have touz'd,
Having off-shakt them and escapt their hands,
Becomes more fell, and all that him withstands
Treads down and overthrowes."

(*F. Q.* II, xi, xxxiii, 1–6.) The animal greed of men is compared to that of a bear and a tiger.

"But they, him spying, both with greedy forse
Attonce upon him ran, and him beset
With strokes of mortall steele without remorse,
And on his shield like yron sledges bet:
As when a Beare and Tygre, being met
In cruell fight on Lybricke Ocean wide,
Espye a traveiler with feet surbet,
Whom they in equall pray hope to divide,
They stint their strife and him assayle on everie side."

(*F. Q.* II, ii, xxii, 1–9.) Wishing to emphasize the long continued fight between Satyrane and the Pagan Knight, he compares it to the fight between two bores:

"So long they fight, and full revenge pursue,
That, fainting, each themselves to breathen lett,
And, ofte refreshed, battell oft renue.
As when two Bores, with rancling malice mett,
Their gory sides fresh bleeding fiercely frett;
Til breathless both themselves aside retire,
Where foming wrath their cruell tuskes they whett,
And trample th'earth, the whiles they may respire,
Then backe to fight againe, new breathed and entire."

(*F. Q.* I, vi, xliv, 1–9.) Spenser compares the deep moan of Amavia to the death groan of a hind (*F. Q.* II, i, xxxviii, 3-9). One of Spenser's most apt similes is concerning a hawk:

"Long he them bore above the subject plaine,
So far as Ewghen bow a shaft may send,
Till struggling strong did him at last constraine
To let them downe before his flightes end:
As hagard hawke, presuming to contend
With hardy fowle above his hable might,
His weary pounces all in vaine doth spend
To trusse the pray too heavy for his flight;
Which, comming down to ground, does free itselfe by flight."

(*F. Q.* I. xi, xix, 1–9.) The snake is used in only one instance by Spenser. (*F. Q.* II, v, xxxiv, 1–3.) One of Spenser's strongest similes is that in which he uses the bittern and eagle:

"Nought booted it the Paynim then to strive;
For as a Bittur in the Eagles clawe,
That may not hope by flight to scape alive,
Still waytes for death with dread and trembling aw;
So he, now subject to the victours low,
Did not once move, nor upward cast his eye,
For vile disdaine and rancour, which did gnaw
His hart in twaine with sad melancholy."

(*F. Q.* II, viii, l, 1–8.) This illustrates Spenser's habit of taking two things together and comparing them with two other things taken together, (cf. *F. Q.* I, vi, xliv, 1–9; I, xi, xix, 1–9; II, xi, xxxiii, 1–6; II. v, ix, 5–9; and x, 1–9; etc.).

Of all the wild animals, Spenser uses the eagle more than any except the lion. The nobleness and prowess of the lion and eagle are peculiarly suggestive to him. By his frequent use of these animals, he shows how strongly he has been drawn into the current of euphuism (cf. similes on the lion, on the bittern, *F. Q.* I, xi, ix, 1–9, and the following).

"At last she saw where he upstarted brave
Out of the well, wherein he drenched lay:
As Eagle, fresh out of the ocean wave,
Where he hath lefte his plumes all hory gray,
And deckt himselfe with fethers youthy gay,
Like Eyas hauke up mounts unto the skies,
His newly-budded pineons to assay,
And marveiles at himselfe stil as he flies:
So new this new-borne knight to battell now did rise."

(*F. Q.* I, xi xxxiv, 1–9.) There seem to me to be two things that are noteworthy in this simile besides that for which I have quoted it. It is a double simile of the character so common in Homer (cf. *Iliad*, xviii, l. 207, etc.) and affected by Spenser here and elswhere (cf. *F. Q.* II, ix, xv, 6–9; and xvi, 1–9; I, xi, viii, 1–9; ix, 1–9; etc.). This is a comparison of two things and an addition of details to the second

which have no direct bearing on the first comparison. Spenser's comparison of the knight to an eagle rising from the ocean wave has a striking resemblance to Homer's frequent comparison of a goddess to a water-hen rising from the ocean wave, (cf. *Od.* v, l. 337, etc.). Spenser uses the bull in only one simile (*F. Q.* II, viii, xli, 1–9; xlii, 1–9).

Of the falcon he says,

> "Eft fierce retourning, as a falcon fayre,
> That once hath failed of her souse full neare,
> Remounts again into the open ayre,
> And unto better fortune doth her selfe prepayre.
>
> "So brave returning, with his brandisht blade
> He to the Carle him selfe agayn addrest."

(*F. Q.* II, xi, xxxvi, 6–9, and xxxvii, 1–2.) The confidence with which Spenser speakes of the practice of falconry here and in the simile on the fowl (cf. *F. Q.* II, iii, xxxv, 6–9; xxxvi, 1–9; xxxvii, 1–2) is sufficient evidence of its great popularity in Spenser's time. The mock simile on a wild fowl and a hawk bears the distinct stamp of euphuism:

> "She staid: with that he crauld out of his nest,
> Forth creeping on his caitive hands and thies;
> And, standing stoutly up, his lofty crest
> Did fiercely shake, and rauze as comming late from rest.
>
> As fearful fowle, that long in secret cave
> For dread of sorlng hauke her selfe hath hid,
> Nor caring how, her silly life to save,
> She her gay painted plumes disorderid:
> Seeing at last her selfe from danger rid,
> Peepes forth, and soone renews her nature pride:
> She gins her feathers fowle disfigured
> Prowdly to prune, and sett on every slde;
> She shakes off shame, ne thinks howerst she did her hide.
>
> So when her goodly visage he beheld,
> He gan himself to vaunt."

(*F. Q.* II, iii, xxxv, 6–9; xxxvi, 1–9; xxxvii. 1–2.) Even in the *Faery Queen*, a poem foreign in its very nature to pastoral poetry, we find evidence of Spenser's tendency to write this kind of poetry in his similes on common animals. We must not, however, loose the thread of euphuism running through these as well as the similes on wild animals. Spenser's similes on the dog remind us of his *Sheapheards Calender*:

> "Streight gan he him revyle, and bitter rate,
> As Shepheardes curre, that in darke evenings shade
> Hath tracted forth some salvage beastes trode."

(*F. Q.* II, vi, xxxix, 3–5). There are two other similes on the dog—one on mad dogs (*F. Q.* II, xi, xlvi, 9; xlvii, 1–2), and one on curs (*F. Q.* II, xi, xxxiii, 1–6). The similes on the gnat give further proof of Spenser's pastoral tendencies:

> "She poured forth out of her hellish sinke
> Her fruitful cursed spawne of serpents small,
> Deformed monsters, fowle, and blacke as inke,
> Which swarming all about his legs did crall,
> And him encombred sore, but could not hurt at all.
>
> As gentle shepheard in sweete eventide,
> When ruddy Phebus gins to welke in west,
> High on an hill, his flocke to vewen wide,
> Markes which doe byte their hasty supper best;
> A cloud of cumbrous gnattes doe him molest,
> All striving to infixe their feeble stinges,
> That from their noyance he no where can rest;
> But with his clownish hands their tender wings
> He brusheth oft, and oft, doth mor their murmurings."

(*F. Q.* I, i, xxii, 4–9; xxiii, 1–9, and *F. Q.* II, ix, xv, 6–9, and xvi, 1–9). Among the similes on common animals there is one on the fly or bee—Spenser used the same word for both insects (*F. Q.* I, i, xxxviii, 1–5). Another simile from pastoral life is that of the sheep:

> "For with such puissaunce and impetuous maine,
> Those Champions broke on them, that forst them fly,
> Like scattered sheepe, whenas the Shepherds swaine
> A Lion and a Tigre doth espye,
> With greedy pace forth rushing from the forest nye."

(*F. Q.* II, ix, xiv, 5–9). There is one simile on the lamb (*F. Q.* I, i, iv, 9; v, 1–2). The simile on the ram bears the distinct mark of euphuism (*F. Q.* I, ii, zv, 1–9; xvi, 1–9).

One of the chief characteristics of euphuism is the employment of a large number of similes drawn from the vegetable kingdom. Spenser makes an almond tree the subject of one of his similes:

> "Upon the top of all his loftie crest,
> A bounch of heares discolourd diversly,
> With sprincled pearle and gold full richly drest,
> Did shake, and seemd to daunce for jollity,
> Like to an almond tree ymounted hye
> On top of greene Selinis all alone,
> With blossoms brave bedecked daintily;
> Whose tender locks do tremble every one
> At everie little breath that under heaven is blowne."

(*F. Q.* I, vii, xxxii, 1–9). The mention of the almond tree in this particular way by Spenser is strong evidence that it was introduced into England for the first time in Spenser's day on account of its ornamental foliage. Spenser uses a tree in one other simile (cf. *F. Q.* I, viii, xxi, 1–9; xxii, 1–9). The branches and leaves of a tree are also referred to by Spenser.

> "Poore Orphan I in the wild world scattered,
> As budding braunch rent from the native tree,

And throwen forth, till it be withered.
Such is the state of men: Thus enter we
Into this life with woe, and end with miseree!"

(*F. Q.* II, ii, II, 5–9.), and

"Upon his shield their heaped hayle he bore,
And with his sword disperst the raskall flockes,
Which fled asouder, and him fell before;
As withered leaves drop from their dryed stockes,
When the wroth Western wind does reave their locks:
And underneath him his courageous steed,
The fierce Spumador, trode them downe like docks."

(*F. Q.* II, xi, xix, 1–7.) Spenser refers to flowers in a simile within the simile on Diana (cf. *F. Q.* I, xii, vi, 6–9). He compares Belphoebe's cheeks to roses:

"And in her cheekes the vermeill red did shew
Like roses in a bed of lillies shed,
The which ambrosiall odours from them threw,
And gazers sence with double pleasure fed,
Hable to heale the sicke, and to revive the ded."

(*F. Q.* II, iii, xxii, 5–9.)

By far the largest number of similes in the *Faery Queen*, drawn from anyone source are those derived by Spenser from classical mythology. They show Spenser's classic learning, in an indirect way, but are particularly noteworthy as furnishing conclusive evidence, by their pedantic modes of expression, that Spenser was converted to euphuism. No better example of his proneness to write this affected style can be found than in the eight instances in which he wishes to tell of the approach of morning or of the heat at midday. Instead of making use of simple poetic language, he describes the events in euphuistic terms almost as far-fetched as those used by Shakspere to ridicule euphuism (cf. *Hamlet*, III, ii, 165). The most characteristic of the similes on Phoebus are:

"At last the golden Orientall gate
Of greatest heaven gan to open fayre;
And Phoebus, fresh as brydegrome to his mate,
Came dauncing forth, shaking his deawie hayre.
And hurld his glistring beams through gloomy ayre."

(*F. Q.* I, v, II, 1–5.)

"But this good knight, soon as he them can spie,
For the coole shade him thither hastly got:
For golden Phoebus, now ymounted hie,
From fiery wheeles of his faire chariot
Hurled his beame so scorching cruell hot,
That living creature mote it not abide;
And his new Lady it endured not."

(*F. Q.* I, ii, xxix, 1–7; I, xii, ii, 1–6; I, iv, viii, 7–9; ix, 1–9; I, ii, i, 6–9; II, xi, iii, 1–4; I, i, xxxii, 6–9, xxxiii, 1–2; II, viii, v, 5–7; and I, i, xxiii, 1–4—a cross ref.). There are three similes used by Spenser in which the sun-god appears under the title of Titan (*F. Q.* II, xi, ix, 1–6; I, iv, viii, 1–8; I, ii, vii, 1–8; II, vii, xli, 1–9).

The same infection of euphuism noticed in the above similes is found in the similes referring to the lunar months. In these comparisons the reference is made to Phebe or Cynthia, the moon goddess:

"Now hath faire Phebe with her silver face
Thrice seene the shadowes of the neather world,
Sith last I left that honorable place,
In which her roiall presence is enrold;
Ne ever shall I rest in house nor hold,
Till I that false Acrasia have wonne."

(*F. Q.* II, ii, xliv, 1–6, and II, i, liii, 1–5.) Virgil is the source of the last simile. In two other similes Spenser refers to Diana or Phoebè as the huntress (*F. Q.* I, xii, vi, 6–9; vii, 1–9), etc. Jove is made the subject of one of Spenser's most classic similes (*F. Q.* I, viii, vii, 1–9; viii 1–9; ix, 1–9). There is one other simile on Jove (cf. *F. Q.* I, iv, xvii, 1–9). The *Faery Queen* contains only one simile on Juno:

"So forth she comes, and to her coche does clyme,
Adorned all with gold and girlonds gay.
That seemd as fresh as Flora in her prime;
And strove to match, in roiall rich array,
Greate Junoes golden chayre; the which they say,
The gods stand gazing on, when she does ride
To Joves high house through heavens braspaved way,
Drawne of fayre Pecocks, that excell in pride,
All full of Argus eyes their tayles dispredden wide."

(*F. Q.* I, iv, xvii, 1–9.) He uses the goddess, Flora, in a simile (*F. Q.* I, iv, xvii, 1–3), and the goddess of love, Venus (*F. Q.* I, ii, iv, 6–9). We have a distinct taint of euphuism in the two similes referring to Aurora, or Morning:

"Now when the rosy fingred Morning faire,
Weary of aged Tithones saffron bed,
Had spred her purple robe through deawy aire,
And the high hils Titon discovered,
The royall virgin shooke off drousy-hed;
And, rising forth out of her baser bowre,
Looked for her knight, who far away was fled,
And for her dwarfe, that wont to wait each howre:
Then gan she wail and weepe to see that woeful stowre."

(*F. Q.* ii, vii, 1–9.) The first verse of this simile bears a remarkable resemblance to one of Homer's favorite similes on Dawn:

"Ἦμος δ' ηριγένεια φάνη ροδοδάκτυλος Ἠώς," etc.

(Homer's *Od.* xii, 8; ix, 307, 152; viii, 1; v. 228; iv, 306; iii, 404; ii, 1.) Aurora is spoken of thus:

"Suddein upriseth from her stately place
The roiall Dame, and for her coche doth call:
All hurtlen forth; and she, with princely pace,
As faire Aurora in her purple pall
Out of the East the dawning day doth call.
So forth she comes; her brightnes brode doth blaze."

(*F. Q.* I, iv, xvi, 1–6.) Spenser uses a simile on Bacchus and the nymphs (*F. Q.* II, i, lv, 1–7), on Tithonus (*F. Q.* I, ii, vii, 1–9), and on Cupid (*F. Q.* II, viii, v, 1–9; vi, 1–9). The simile on Cupid gives us a very good insight into Spenser's knowledge of mythology and into his use of it in euphuism.

Spenser calls attention to the wanderings of Odysseus (*F. Q.* I, iii, xxi, 1–9), and to the labors of Hercules:

"Not that great Champion of the antique world,
Whom famous Poetes verse so much doth vaunt,
And hath for twelve huge labours high extold,
So many furies and sharpe fits did haunt.
When him the poysoned garment did enchaunt,
When Centaures blood and bloody verses charmed;
As did this knight twelve thousand dolours daunt,
Whom fyrie steede now burnt, that erst him armd;
That erst him goodly armd, now most of all him harmd."

(*F. Q.* I, xi, xxvii, 1–9.) Places of classic fame furnish Spenser with subjects for several interesting illustrations. Of the towers of Thebes and Troy he speaks as follows:

"That Turrets frame most admirable was,
Like highest heaven compassed around,
And lifted high above the earthly masse,
Which is survewd as hils doen lower grownd;
But not on ground mote like to this be found:
Not that, which antique Cadmus whylome built
In Thebes which Alexander did confound;
Nor that proud towre of Troy, though richly guilt,
From which young Hectors blood by cruell Greekes was spilt."

(*F. Q.* II. ix, xlv, 1–9.) Spenser gives us some important points in the mythological history of the Isle of Delos (*F. Q.* II, xii, xi. 1–9; xii, 1–9; xiii, 1–9). Mount Parnassus is spoken of in another simile (*F. Q.* I, x, liii, 1–9; liv, 1–9). Tartarus is described in terms very similar to those used by Homer (*F. Q.* II, xii, vi, 1–9). Spenser employs four similes from classic sources to indicate the time of day or night:

"At last faire Hesperus in highest skie
Had spent his lamp, and brought forth dawning light;
Then up he rose, and clad him hastily:
The dwarfe him brought his steed; so both away do fly."

(*F. Q.* I, ii, vi, 6–9.) The morning star (*F. Q.* I, xii, xxi, 5–9), and Orion (*F. Q.* II, ii, xlvi, 1–9) are made the subject of illustrations. The simile on the Northern wagoner and the North star is additional proof of Spenser's euphuistic tendency:

"By this the Northerne Wagoner had set
His sevenfold teme behind the steadfast starre
That was in Ocean wave yet never wet,
But firme is fixt, and sendeth light from farre
To al that in the wide deepe wandring arre;
And chearefull Chaunticlere with note shrill
Had warned once, that Phoebus fiery earre
In hast was climbing up the Easterne hill,
Full envious that night so long his roome did fill."

(*F. Q.* I, ii, i, 1–9.) Spenser's fondness for mythological subjects lead him to introduce into his similes some of the most fabulous animals created by the fertile imagination of the ancients. This style of simile is prevalent in euphuism. The animals used by Spenser are the eagle (cf. *F. Q.* II, xi, xlii, 7–9; xliii, 1–5), the unicorn (cf. II, v, ix, 5–9; x, 1–9; xi, 1–9), the gryfon (cf. I, v, viii, 1–9), and Cerberus. Spenser uses the often quoted simile on Cerberus:

Much was the man encombred with his hold,
In feare to lose his weapon in his paw,
Ne wist yett how his talaunts to unfold;
Nor harder was from Cerberus greedy jaw
To plucke a bone, then from his cruell claw
To reave by strength the griped gage away:
Thrise he assayd it from his foote to draw,
And thrise in vaine to draw it did assay;
It booted nought to thinke to robbe him of his pray."

(*F. Q.* I, xi, xli, 1–9.)

Homer and other ancient writers were very fond of using similes suggested by fire. Under the influence of euphuism, Spenser frequently made use of this kind of simile. The most illustrative of these are:

"The whiles the Prince, prickt with reprochful shame,
As one awakte out of long slombring shade,
Revivyng thought of glory and of fame,
United all his powres to purge himself from blame.
Like as a fire, the which in hollow cave
Hath long bene underkept and down suppresst,
With murmurous disdayne doth inly rave,
And grudge in so streight prison to be prest,
At last breakes forth with furious unrest,
And strives to mount unto his native seat;
All that did earst it hinder and molest,
Yt now devoures with flames and scorching heat,
And carries into smoake with rage and horror great.

So mightely, the Briton Prince him rouzd
Out of his holde, and broke his caytive bands,"

(*F. Q.* II, xi, xxxi, 6–9; xxxii, 1–9; xxxiii, 1–2)

and the simile alluding to sparks flying from an anvil (*F. Q.* I, xi, xlii, 1–7). Mount Aetna has been made the subject of legends by nearly every classic writer. The unusual activity of the volcano during the sixteenth century attracted the attention of learned men. Spenser makes it the subject of one of his similes (*F. Q.* I, xi, xliv, 1–9). A comparison is made between the eyes of a dragon and two beacon fires (*F. Q.* I, xi, xiv, 1–9).

The combined influence of the revival of Classic literature and the introduction of a style modelled on Lyly's *Euphues* was clearly seen in the above similes. The remaining similes reflect the progress of England in commerce, manufacturing, fisheries, explorations, and inventions.

One of the most remarkable characteristics of the *Faery Queen* is the large number of similes referring to the sea. The great maritime activity of the age lead Spenser to suppose that his readers were familiar with the sea, with ships and their parts, and with the recent explorations. The similes on mariners are:

"Shee has forgott how many a woeful stowre
For him she late endurd; she speakes no more
Of past: true is, that true love hath no powre
To looken backe; his eies be fixt before.
Before her stands her knight, for whom she toyld so sore

Much like, as when the beaten mariners,
That long hath wandred in Ocean wide,
Oft soust in swelling Tethys saltish teare;
And long time having tand his tawney hide
With blustring breath of Heaven, that none can bide,
And scorching flames of fierce Orions hound;
Soone as the post from far he has espide,
His chearful whistle merily doth sound,
And Nereus crownes with cups; his mates him pledg around.
Such joy made Una, when her knight she found."

(*F. Q.* I, iii, xxx, 5–9; xxxi, 1–9; xxxii, 1; I, xii, xlii, 1–9, and I, vi, I, 1–9.) The simile concerning the pilot is an excellent illustration of his knowledge of sea-faring (*F. Q.* II, vii, I, 1–9; II, 1–5). Among the four similes referring to the sea, there is one which is famous for the beauty of its rhythm:

"But still, when Guyon came to part their fight,
With heavie load on him they freshly gan to smight.
As a tall ship tossed in troublous seas,
Whom raging windes, threatning to make the pray
Of the rough rockes, doe diversly disease,
Meetes two contrarie billowes by the way,
That her on either side doe sore assay,
And boast to swallow her in greedy grave;
Shee, scorning both their spights, does make wide way,
And with her breast breaking the fomy wave;
Does ride on both their backs and faire her self, doth save.

So boldly he him beares, and rusheth forth
Between them both by conduct of his blade."

(*F. Q.* II, ii, xxiii, 8–9; xxiv, 1–9; xxv, 1–2.) The mercantile spirit of the age is seen in the following simile:

"And eke th'enchaunted joyous seemde no less
Than the glad merchant, that does vew from ground
His ship far come from watrie wildernesse;
He hurles out vowes, and Neptune oft doth blesse."

(*F. Q.* I, iii, xxxii, 2–5.) Spenser describes in nautical terms the entrance of a vessel into port:

"Behold! I see the haven nigh at hand
To which I meane my wearie course to bend;
Vere the maine shete, and beare up with the land
The which afore is fayrly to be kend,
And seemeth safe from storms that may offend;
There this fayre virgin wearie of her way
Must landed bee, now at her journeyes end;
There eke my feeble barke a while may stay,
Till mery wynd and weather call her thence away."

(*F. Q.* i, xii, I, 1–9.) He uses the weather-beaten vessel in simile (cf. *F. Q.* II, i, ii, 5–9) besides other vessels in two similes on mariners (cf. *F. Q.* I, vi, i, 1–9; and I, xii, xlii, 1–9). It is interesting to note the parts of a vessel used in similes by Spenser—main-yards, sails and pennons, and main sails:

"His flaggy wings, when forth he did display,
Were like two sayles, in which the hollow wynd
Is gathered full, and worketh speedy way:
And eke the pennes, that did his pineons bynd,
Were like mayne-yardes with flying canvas lynd."

(*F. Q.* I, xi, x, 1–5; and II, iii, xxx, 1–5.) Spenser speaks of the main-sheet in his simile on a vessel entering port (cf. *F. Q.* I, xii, i, 1–9), of sails in a simile referring to the Caspian Sea (cf. *F. Q.* II, viii, xiv, 1–5). The most conclusive evidence of maritime activity, and the restless desire for travel is shown in Spenser's similes on travels and travellers. It is evident that the Caspian Sea was one of the places visited by these early explorers:

"Long were to tell the troublous storms that tosse
The private state, and make the life unsweete:
Who swelling sayles in Caspian sea doth crosse,
And in frayle wood on Adrian Gulf doth fleet,
Doth not, I weene, so many evils meet."

(*F. Q.* II, vii, xiv, 1–5.) Another reference is made to the Caspian Sea by Spenser:

"Through hils and dales he speedy way did make,
Ne hedge ne ditch his readie passage brake;
And In hls flight the villein turn'd hls face
(As wonts the Tartar by Caspian lake,
Whenas the Russian hlm in fight does chace)
Unto hls Tygrestaile, and shot at him apace."

(*F. Q.* II. xi, xxvi, 4–9.) This simile is interesting from an historical point of view. It tells us of the advance the Russians were making against the Tartars along the Caspian Sea, just at the time that Spenser was writing his *Faery Queen*. He calls our attention to the peculiar mode of war-fare used by the barbarians. Xenophon describes this method of war-fare as having been used among the barbarians of Asia Minor. Two similes referring to the Nile give evidence of recent travel in that quarter:

"And all the while most heavenly melody
About the bed sweet musicke did divide,
Him to beguile of griefe and agony;
And all the while Duessa wept full bitterly.

As when a wearie traveiler, that strayes
By muddy shore of brood seven-mouthed Nile,
Unweeting of the perillous wandring wayes,
Doth meete a cruell craftre Crocodile,
Which, in false griefe hyding his harmefull guile,

Doth weepe full sore, and sheddeth tender teares;
The foolish man, that pities all this while
His mournefull plight, is swallowed up unwares,
Forgetfull of his owne that mindes anothers cares."

(*F. Q.* I, v, xvii, 6–9; xviii, 1–9; and I, i, xx, 9; xxi, 1–4.) This is another example of Spenser's mock-simile.

In answer to the criticisms on the reality of the Faery land, Spenser makes a short summary of the most important discoveries and explorations of his day:

"But let that man with better sence advize,
That of the world least part to us is red;
And daily how through hardy enterprize
Many great Regions are discovered,
Which to late age were never mentioned.
Who ever heard of th'Indian Peru?
Or who in venturous vessel measured
The Amazon huge river, now found trew?
Or fruitfullest Virginia who did ever vew?

Yet all these were, when no man did then know,
Yet have from wisest ages hidden beene."

(*F. Q.* II, Introd., ii, 1–9; iii, 1–2.) He uses a simile referring to a weary traveller (cf. *F. Q.* II, ii, xxiii, 1–4). The timidity still felt at this age for storms on the unknown seas, is implied by Spenser in two similes (*F. Q.* I, xi, xx, 9; xxi, 1–9; and II, viii, xlvii, 1–9). He tells us of the power of waves to wash a rocky cliff into the sea (*F. Q.* I, xi, liv, 5–8). An opportunity for making this observation was afforded him in his passage from England to Ireland. Spenser emphasizes the exaggerated terrors of the sea by employing a species of unnatural Natural Philosophy in which the existence of certain animals with peculiar characteristics is presumed in order to afford similes and illustrations (cf. *F. Q.* II, xii, xxii, 8–9; xxiii, 1–9; xxiv, 1–9; xxv, 1–9).

The similes referring to the implements of war show how well Spenser was in touch with the new conditions of his own day. He describes some newly invented war-like engine in the following terms:

"The Geaunt strooke so maynly mercilesse,
That could have overthrowne a stony towre;
And, were not hevenly grace that did him blesse,
He had beene pouldred all as thin as flowre,
But he was wary of that deadly stowre,
And lightly lept from underneath the hlow:
Yet so exceeding was the villeins powre,
That with the winde it did him overthrow,
And all his sences stound that still he lay full low."

"As when that divlish yron Engin, wrought
In deepest Hell, and framd by Furies skill,
With windy Nitre and quick Sulphur frought,
And round with bollet round, ordained to kill,
Conceiveth fyre, the heavens it doth fill
With thundring noyse, and all the ayre doth choke,
That none can breath, nor see, nor hear at will,
Through smouldry cloud of duskish stincking smoke;
That th'only breath him daunts, who hath escapt the stroke."

(*F. Q.* I, vii, xii, 1–9.) There is a simile referring to a castle besieged by engines of war (cf. *F. Q.* I, viii, xxii, 1–9; xxiii, 1–9). Spenser is evidently familiar with the new and strange warfare of the Indians:

"And in his hand a bended bow as seeme,
And many arrowes under his right side,
All deadly daungerous, all cruell keene,
Headed with flint, and fethers bloody dide;
Such as the Indians in their quivers hide."

(*F. Q.* II, xi, xxi, 1–5.) Another simile on the arrow is found within the simile on the hawk (cf. *F. Q.* I, xi, xix, 1–4). There is one interesting simile on armor (cf. *F. Q.* I, xi, ix, 1–9).

A large number of Spenser's similes cannot be conveniently classified, although they add important evidence in support of facts stated above. The simile referring to the theatre is suggestive of the interest exhibited in England for the new theatres that were being erected in Spenser's time:

"And now they nigh approched to the sted
Whereas those Mermayds dwelt: it was a still
And calmy bay, on th'one side sheltered
With the brode shadow of an hoorie hill;
On th'other side an high rocke tourned still,
That twixt them both a pleasaunt port they made,
And did like an halfe Theatre fulfill."

(*F. Q.* II, xii, xxx, 1–7.) The great popularity and influence of the Bible which marked the close of the sixteenth century is reflected in one of Spenser's similes:

"That done he leads him to the highest mount,
Such one as that same mighty man of God,
That blood-red billowes, like a walled front,
On either side disported with his rod,
Till that his army dry-foot through them yod,
Dwelt forty dais upon; where, writt in stone
With bloody letters by the hand of God,
The bitter doome of death and balefull mone
He did receive, whiles flashing fire about him shone:
Or like that sacred hill, whose head full hie,
Adorned with fruitfull Olives all around,
Is, as it were for endlesse memory
Of that deare Lord who oft thereon was fownd,
For even with a flowring girlond crownd."

(*F. Q.* I, x, liii, 1–9; liv, 1–5.)

Of the remaining similes there are four that show euphustic tendencies (*F. Q.* II, xi, xviii, 1–9; II, xi, xxix, 1–9, and xxx, 1–9; I, xi, viii, 1–9; II, i, xliii, 1–9). The other three are of little importance. One refers to friends (*F. Q.* I, x, lvi, 1–5), another to the loathing of a man for life and his disdain of death (*F. Q.* II, viii, i, 1–9), the third compares King Lear to the useless wick that has burned out in the oil. This though short is one of Spenser's most apt illustrations:

"But true it is that, when the oyle is spent,
The light goes out, and weeke is throwne away:
So, when he had resigned his regiment,
His daughter gan despise his drouping day,
And wearie wax of his continuall stay."

(*F. Q.* II, x, xxx, 1–5.)

FLORENCE EDNA ROWE.
*Dallas, Texas.*

## *DUTCH LITERATURE.*

*Vondel's Lucifer.* Translated from the Dutch by LEONARD CHARLES VAN NOPPEN, illustrated by JOHN AARTS. New York and London: Continental Publishing Company, 1898. Holland Society Art Edition limited to 1250 numbered copies. 8vo, pp. 438. Price $5.

THE author of this translation was born in Holland in 1868. In early childhood he came to America, and in due time was graduated at Guilford College, N. C., and later at the University of N. C. In 1893 he obtained the degree of A. M. from Haverford College, and left a year later for Holland, where for two years he was engaged in the study of Dutch, and in translating some of the choicest Dutch lyrics into English, among them the choruses in Vondel's *Lucifer*. By the close of his second year in Holland the entire drama had been translated, and the remaining two years before publication were devoted to touching and retouching the more difficult passages.

Mr. Van Noppen's book contains four hundred and thirty-eight pages which are divided into "Translator's Preface" (pp. 13–17); "Introduction" (pp. 19–24) by Prof. Wm. H. Carpenter, of Columbia University; another "Introduction" (pp. 27–38) by Prof. G. Kalff, of the University of Utrecht; "Life and Times of Vondel" (pp. 41–154) by Mr. Van Noppen, who adds "An Interpretation of the *Lucifer*" (pp. 157–224), "A Bibliography of Vondelian Literature" (pp. 227–228), "Edmundson's Parallelisms between Vondel and Milton" (pp. 229–234), "Vondel's Dedication of *Lucifer* to Ferdinand III." (pp. 239–242), "Vondel's Lines on the Portrait of Ferdinand III." (pp. 243–244), and Vondel's "Word to all Fellow-Academicians and Patrons of the Drama" (pp. 245–258), which is really Vondel's Preface. Then follow the "Argument" (pp. 263–264), the "Dramatis Personæ" (p. 265), and last the "Lucifer" (pp. 267–438).

Mr. Van Noppen declares at the outset that his version was not made for the purpose of showing Milton's indebtedness to Vondel:

"With the much discussed question of Milton's indebtedness to Vondel this effort has nothing to do. I mention this merely to show that this version was not made that it might be adduced as proof of Vondel's influence on his great English contemporary. It has a much higher reason to commend it; namely, the intrinsic value of the original as a poem and as a national masterpiece. My desire has been to give Vondel; and Vondel is a sufficient justification" ("Preface," p. 15).

Dr. Carpenter reminds us very appropriately in his "Introduction" (p. 22) that:

"It is particularly fitting that such an English translation, both because it is first and because it is Vondel, should be put forth, beyond all other places, from this old Dutch city of New

York. There is surely more than a passing interest in the thought that, at the time of the appearance of Vondel's *Lucifer* in Old Amsterdam, in 1654, its reading public was in part New Amsterdam as well."

The same international note is struck in Dr. Kalff's "Introduction" (p. 37):

"We heartily rejoice over the fact," says Dr. Kalff, who is, perhaps, the greatest Vondelian authority living, "that Vondel's drama has been translated into English by an American for Americans, with whom we Netherlanders have from time immemorial been on a friendly footing. . . . Whoever," adds Dr. Kalff, "is in a position, by the comparison of the translation with the original, to form an individual opinion of Van Noppen's work, will probably be convinced, even as I have been, that here an extraordinarily difficult task has been magnificently done.

Dr. Kalff hopes that this translation may draw more closely the bond "between America and that land which at one time possessed the opportunity to be the mother-country." It should be added that Dr. Kalff spent two weeks in going over the manuscript of the translation with Mr. Van Noppen, during the latter's stay in Holland.

The space that the translator gives to the "Life and Times of Vondel," and to the "Interpretation" is, perhaps, justified by the prevalent ignorance in regard to Dutch literature in general, to say nothing of the *Lucifer*, which has never before been translated into English. There has existed hitherto no adequate life of Vondel in English, and not even an English critique of his style that was not influenced more or less by the Milton-Vondel controversy. The best short sketch of his life, outside of Dutch sources, is found in volume 44 of Michaud's *Biographie Universelle*. One paragraph deserves to be quoted as showing with admirable precision and perspective the place in Dutch letters that Vondel filled:

"Bien qu'à la renaissance des lettres la Hollande ne demeurât point plongée dans un honteux sommeil, bien que l'affranchissement du peuple batave dût éveiller les esprits dans son sein et aiguillonner le génie, bien que des hommes d'un mérite supérieur ne tardassent pas à s'y occuper d'une littérature nationale, et qu'ils eussent déjà déployé de généreux efforts dans cette honorable carrière, il manquait un point central pour diriger la commune tendance vers le but d'une noble émulation; il fallait un de ces hommes rares qui, secouant les entraves, savent s'élever au-dessus de la commune portée et devenir le coryphée du Parnasse hollandais: cet homme fut Vondel."

Mr. Van Noppen's treatment of the life and times of Vondel evinces thorough familiarity with his subject and is written *con amore;* but the note of laudation so uniformly held will probably beget a somewhat insurrectionary feeling in the minds of many readers, while the profusion of metaphor inwrought into his style tends to rob his sentences of that critical exactness and sense of clear vision that they would otherwise have.

In his "Interpretation" the translator takes the common-sense view of the *Lucifer* that was ably defended by Cramer in the *Inleiding* to his edition of the *Lucifer* of 1891. Both critics rehearse only to reject the various political interpretations that have from time to time been put upon Vondel's drama. Cramer deems most plausible of these erroneous interpretations the one that identifies Lucifer in the main with Wallenstein, while Mr. Van Noppen finds a greater show of probability in the contention that Lucifer represents Cromwell. But Cramer sees in the drama not the strife of political parties, but a picture of the eternal warfare of good with evil, of truth with lies:

"Zoo kwam de dichter bij zijn belangstellend waarnemen der grootsche worstelingen, waar ook zijn tijd vol van was, tot de wetenschap, dat de wereldhistorie niet is, dan het zich eeuwig verjongend schouwspel van den mensch, die in zijn trots zich tegen God verzet, m. a. w., van den strijd tusschen waarheid en logen."

And Mr. Van Noppen voices the same conclusion when he says that,

"The *Lucifer* represents the gigantic and eternal battle of evil with good, with the universe as the battlefield;"

but when he adds that,

"Furthermore, the tragedy typifies the character of the Hollanders themselves, . . . . . a nation that has ever been in revolt, not only against man, but ever against the sublime forces of nature, a race that has never known defeat,"

and that,

"Like *Faust*, the *Lucifer* is 'ever more a striving towards the highest existence,'" the interpretation seems to us strained and even verging on self-contradiction.

We may add that Vondel himself gave the supposed cue to a political interpretation of his drama, by declaring in 1658 (in *Apollo's Harp*) that the English people might find food for thought ("stichtelijke Leer") in the *Lucifer*. The thrust was plainly at Cromwell and his Puritan followers; for Vondel, having gone over to the Roman Catholics in 1641, had more than once expressed his detestation of the Roundheads. It remained, however, for the critics of this century to carry to an extreme, if not utterly to misconstrue, the comment of Vondel on his own poem.

In 1844 Van Lennep, in his lectures on Vondel, gave wide currency to the view that the *Lucifer* was meant to represent the uprising of the Netherlanders against Philip II. of Spain, Lucifer typifying William of Orange. Independently of Van Lennep, the same conclusion was reached by Dr. Jonckbloet in his *Vondel's Lucifer: een politieke allegorie* (published in 1849 in the *Overijsselsche Almanak*). This view was combated by Beets in 1864. The battle was then on, and has raged ever since. A list of some of the leading contestants may be found in Van Lennep's *Vondel, 1654–1655* (p. 5), which constitutes volume seventeen of his edition of Vondel's complete works. This edition first appeared in 1855–'69, but has been re-edited by Unger, the author of the well-known *Bibliographie van Vondel's Werken* (1888).

On page 227, in his "Bibliography," Mr. Van Noppen has this entry: "VONDEL AND MILTON. August Müller, 1864"; and following it, "UBER [it should be ÜBER] MILTON'S ABHÄNGIGKEIT VON VONDEL. Berlin, 1891." There is no such book as that first named, for Müller was born in 1864; but Müller's name should be added to the second.

It is an interesting bibliographical fact, which we gather from Unger's *Bibliographie*, that no new edition of the *Lucifer* appeared throughout the whole of the eighteenth century. The nineteenth century, however, has witnessed about twenty-five editions. The first edition was that printed by Abraham de Wees, Amsterdam, 1654.

In regard to Edmundson's so-called "Parallelisms," while they will facilitate comparison between the *Lucifer* and *Paradise Lost*, and thus save time and trouble to the student of comparative literature, we believe that the question of Milton's alleged indebtedness to Vondel is not thus hastily to be settled. The only scientific method would be to examine first the sources from which both poets drew in common, then to compare the overlappings of each. By failing to do this Edmundson has vitiated his entire treatment of the controversy. The last ten years, moreover, have witnessed notable additions to the material given in Todd's *Conspectus*. For example, Vondel himself says (Van Noppen's edition, p. 254),

> "Among the English Protestants, the learned pen of Richard Baker hath discoursed very freely in prose concerning Lucifer and all the acts of the rebellious Spirits."

Vondel is here enumerating his own sources. And Bishop Avitus, of Vienne (c. 450–525 A. D.), is now known to have written a poem in five acts with which both Milton and Vondel would seem to have been familiar. See "A Precursor of Milton" (unsigned) in the *Atlantic Monthly*, Vol. 65, Jan., 1890:

> "It is incomprehensible," says this contributor, commenting on Avitus's poem, "that in all which had hitherto been written [that is, before the appearance of Edmundson's 'Parallelisms' in 1885] about Milton and his borrowing, Vondel should practically have been overlooked; but it is still more strange that nobody has yet named the original source whence the poets of the seventeenth century drew, who sang the revolt of the angels or the fall of man,—a source to which Vondel owed more than any of them."

Baker's prose works, therefore, and Avitus's poem, to neither of which the Milton-Vondel jury has yet had access, must be thoroughly examined before any attempt is made to pass judgment on the interrelations of the two great masterpieces so summarily appraised by Edmundson. It must be remembered, too, that Vondel wrote in rimed Alexandrines, which Mr. Van Noppen translates into blank verse, the verse of Milton. Unless the reader, therefore, is on his guard, the metrical resemblance will unduly enhance the resemblance of content.

Before dismissing the question of parallelisms, not in itself important, we desire to mention a few fundamental divergences of treatment in the two poems, divergences that

must effectually bar any attempt to detract materially from the originality of Milton's work by comparison with that of his Dutch contemporary: (1) The *Lucifer* is a drama, constructed rigidly on the Greek model—a fact that differentiates *in toto* its style and method of progression from the epic scope and leisurely movement of *Paradise Lost*. (2) There is a wide difference between the two poems in the sphere and characterization of the various rebel leaders. (3) The *motif* of the action in the two poems could hardly be more unlike: Milton represents the rebellion of the angels as taking place before the creation of man; Satan rebelled because, and as soon as, God proclaimed His Son Ruler over all the heavenly hierarchies (Bk. v.); Adam and Eve were then created for the purpose of filling the void left by the fallen angels. But with Vondel, the angels rebel because man has already been created, and because the prophecy of Christ's Incarnation in human form has been made. Lucifer considers this unworthy of the Godhead:

> "The majesty
> Of God and of the Godhead is debased,
> If with the blood of man his nature ever
> Unites, combines, or otherwise is bound."
> (Van Noppen's ed. ii, 222–225.)

Vondel, therefore, must have believed that the Incarnation would have taken place even had Adam not sinned. In revenge for his defeat, Lucifer sends Belial to earth, who brings about man's first disobedience. (4) *Paradise Lost* is, above all, a learned poem, Milton having announced publicly in 1641 his intention of writing a poem requiring "industrious and select reading." Instead of the incessant demand made by *Paradise Lost* upon the reader's knowledge of history, geography, theology, astronomy, and mythology, we find in the *Lucifer* not even the need of a footnote from beginning to end.

Many minor differences will occur to every reader of Mr. Van Noppen's excellent version. For example, Vondel represents Apollion as thus describing to Lucifer Adam's sovereignty over the beasts of the field:

> "The mountain-lion wagged his tail and smiled
> Upon his lord. And, at his sovereign's feet,
> The tiger, too, his fierceness laid. The bull
> Bowed low his horns; the elephant, his trunk.
> The bear forgot his rage."
> (i, 107–111.)

But before the fall had the tiger developed any "fierceness," the lion any "rage"? Did not the lion and the lamb lie down together (the lamb *not* inside the lion)? Milton has his menagerie better in hand. Speaking in his own person he says,

> "About them frisking played
> All beasts of the earth, *since wild*."
> (iv, 340–'41.)

As to Mr. Van Noppen's translation of the *Lucifer*, we believe that Dr. Kalff's words of commendation already quoted are no more than just. The work evinces not only a mastery of seventeenth century Dutch but an insight into metrical effects, and facility in reproducing them in English. This version could not have come from one who had not drilled himself for years in the theory and practice of English verse. Space will permit the quotation of only a few lines. When Belzebub asks Apollion "of the twain thou sawest" on the earth, Apollion thus replies:

> "No creature hath on high mine eye so pleased
> As those below. Who could so subtly soul
> With body weave and two-fold Angels form
> From clay and bone? The body's shapely mould
> Attests the Maker's art, that, in the face,
> The mirror of the mind, doth best appear.
> But wonderful! upon the face is stamped
> The image of the soul. All beauty here
> Concentres, while a god looks through the eyes.
> Above the whole the reasoning soul doth hover,
> And while the dumb and brutish beasts all look
> Down towards their feet, man proudly lifts alone
> His head to Heaven, in lofty praise to God."
> (i, 123–135.)

Occasionally the translator introduces certain expansions into his version which, while not marring the original meaning, serve to give us inaccurate impressions as to Vondel's style. Thus, "den zilvren dau"—"the *sparkling* silvery dew"; "dit loof"—"those *radiant* leaves"; "op mijn pennen"—"on *floating* pinions." Sometimes one line of Vondel is explanded into two:

> "Aen d'een zy flaeuwe hoop; aen d'andre gooter schrick"—
> "On the one side flicker feeble rays of hope,
> While on the other yawns a flaming horror."
> (iv, 386–'87.)

But that these double-line expansions are comparatively rare is attested by the fact that Vondel's nineteen hundred and sixty-two Alexandrines are represented by only two thousand four hundred and ninety lines of blank verse.

The translations of the choruses preserve every detail of the original meter. We do not think that any succeeding translator is likely to improve materially Mr. Van Noppen's version of these difficult portions of the *Lucifer*. Involved in style and intricate in form as many of these Dutch strophes and anti-strophes are, the translator has yet preserved meaning and meter so skilfully, and blended with them so fine a lyric grace, that his work nowhere suggests the merely mechanical, and nowhere evinces the lifeless mimicry that so often accompanies the attempt to reproduce original meters.

We bespeak for the handsome volume before us a wide circulation. That such a translation has been sorely needed, every student of comparative literature knows. That this need has been adequately met every impartial student of Mr. Van Noppen's version will, we believe, readily admit.

C. Alphonso Smith.

*Louisiana State University.*

## *KLUGE AND LUTZ, ENGLISH ETYMOLOGY.*

*English Etymology*, a select glossary serving as an Introduction to the History of the English Language, by Friedrich Kluge and Frederick Lutz. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1898. 8vo, pp. viii+234.

This little work, the general reliability of which is vouched for by the name of Kluge, is not intended to supplant Skeat's *Etymological Dictionary*, but "is meant to serve as an introduction to the study of the historical grammar of English." The book is, therefore, in place and needs no apology for its appearance. For in Skeat, as the authors say,

"the linguistic laws underlying the various changes of form and meaning are not brought out clearly enough to be easily grasped by the uninitiated."

In *English Etymology*, therefore, are included "loan-words of Scandinavian, French and Latin origin, and such genuine English words as may afford matter for linguistic investigation."

But let not the uninitiated imagine that in this work the phonetic laws are clearly explained. That could not be expected. The place for that is in comparative grammars. And yet it could be wished and expected that we might not find phonetic improbabilities or impossibilities. For in a work so sponsored these must necessarily cause confusion.

To begin with, the palatals, pure velars, and labio-velars ought to be kept distinct. But the same character is used to represent the IE. (or Aryan, as it is here called) palatal and the pure velar, and, in some cases, the three series of gutturals. How are the uninitiated to distinguish between the IE. palatal tenuis and the pure velar tenuis if both are given as *k*, or how is he to judge of the palatal, the pure velar, and the labio-velar media if all appear as *g*? This confusion is seen not only in the use of the characters but also in the etymological connections made. For example, E. *herd* is referred to an Aryan *kerdhā*, which is said to be connected with Skt. *çárdha-s* 'troop,' with IE. *k̂*; and with OSlav. *črěda* 'herd,' Lith. *kerdžus* 'shepherd.' with IE. *q*, the pure velar. Now there are cases of such confusion (cf. Brugmann, *Grd.* I², 545 f.), and if this is one of them it should have been so explained. But it is more probable that the confusion here is of recent origin, due to Kluge and Lutz.

It is a pity also to find so many cases of supposed interchange between the labio-velar and the labial series. Mere similarity in meaning is no ground for making such connections. Let us examine the list to see whether they may not be explained otherwise. E. *creep*, OE. *crēopan*, etc., are referred to a Germ. root *krŭp*, *krŭq*, on account of the synonymous OHG. *kriohhan*. It is true we have here the roots *krŭp*, *krŭq*, but they are not necessarily the same. They probably are related through a pre-Germ. root *grŭ-*, but beyond that we have no right to go. E. *creep* may be further connected with OE. *cryppan* 'bend, crook' (finger), *crīepan* 'contract, clench' (hand), and perhaps *crump*, *crumb*, Gk. γρῡπός 'bent.' Cf. Kluge, *Et. Wb.*⁵ s.v. *krumm*; Prellwitz, *Et. Wb.* s.v. γρῡπός.—E. *draff*: *dregs*. Comparison is made here with Lat. *fracēs*, which does not contain the labio-velar *qu̯*. Cf. Brugmann, *Grd.*, I², 369. E. *draff* may be referred to Goth. *drōbjan*. Cf. Uhlenbeck, *Et. Wb.* s.v. *drōbjan*. Here *b* certainly does not go back

to IE, *qz*.—E. *hope* is supposed to go back to a Germ. root *hup*, *huq*, on account of OE. *hyht* 'hope, joy, pleasure.' But these words should not be combined. OE. *hyht* belongs to the Germ. root *hug-* 'joy, animation, mind.' Cf. OE. *hycgan* 'think of, be intent on, hope,' *hogian* 'think, intend, wish,' *hyge* 'mind, heart, courage, pride,' Goth. *hugs*, etc. With these *hope* cannot be directly connected.—E. *knave: knight.* These may be, and probably are, connected through the root *ĝen-* 'bear, beget,' but only in their first element *kn-*. There is no reason for supposing the labial of *knave* is from a labio-velar. We have different suffixes. Others also occur. Cf. Goth. *knōþs*, OHG. *kind*, etc.—E. *left:* G. *link.* This is really too bad. As far as the meaning is concerned—or the phonetics either—we might as well compare Lat. *lævus* or Goth. *hleiduma.* OHG. *lenka* 'left hand' may be for older **hlankja*, and connected with G. *lenken*, as Kluge himself suggests in his *Et. Wb.*[5] Cf. also OE. *hlinc* 'slope, hill.' For meaning cf. Goth. *hleiduma* 'left': Gk. *κλῖτύς* 'slope, hill.' This is from the root *k̂leį-* 'lean, incline.' As OHG. *lenka*, OE. *hlinc* may be from the root *k̂el-* 'incline' (from which comes *k̂leį-*), Germ. *link* and Goth. *hleiduma* may contain the same root.—E. *often:* Skt. *uc* 'be wont.' In that case we must join also Goth. *bi-ūhts* 'accustomed.' Cf. Brugmann, *Grd.* ii, 1003; Uhlenbeck, *Et. Wb.* s. v. *biūhts.* That is very improbable.—E. *pith* is referred to a pre-Germ. root *gĭt*, that is, *gz̆it-*, but without giving any form that would require such a root. It may, therefore, be left out of consideration.—E. *spell*, Germ. base *spella-*, is dogmatically given as assimilated from *sqedlo-*, pre-Germ. *sq·etlo-* =OIr. *scél* 'story,' root *seq-*. I see no cause for assuming such a phonetic change.—E. *warp:* Skt. *vṛj* 'remove.' This is an old comparison, as are some of the others given above, and has more in its favor on account of initial *w*; but even here it is an unnecessary assumption. It is hardly probable that E. *warp* and *wreak* are directly related, and yet *wreak* is here also referred to Skt. *vṛj* 'remove.' The probabilities are that Germ. *werpan* 'throw' comes from pre-Germ. *u̯er-b-*, *u̯er-p-*, an extension of the root *u̯er-* 'turn.' Cf. Gk. *ῥάβδος* 'rod,' Lith. *vir̃bas* 'rod,' Lat. *verbēnæ*, *verbera*, Gk. *ῥαβδίζω* 'beat'; and also *ῥέπω* 'swing,' Lith. *verpù* 'spin,' *verpalai* 'yarn,' *vèrpalas* 'web,' with which meaning cf. E. *warp.*[1]

Inexactness in the representation of Germ. roots or stems occurs not infrequently. For example, E. *cot* is referred to a Germ. base *kuta-* instead of *kota-*. The *o* was probably here prim. Germ. Cf. Streitberg, *Urg. Gr.* § 71.—E. *find*, to Germ. *fĕnþ*, *finþ*, though the change from *ĕ* to *i* before nasal combinations was an early one—in some cases before the sound-shifting.—Germ. *blāwa-*, *blēwa-*, *grāwa-*, *grēwa-*, etc., are given. And yet there is no Germ. (urg.) *ā* except as it arises from Germ. *a(n)χ-*. The word Teut. is here used loosely covering the entire Germ. period from the sound-shifting on.—Under *mast* we are told: "In accordance with Grimm's law, the Teut. base *masta-* is based on pre-Teut. *mazdo-*." (the uninitiated might here suppose that Germ. *masta-* necessarily goes back to pre-Germ. *mazdo-*); but *ghost* is referred to pre-Germ. *ghaisdos.* Why not *-zd-* here?—E. *mean*< **mainjan* is connected doubtfully with the root *man* 'think.' It is encouraging to see doubt expressed. The way seems to be clear now for abandoning such an improbable etymology. —Equally bad is the connection of *little*, OE. *litel*, etc., with OS. *luttil.* As the latter may be compared with ON. *lūta*, OE. *lūtan* 'bow, bend down,' Goth. *lūtōn* 'deceive,' Lith. *liūdnas* 'depressed, sad.' Cf. Schade, *Wb.* s.v. *luzzil;* Uhlenbeck, *Et. Wb.*, s. v. *liuts;* Koegel, Paul's *Grd.* ii, 177, where to *luttila*, Hild. 20, the meaning 'sad' is given. So OE. *litel*, Goth. *leitils* may be referred to a Germ. **l̃itan* 'disappear, hide.' Cf. Goth. *lita* 'hypocrisy,' *-litjan* 'dissimulate,' etc. These are from the root *li̯-* 'cling to, lie close, disappear,' in Skt. *láyatē* 'disappear, hide,' Gk. *λῑ-μός* 'hunger.' Compare also Lith. *léid-mi* 'leave.' The further explanation of this root *li̯-*, I reserve for another occasion.—Other phonetically improbable connections are OE. *ārundi:* Goth. *airus*, s. v. *errand;* E. *oar: row; hack: hew; halt:* Lat. *claudus.* S. v. *God* reference should be given to Goth. *guda-* not *gupa-*, cf. Hench, *PBB.*, 21, 562 ff.

1 This connection is given, I think, in Persson, *Wz.*, but the page I cannot give, as I have not the book within reach.

Many etymologies are incomplete, and in some cases no etymon is given. Often this is easily found or has been suggested before. Examples of such are: *Bark*, Germ. root *berk-*, compared by Skeat with *break*, root *brĕk-*, Lat. *frangō* 'break, crash,' *fragor* 'crash.' Cf. also OE. *ge-brec* 'noise, clamor,' *ge-brǣc* 'phlegm, cough.' For the double form of the root *bherg-*, *bhrĕg-*, cf. *spark* below.—*Bill* is better connected with OHG. *bīhal* 'beil,' representing **biðlá-* and **bíþla-*, cf. Brugmann, *Grd.* I², 540, 636.—*Blare* may very well be from the Germ. root *blas-*, *blēs-* 'blow,' Skeat.—*Dark*, cf. MHG. *terken* 'darken, soil,' OHG. *terchinen* 'conceal, cover.'—*Dung*, Lith. *dengiù* 'cover,' Schade, *Wb.* s. v. *tung*.—*Grisly*, cf. OE. *gryre* 'terror, horror,' *grorn* 'sad; grief,' *an-gryrlic* 'terrible,' Germ. root *grŭs-*, *grŭz-*, enlarged from *grŭ-* in OHG. *in-grūēn* 'shudder,' MHG. *grinel*, etc. Cf. Noreen, *UL.* 221.—*Guilt*< pre-Germ. **ǧ̑hl̥dhni-*, Germ. **gult(t)i-*, cf. Gk. *τέλθος· χρέος* (Hesych.), *ὀφείλω* 'owe.' These have been compared with Goth. *fragildan*, OE. *gieldan*, etc., 'pay, yield,' and to this Skeat had referred *guilt*.—*Helm*, Gk. *κέλλω*, etc., J. Hoops, *PBB.* 22, 435 f.—*Keel*, Gk. *γαυλός* 'vessel, boat,' Skt. *gōlam* 'spherical vessel for water,' Noreen, *UL.* 58; Brg. *Grd.* I², 576.—*Let* 'permit' and *let* 'hinder' should be connected, cf. Uhlenbeck, *Et. Wb.* s. v. *lētan*, *lats*.—*Like* adj. and *like* vb. are one in origin, cf. Uhl., *Wb.* s. v. *leikan*.—*Lime* and *slime* should be combined, since both are here compared with Lat. *līmus*. Or are we to suppose that *līmus* 'slime' and *līmus* 'mud' are not the same?—*Meek* and *muck* are from the same root, cf. Uhl. *Wb.* s. v. *mūkamōdei*—*Need*, OHG. *nūan*, Goth. *bnauan*, cf. Uhl. *Wb.* s. v. *bnauan*.—*Rick* and *ridge* belong together, cf. Kluge, *Wb.*⁵ s. v. *Rücken*.—*Sear*, Lith. *saũsa-s* 'dry,' etc., Brg. *Grd.* I², 193.—*Seethe*, root *k̂peu̯t-*, Lith. *szuntù*, etc., Brg. *Grd.* I², 790.—*Shape*, cf. Uhl. *Wb.* s. v. *gaskapjan*.—*Shore*, for further connections cf. author, MOD. LANG. NOTES, 13, 290 f.—*Soul*, cf. Uhl. *Wb.* s. v. *saiwala*.—*Spark*, root *spherg-*, *sphrēg-*, etc., in Skt. *sphūrjati* 'crackle,' Lett. *sprēgt* 'burst,' Lith. *sprōkti*, *spragėti*, ON. *spraka* 'crackle,' etc., Brg. *Grd.* I², 480 f. The last two words are also compared by K. and L. with the Germ. root *sprĕk-* 'speak,' which is quite possible.—Under *sward* should have been mentioned E. *greensward*.—*Swerve*, **su̯erbh-* 'rub.' cf. also OIr. *sorbaim* 'smear, defile.'—*Threat*, add Goth. *-þriutan*, etc., Balg, *Comp. Gloss.* Cf. also Gk. *τρύω* 'rub, harass, vex.'—*Throne* is not explained by a reference to ME. *trǫ́ne*, OFr. *trone*. The *th* was brought about by a secondary reference to the classical form. The same is true of a considerable number of words of Latin-French origin, as *advance*, *advice*, etc.—In several instances a cross-reference would be in place; for example, to *name* under *noun*, to *naked* under *nude*, etc.

Several of the etymologies given are more than doubtful. As such may be mentioned: *Bane:* Gk. *φόνος*. The latter certainly belongs to *θείνω*, root *ǧ̑hen-*.—*Bolt:* Lat. *catapulta*. Germ. *bolta-* is probably connected, as has been supposed, with OHG. *bolōn*, MHG. *boln* 'throw.' Kluge, *Et. Wb*⁵., thinks this impossible on account of the apparent suf. *-do-*. But the suf. *-do-* is not uncommon in the verb and related noun forms, and it is not impossible that, in many cases, it originated in the nominal stem. On this suf. cf. Brg. *Grd.* II, 1047 f. The suf. *-do-* may occur in OE., E. *colt*<**ǧ̑l̥do-*, root *ǧ̑uel-* in Goth. *kal-bō* 'calf,' *kil-þei* 'womb,' etc. Cf. author, *AJP.* 19, 47. Other examples are E. *dolt*, ME. *dulte*< **dhul-do-:* OE. *dol* 'dull'<**dhulo-;* E. *dint*, OE. *dynt* 'blow,' primarily 'a resounding blow': OE. *dynian*, OS. *dunnian*, etc., Skt. *dhvan* 'resound;' OE. *stunt* 'foolish,' (stunned), ON. *stuttr*, OSw. *stunter*, G. dial. *stuntz* 'short,' OE. *styntan* 'stupefy': E. *stun*, OE. *stunian* 'resound, dash' (against). These examples do not with certainty point to a nominal suf. *-do-*, though it undoubtedly occurred by the side of the verb, since all the above forms may go back to compounds with the suf. *tnó-*. This would give in Germ. *-tta-*, which would be simplified to *-ta-* in the examples cited. This suf. *-tnó-*, forming participial derivatives, may have been a formative element in Germ. as it was in Aryan, Balto-Slav., and Lat. Cf. Brg. *Grd.* II, 151.—*Blue*<*blēwa-:* Lat. *flāvos*. Cf., for different explanation, author *JGP.* I, 297; AJP. 19, 53.—*Glee*, OE. *glēow*, rather with Gk. *χλευή*, etc., Noreen, *UL.* 216; Brg. *Grd.* I², 573.—*Hang*, root *k̂enq-*, and *hunger*, root *qenq-*, should not be connected. Cf. Uhl. *Et. Wb.* s. v. *hāhan*, *hūhrus*.—*Have* is better separated from Lat. *habeō*. For two explanations of

*habēo* see Brg. *Grd.* I², 575 and Uhl. *Wb.* s. v. *gadiliggs.*—*Hear: ear* is altogether improbable. Verbs signifying to 'hear' often come from a root-meaning 'resound, sound.' The proethnic man would know the ear not as an organ of hearing but as a projection or orifice. Cf. author, MOD. LANG. NOTES, 13, 87.—*Hound* is better connected with IE. *k̂uon-* 'dog.' Cf. especially Arm. *skund*<**k̂u̯on-to-*, Brg. *Grd.* I², 336, 555.—*String* may be otherwise explained. Cf. Brg. *Grd.* I², 726. Lat. *stringō* is better taken with *strike.*—*Thaw* cannot be accounted for from Gk. *τήκω*, since that would be represented in Germ. by **þōh-* or **þōg-*, not by **þa(g)w-*. At best it can be connected only through a root *tă̆-*. Cf. Prellwitz, *Et. Wb.* s. v. *τήκω*. It is, perhaps, rather a derivative of the root *tā-* 'swell, flow.'—On the connection *thrall*, Goth. *þragjan* 'run': Gk. *τρέχω* 'run,' cf. Uhlenbeck, *PBB.*, 22, 191 f. Goth. *þragjan* may be referred to a root *terq-*, *trq-*, *trēq-*, an outgrowth of *ter-*, *trē-* 'turn.' Cf. OSl. *trŭkaljati* 'roll,' *trŭkalo* 'circle, wheel,' NSl. *trc̆ati* 'run' (Miklosich), OE. *þrāg* 'time' (cycle); 'paroxysm' (a twisting). For other closely related words cf. Kluge, *Wb.* s. v. *drechseln, drehen.*

The development in meaning is in some cases not explained, in others incorrectly explained. For example, a note should be added under *dapper* to explain the various meanings of its congeners. Again, it is not true that the primary meaning of Germ. *haira-*, E. *hoar*, was 'venerable,' but rather 'gray' (with age), from the root *qei-* 'shine, be bright, white' in Goth. *hai-dus*, *hai-s*, *hei-tō*, etc.

A few slips in English occur. It is a loose use of the word *identical* to say: "The Teut. √ *hat* 'hate' is perhaps ident. w. the Teut. √ *hap*," etc. So in several instances.—Under *sin* we meet with the queer expression "cf. yet ON. *synð*" (=G. "vgl. noch") instead of "cf. also," etc.—We should hardly say "the sb. (Teut. *staupa-* 'beaker') rests on [=beruht auf] the adj. *staupa-*," but rather "is based on."—It is incorrect to say: "The meaning of the E. word [glad] is secondary when compared with the orig. meaning 'smooth.'" Not "when" but "as compared," since it is secondary whether compared or not.—Under *glare* we read: "OE. **glarian* is unauthorized" =unauthenticated, unbelegt. So under *hogshead:* "origin and history of this compound are unauthorized"=unexplained.

The above appear to me, on a rather hasty examination of the book, to be the principal errors. In spite of these, *Eng. Et.* will serve the student as an excellent "introduction to the study of the historical grammar of English." One could wish that the book were not quite so unpretentious in size and general plan. Perhaps later editions of *Eng. Et.* will show as rapid a growth as did the several editions of Kluge's *Et. Wb.*

FRANCIS A. WOOD.

*Cornell College.*

## *ICELANDIC GEOGRAPHY.*

*Th. Thoroddsen, Geschichte der isländischen Geographie.* Autorisierte Übersetzung von AUGUST GEBHARDT. Erster Band: Die isländische Geographie bis zum Schlusse des 16. Jahrhunderts. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1897. 8vo, pp. xvi, 237. Zweiter Band: Vom Beginne des 17. bis zur Mitte des 18. Jahrhunderts, 1898. 8vo, pp. xvi, 383.

THORODDSEN'S work, as far as completed, lies before us in a German translation. If we call attention to the work of the famous Icelandic geologist in the columns of this journal it is because of the rich contents of the book, which will equally interest the geographer and the student of history and literature.

The title is indeed misleading; even if we interpret it in its widest application it will hardly cover all that is presented in these chapters. The author, as well as the translator, has realized this, and the second volume bears the enlarged title: *Vorstellungen von Island und seiner Natur und Untersuchungen darüber in alter und neuer Zeit.* The first volume begins with an account of the island before its colonization; the various adventuresome journeys are then discussed and the trade relations with the mother country and other nations. It ends with a presentation of Icelandic culture during the period of reformation. The second volume, more minutely than the first, treats of the intellectual history of Iceland during the following one hundred and fifty years—the time of superstition and of the gradual reforms that prepare its modern culture. What lends these investigations an especial importance is the great amount of manuscript material that the author has drawn upon, and the many other sources now for the first time made more accessible. The translator has acquitted himself of his exceptionally arduous task with great skill; the happy imitation of a style so different from a more or less artificial literary idiom puts the reader at once into the *milieu* of the public for whom the original work was written.

A third volume is to carry the author's researches to the beginning of his own geographical survey, which after seventeen years of unceasing toil and unparalleled endurance

has just been completed. Naturally the history of scientific pursuits will be more emphasized. Besides the additional notes and the indispensable index, we are promised a map of Iceland, which would be welcomed by many, certainly by the students in the early history and literature of a country for the study of whose geography there are very few helps at our disposal.

H. SCHMIDT-WARTENBERG.
*University of Chicago.*

## *MAIDEN MODER MILDE.*

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—In a note in your columns (x, 127) I called attention to the fact that, although Morris pointed out on p. 5 of his edition of the *Ayenbite* a passage in verse written in the MS. as prose, he seems not to have perceived that the prayers with which the MS. opens and closes are likewise in verse, though written as prose.

The second of these prayers runs as follows:

Mayde and moder mylde.
uor loue of þine childe:
pet is god an man:
Me þet am zuo wylde
uram zenne þou me ssylde:
ase ich þe bydde can. amen. P. 271.

A certain similarity in phraseology in religious poems similar in subject, particularly in such a meter, is to be expected. In certain cases, however, the similarity is such as to be worthy of remark. In the remarkable body of poems collected in MS. Harl. 2253 (ed. Böddeker, Berlin, 1878, and in part elsewhere) occurs the following close parallel to this passage:

Maiden moder milde,
oiez cel oreysoun;
from shame þou me shilde,
e de ly malfeloun.
for loue of þine childe
me menez de tresoun;
Ich wes wod & wilde,
ore su en prisoun. P. 220.

Other parallels to separate phrases occur:

mayden ant moder mylde,
fore loue of þine childe
ernde vs heuene lyht. P. 194.
soffre neuer þat y be so wilde ne so wod P. 216.
bat ich her forleose be ..... P. 216.
leuedi, for þi milde mod, þou shilde me from synne.

Also to the opening lines of the first of the two prayers in the *Ayenbite*

Zuete iesu bin holy blod
bet bou sseddest ane be rod P. 1.

there is the following parallel:

louerd, þat ilke blod,
þat oþu sheddest on þe rod ..... P. 208.

These are worthy of remark only incidentally. The parallel in the first case can hardly be accidental. The date of the Collection is c. 2300 (Wright, in or after 1307; Böddeker, c. 1310; N.E.D., s. v. amarstled, c. 1500), that of the *Ayenbite*, is of course, 1340. The poem in question is presumably of Midland origin, as Böddeker says: certainly there is nothing distinctively Southern about it: and in this connection, it may be noted that in the prayer the form *ssylde* is used, instead of the distinctively Kentish form *sseld*—a form occurring, in fact, in the first of the two prayers of the *Ayenbite*. And the poem is doubtless original—not a translation from the French. The neatness of the versification with its triple rime (there are six stanzas) taken together with its macaronic character attests this.

We may suppose then that the composer of the prayer knew the poem in the Harleian collection. Whether Dan Michel was the composer is of course a matter apart, and immaterial. The prayer occurs at the end of the dissertation on the difference between men and beasts, which with the allegory of the Sawles Warde follows Michel's colophon to his translation of Lorenz; presumably these are his as well as the main work—the MS. is, I believe, supposed to be a holograph. But this naturally does not argue that the prayer was of his composition.

The point to which I would call attention is that this prayer (the same is true to a less notable extent of the other cases cited) is a good example of the free use made in religious verse of "tags" or religious kennings, as they might be called,—of which the phrase "maide and moder mylde" is a typical example.

C. G. CHILD.
*University of Pennsylvania.*

## *AVERAGE.*

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—The *Oxford Dictionary* questions the derivation of *average* from *averia*, "beasts of burden," meaning the services which tenants were bound to render in hauling loads, etc., for the lord. But a passage in Jocelin of Brakelond's *Chronicle*, (1173–1202) seems decisive. He says:

"Solebant homines ville ire apud Laginghehe et reportare *avragium* de anguillis de Sutreia, et sepe vacui redire, et ita vexari sine aliquo emolimento celerarii: unde convenit inter eos ut singule triginta acre de cetero darent unum denarium per annum, et homines remanerent domi."

Evidently they commuted the uncertain and vexatious service of hauling, when their time was often wasted because there were no eels to haul, for a fixed *avragium*, or money-payment, based, no doubt, upon the *average* value of their services in the year.

WM. HAND BROWNE.
*Johns Hopkins University.*

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

**Baltimore, February, 1899.**

## *SOME OLD FRENCH PLACE NAMES IN THE STATE OF ARKANSAS.*

THE southern part of the state of Arkansas was early explored and settled by French traders and trappers. The history of these first settlers is mostly lost already, for they were frontiersmen, who left but few documents or other records by which their history can be traced. The French names given by them to streams and camping grounds have clung to some of the places, while in other instances these names have been so modified and Anglicized as to be almost, if not quite, beyond recognition.

It is worthy of note that the French names are confined chiefly to the southern and eastern parts of the state, and to the valley of the Arkansas. I have no doubt that this is owing to the fact that trappers and traders were the first white men to enter the state in considerable numbers, and that they traveled chiefly along the navigable streams. They did not enter the Ozark-Mountains region because there are no navigable streams entering the Arkansas river from that direction, while the Upper White river is swift, and, in places, difficult of navigation.

During the progress of the Geological Survey of the state, I have had occasion to use these place names on my maps, and I have been puzzled to know how to spell some of them, and have thus been interested in learning their origin. I have here brought together several of them, with such explanations of their origins as are suggested by the words themselves, or by some circumstance connected with the localities. In many instances I have been unable to find what seems to be a rational explanation of the origin of the words. Concerning a certain number of them, I am able to give the opinion of Judge U. M. Rose, of Little Rock, and I have inserted his name in parentheses after the explanations for which he is responsible. Judge Rose remarks, however, that he considers some of his suggestions "exceedingly risky." Indeed but few of the explanations offered in the present paper are to be accepted without question. It is to be hoped that the Arkansas Historical Society will try to trace these words to their sources while yet there is some possibility of its being done: If, for example, *Moro* is from *Moreau*, why was it called *Moureau?* Such a history cannot be deciphered by an inspection of the word alone.

Some of our most valuable records of these old names are to be found in Dunbar and Hunter's *Observations*, written in 1805, during a trip up the Washita to Hot Springs.[1] Unfortunately it contains many typographic errors.

Nuttall, the botanist, who traveled in Arkansas Territory in 1819, makes mention of some of these place names, and as he was on the ground before the French origins of the words were entirely lost sight of, his spellings of them are of interest.[2]

I have looked up the spelling of most of these names on the lithographed copies of the original land-plats of the first official surveys of the state. The references given in the present paper under the head of "plats" are to the lithographs, not to the original sheets themselves. The field notes of the surveyors who did this work are preserved in the office of the Land Commissioner at Little Rock. It would be of interest to find how the names are spelled in those notes, for while it is not to be supposed that the names were all properly written down in them, changes are liable to have been made in putting those memoranda upon the original plats, and others may have been made when they were lithographed. It is a remarkable fact that some of the names now in use have originated, not by any process of philological evolution, but simply in clerical errors in copying them. *Bodcaw* seems to be a good illustration of a name of this kind.

No doubt some of the difficulty in tracing

1 *Message from the President of the United States communicating discoveries made in exploring the Missouri, Red River, and Washita, by Captains Lewis and Clark, Doctor Sibley and Mr. Dunbar.* Washington, 1806.

2 *a. A Journal of Travels into the Arkansas Territory during the Year 1819.* By Thomas Nuttall, Philadelphia, 1821.

*b. Observations on the Geological Structure of the Valley of the Mississippi. Journal of the Acad. Nat. Sci.*, vol. II, pp. 14–52. Philadelphia, 1820.

these names is due to the fact that travelers in new and unsettled countries often name places from trivial events, or for persons, rather than from some local feature or characteristic.

Certain habits regarding the names have been pretty firmly fixed upon the state by these French settlers. For example, streams having several large branches, generally known in the northern part of the state as "forks" (as Buffalo Fork and North Fork of the White River), in the southern part of the state are often called "fourche," as Fourche à Loup, Fourche à Caddo. We even find the "South Fork of Fourche La Fave."

In some instances the original French names have been preserved intact, as in the case of the Vache Grasse, Petit Jean, Bayou de Roche, Fourche à Loup,[3] Terre Rouge, etc.; in others, one may occasionally see sometimes the French form, and sometimes the Anglicized word, as in the case of the Terre noir or Turnwall.

It is not to be supposed that in the substitution of an English word, or of an English-sounding word, for a French one, the changes are necessarily, or even likely to be, of a kind that would take place among a people using a patois or some provincial form of French, but they are often nothing more nor less than a complete abandonment of the French word for an English word that it seems to resemble, or that strikes the fancy.

Although this region was first explored by the Spaniards, they seem to have left but few Spanish names. In looking over a list of the place-names of a state as new as Arkansas, one must of course be on his guard against names of foreign origin but recently bestowed, such as *Bon Air*, *Belmont*, *Barcelona*, *La Belle*, etc.

The words given in the list are far from being the only ones of French origin in the state.

In the following alphabetic list the name, as now used, is given first, then the word from which it is derived. Some words are put down without any suggestion as to their origin or meaning. They are possibly of French origin, but I am unable to make any satisfactory suggestion as to their derivation.

3 Dunbar and Hunter in their *Observations* (p. 166) call this stream "Fourche à Luke."

ANTOINE.—L. Page du Pratz mentions in his *Histoire de la Louisiane*, Vol. i, p. 303, a silver mine in the country of the "Cadodaquioux" or Caddos, located "by a Portuguese named Antoine." Stream in Pike and Clark counties, and town in Pike Co.

ARKANSAS.—Father Marquette, who visited this region in 1673, spelled the word *Akansea* on his map, but in the text it is spelled *Akamsea* and *Akensea*.[4] In both instances it is the name of a village.

Father Membré, who was one of La Salle's party on his voyage down the Mississippi in 1681, speaks of a tribe or nation of Indians called *Akansa*.[5] It was spelled *Akansa* by Tonty in 1682.[6]

Father Anastasius Douay who was with La Salle at the time of his death in this region in 1687, mentions "the famous river of the Achansa, who here form several villages" (p. 219); elsewhere he calls the people and the stream Akansa (pp. 220–1–2–3; 226).

Joutel, the companion of La Salle, spelled it *Accancea's* in 1687.[7] He says there was a nation of Indians of this name, and on the map accompanying his account the river is called "Rivière des Acanssas." Dr. Elliott Coues says:[8]

> "the name Akansa adopted in some form by the French, is what the Kwapas were called by the Illinois Indians, and the origin of our Arkansas or Arkansaw. The form Acanza is found on Vaugondy's map, 1783."

Joutel, cited above, used the name a century earlier. Du Pratz says (p. 125) "The

4 *Discovery and Exploration of the Mississippi Valley;* with the original narratives of Marquette, Allouez, etc. By John G. Shea. New York, 1852, pp. 46, 50, 254, and 257. This work contains a

"facsimile of the autograph map of the Mississippi or Conception River, drawn by Father Marquette at the time of his voyage. From the original preserved at St. Mary's College, Montreal."

5 *Op. cit.*, pp. 168, 170, 172.

6 *Relation of Henri de Tonty Concerning the Explorations of La Salle from 1678 to 1683.* Translated by M. B. Anderson Chicago, The Caxton Club, 1898, pp. 73, 77, 95, 105, 106.

7 *A Journal of the Last Voyage Performed by Monsr. de la Sale to the Gulph of Mexico.* By Monsieur Joutel . . . . and translated from the edition just published at Paris, London, 1817. Reprinted by the Caxton Club, Chicago, 1896, pp. 155, 158, 159, 162.

8 *Pike's Expedition.* New ed. by Elliott Coues, N. Y. 1895. Vol. ii, p. 559, foot-note.

river of the Arkansas . . . . . is so denominated from the Indians of that name." (See also pp. 60 and 318–319.)

"There are a few villages of the Quawpaws, or Arkansaws and Chocktaws, situated on the south side of the Arkansa river below the high lands" (*Long's Expedition*, vol. ii, p. 347).

In 1811 Brackenridge spoke of these Indians and spelled the word as it is now spelled (p. 83). Sibley[9] spelled it Arkansa in 1805, and Nuttall spelled it so in 1819.

It is frequently assumed that the words Arkansas and Kansas are genetically related. This is erroneous. The word Kansas is also of Indian origin, and it was also the name of a tribe, and in old publications is variously spelled. On Marquette's map made in 1673, it is spelled *Kansa*. Le Page Du Pratz, who lived in old Louisiana territory from 1718 to 1735, makes frequent mention of the Canzas Indians and of Canzas river.[10] On his map this name is Cansez.

Pike makes frequent mention of both the river and the Indians, and calls them both Kans and Kanses. In one place he says: "The Kans are a small nation situated on the river of that name."[11]

In *Long's Expedition*[12] the Konzas nation and river are spoken of, and it is stated that these Indians lived upon the river of that name (Vol. ii, p. 348). In one place the author speaks of "the Konzas or Konzays, as it is pronounced by the Indians." (Vol. ii, p. 354.)

In a foot-note to the new edition of Lewis and Clark, Vol. i, pp. 32–33, Dr. Coues says the early French forms of the word were Quans, Cans, Kances and Kansez. It is, therefore, evident that the words *Kansas* and *Arkansas* are not related in origin, and that the *-kansas* part of the Arkansas was not pronounced like the name of the state of Kansas.

The spelling by Marquette in 1673; by Membré in 1681 (*Akansa*); by Douay in 1687; by Joutel in 1687 (*Accancea's* and *Acanssas*), and the subsequent spelling by Sibley, Dunbar and Hunter, Pike, and Nuttall, (*Arkansa*), show as plainly as can be expected that the pronunciation now in vogue in the state is the one originally used.

BARRAQUE.—Featherstonhaugh,[13] who travelled in the state in 1834–5, has much about M. Barraque, who then lived on the Arkansas River near Pine Bluff. Township in Jefferson county.

BAYOU.—This word is in common use in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Arkansas. It is thus defined by Du Pratz:[14] "Bayouc, a stream of dead water, with little or no observable current." The same has been extended in many cases to swift mountain streams in spite of the protests of the people; for example, Polk Bayou at Batesville. The word is a corrupton of the French *boyau*, a gut, and by extension, a long narrow passage. Sibley, and Dunbar and Hunter write it "bayau."

BARTHOLOMEW.—Bartholomé was the name of a Frenchman who lived near Pine Bluff in 1819 (Nuttall). This name, however, was already in use in 1804, when Dunbar and Hunter ascended the Ouachita. (See their *Observations*, p. 126.) Bayou in Lincoln, Drew, and Ashley counties.

BELLE POINT.—"The site of Fort Smith was selected by Major Long in the fall of 1817, and called Belle Point in allusion to its peculiar beauty."[15] Nuttall calls it by this name.

BODCAW.—The original land map (1824) has it

9 *Historical Sketches of the Several Indian Tribes in Louisiana*. By John Sibley. Part of *Message from the President . . . Discoveries by Lewis and Clark, Doctor Sibley and Mr. Dunbar*. Washington, 1806. pp. 66–86.

10 *The History of Louisiana*. Translated from the French of M. Le Page Du Pratz. New ed., London, 1774. The first edition of this work was the *Histoire de la Louisana*, Paris, 1758.

11 *An Account of Expeditions to the Sources of the Mississippi and Through the Western Parts of Louisana . . in the Year 1807*. By Major Z. M. Pike. Philadelphia, 1810. Appendix to Part ii, p. 17. See also pp. 107, 108, 116, 123, 137, 138, 140, 149, 152, etc.

12 *An Account of an Expedition from Pittsburgh to the Rocky Mountains Performed in the Years 1819 and '20, by Order of the Hon. J. C. Calhoun, Sec'y of War; under the command of Major Stephen H. Long*. . . . Compiled by Edwin James. 2 vols. Philadelphia, 1823. Vol. i, chaps. vi and vii; Vol. ii. 245, 346, 348, 354.

13 *Excursion Through the Slave States*. New York, 1844, pp. 131, 133.

14 *The History of Louisiana*. Translated from the French of M. Le Page Du Pratz. New ed., London, 1774, page 20.

15 *Long's Expedition from Pittsburgh to the Rocky Mountains*, Vol. ii, p. 260.

spelled *Bodcau*. This, and the fact that this stream is called *Badeau* in Louisiana, lead me to believe that *Bodcaw* comes from Bodcau, which is from Badeau by a clerical error; mistaking the *a* of *Badeau* for an *o* and the *e* for a *c*, thus turned *Badeau* into *Bodcau*, and later it was spelled as we now have it—*Bodcaw*. One difficulty with this theory is that the lake into which the Badeau flows in Louisiana is called the Bodcau. Another one is that as long ago as 1805 Dr. John Sibley said this stream was called Badkah by the Indians. Dunbar and Hunter, p. 103. Stream and township in Lafayette county.

BODOCK.—*Bois d'arc* (the Osage orange). This is the name of several small streams in the southwestern part of the state, but these stream-names are always, so far as I know, derived from the "bodock" or *bois d'arc* wood.

BOUFF.—Bœuf (beef). Dunbar and Hunter call it "Bayau aux Bœufs" (p. 124), and the old land plat of 19 S. 3 W. has it "Bayou Boeuff," 1839. Stream in Chicot county.

CADDO.—Judge Rose tells me that he has seen an old French manuscript that refers to a tribe of Indians living in Northern Louisiana and Southern Arkansas called *les Caddaux*. The date of the manuscript is not mentioned. This word seems to be of Indian origin. Father Anastasius Douay, who accompanied La Salle in his attempt to ascend the Mississippi in 1687, mentions the Cadodacchos,[16] a tribe of Indians in this part of the country. In Joutel's journal of La Salle's last voyage, mention is made[17] of a village called *Cadodaquio* in what is now Texas or Louisiana. The map in Page du Pratz shows, north of the Red River, "the country of the Quadodaquious." In the text he calls the "Cadodaquioux" (p. 318) "a great nation." Dunbar and Hunter speak of these people as "Cadadoquis, or Cadaux as the French pronounce the word" (p. 136), while Sibley calls them Caddos and Caddoquies (Dunbar and Hunter, p. 105). Pike's map of Louisiana has this word both "Cadaux" and "Caddo;" and he represents a trail "from Caddos to Arkansaw," showing that these Indians lived southwest of Red River. Brackenridge speaks[18] in one place of the "Cado nation," and in another of the "Caddoquis" Indians, who lived thirty-five miles west of Red River and "one hundred and twenty miles by land above Natchitoches."

CADRON.—Pike calls it "Quatran;" Nuttall says the French hunters called it "Quadrant." Mr. Rose thinks it may come from *cadran*, a sun dial. Stream, old village and township in Faulkner county.

CHAMPAGNOLLE.—Possibly the name or nickname of a person, derived from Champagne. On the old land plates it is spelled "Champagnole" (1818–45). The name was in use in 1805 (Dunbar and Hunter, p. 133). Stream and landing in Calhoun county.

CANADIAN.—*Cañada* (Spanish).[19] Diminutive form of *cañon*, a steep-sided gorge. A stream in Clark county.

CHICOT.—*Chicot*, a stump. Name of a county on the Mississippi River.

CASH.—*Cache*. Brackenridge (*Op. cit.*, 101) calls this stream *Eaux caché(s)*. Stream and village in Greene county.

CORNIE, or CORNY.—(?) Streams in Union county.

COSSATOT.—*Casse tête*. The stream runs through a very rough country, and the name may have been suggested by the topography along its course. The word *cassetête*, however, was the French for "tomahawk," and the name may have been given the stream, just as a stream in Searcy county is now known as Tomahawk creek. River in Sevier county.

DARDANELLE.—Nuttall says (p. 126) this place was commonly called "Derdanai" by both the French and Americans. I do not know whether the name was imported from Eu-

16 *Discovery and Exploration of the Miss. Valley*, etc. By J. G. Shea. Pp. 217, 221.

17 *A Journal of the Latest Voyage Perform'd by Monsr. de la Sale.* By Monsieur Joutel. London, 1714. Reprint Chicago, 1896, pages 140, 142.

18 *Views of Louisiana; Together with a Journal of a Voyage up the Missouri River in 1811.* By H. M. Brackenridge. Pittsburgh, 1814, pp. 63 and 80.

19 *The Expedition of Z. M. Pike.* By Elliott Coues, New York, 1895. Vol. ii, p. 558, foot-note.

rope, or, as is said of the European name, was derived directly from *dort d'un œille*. A rocky point projects into the river at this place making the navigation a little dangerous. In Long's expedition it is usually given as Dardenai, but in one case it is called "Dardenai Eye" (Vol. ii, 288). Name of a town on the Arkansas River.

DARYSAW, DARISAW, and DAIRYSAW.—*Des ruisseaux* (streamlets). Mr. Rose tells me that one of the early settlers at Pine Bluff was named Des Ruisseaux. Township and village in Grant county.

DECIPER.—(?) The land plat of 9 S. 19 W. (1819) has it "Decepier;" that of 8 S. 19 W. has it "Deciper." Streams in Clark county.

DE GRAY.—*De grès* (sandstone). The stream of this name is noted for the soft, easily cut, sandstone along its course. This rock was formerly much used for chimneys and foundations. The original land plat, surveyed in 1819, calls it "Bayou Degraff," however, and it may be that it comes from a personal name, and that the sandstone has nothing to do with the case. Stream in Clark county.

DES ARC.—*Des arcs*. See explanation of "Ozark." Stream and town in Prairie county.

DE LUTER.—This is Saluter on the original land plat (1838–1844); possibly from *Salutaire*. In *Long's Expedition* (ii, 301) some of the tributaries of the Washita are spoken of as the "Saluder, Derbane," etc. *Saluda* is a rather common name in South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia. Or was it originally *Bayou de loutre*; that is, otter creek? Bayou in Union county.

DEVOE and DEVIEW.—*De veau*. On the old land plat this name is spelled both "Deview" and "Devue." Stream in Craighead, Ponisett, and Woodruff counties.

DORCHEAT.—In *Long's Expedition to the Rocky Mountains* (ii, 307) mention is made of "Bayou Dache" which enters Lake Bistineau in Louisiana. In *Dunbar and Hunter's Observations* (ii, 102), Doctor Sibley mentions *Bayau Daicet*. There is nothing said that suggests the origin of the word.

Dunbar and Hunter mention (p. 133) the "Bayau de Hachis" at a certain place on the west side of the Washita. At the point referred to there is no considerable stream, and I cannot learn that any of the creeks of the vicinity have, or ever had, such a name. Pike's map of the Washita gives a Bayou Hachis and also "Côte de Hachis" in this same region. I infer that Pike took the names from Dunbar and Hunter, and that the latter by mistake put down a stream on the Washita that was reported to them to lie to the west of where they locate it. Another suggestion comes from the mention by Father Anastasius Douay (in 1697) of a tribe of Indians in this part of the world under the name of *Haquis*.[20] Stream and township in Columbia county.

DOTA or DOTY.—*D'eau tiède* (Rose). Doty is so common a name that it might well have come from the name of a Doty family. Stream in Independence county.

ECORE FABRE.—*Écore* (or *accore*) a shore-bank or bluff and *Fabre* a proper name. On the land plat of 12 S. 18 W. it is put down "Fabre," "Ecoze a Fabra" and "Ecoze Fabra" (1838). These last are only mispellings by the draftsmen. Stream and township in Ouachita county. The Ecore Fabre is now a stream entering the Ouachita just above the high bluffs at Camden. The name *Ecore Fabre* was originally applied to the bluffs on which the city of Camden is built. Dunbar and Hunter (p. 134) speak of "the Ecor Frabri (*sic*) (Fabri's cliffs) . . . . and a little distance above, a" smaller cliff called Le Petit Ecor a Fabri.

ELEVEN POINTS.—*Levé pont* (? Rose). River in Randolph county.

FORT SMITH.—See *Belle Point*.

FOURCHE À LOUP.—I supposed this name was correct as it stands, but Dunbar and Hunter call it "Fourche à Luke" (p. 166).

FRANCEWAY.—François, a proper name. Creek in Grant county.

FREEO.—*Frio*, cold. (Spanish.) On the land plat (1845) this is spelled "Frio." Creek in Dallas and Ouachita counties.

GALLA or GALLEY ROCK.—*Galets* (pebbles).

20 *Discovery and Exploration, etc.* By J. G. Shea, New York, 1852, p, 217.

Landing on the Arkansas River in Pope county.

GLAZYPOOL or GLAZYPEAU.—*Glaise à Paul*, Paul's clay pit. (Dunbar and Hunter, p. 166.) On the land plat of 2 S. 20 W. it is called "Glady pole" (1838); while on 1 S. 20. W. it is "Glazy pole." Mountain and stream near Hot Springs.

GLAISE (GRAND).—*Glaise*, pottery clay. Pike has a "Great Glaise" on his map of Louisiana about where Arkadelphia now stands. Dunbar and Hunter have the following upon the origin of *Glaise*:

> "The salt lick marsh does not derive its name from any brackishness in the water of the lake or marsh, but from its contiguity to some of the licks, sometimes called saline, and sometimes 'glaise,' generally found in a clay compact enough for a potters' ware." (*Observations*, p. 130.)

Name of an old landing and town on the White River in Jackson county.

GULPHA.—*Calfat*, calker, a proper name. On land plat 3 S. 19 W. this is "Gulfer"; on 3 S. 18. W. it is "Sulphur" (1837-8). Creeks near Hot Springs. Dunbar and Hunter call it "Fourche of Calfat" (pp. 143, 157, 159).

LA FAVE.—*La Feve* (Bean). A family of this name formerly lived near the mouth of the stream. (Nuttall, 103.) Dunbar and Hunter (p. 159) mention "a Mr. Le Fevre .... residing at the Arkansas." On land plat 4 N. 18-20 W. it is "La Feve"; on 4 N. 17 W. it is "La Feve" (1839-42), and in *Long's Expedition to the Rocky Mountains* (ii. 345) it is called "Le Fevre." Stream in Perry county.

L'AGLES.—*L'aigle*, an eagle. On the old land plat it is called "Eagle or L'aigle Creek." Streams in Bradley county.

LAGRUE.—*La grue*, a crane. On Pike's map this is called Crane river. Streams in Arkansas county.

L'ANGUILLE.—*L'anguille*, an eel. Stream and township in St. Francis county.

LAPILE.—*La pile*, a pile or pier. Probably a personal name. It is spelled "La Peil" on the original plat of the land survey. Stream and town in Union county.

LOW FREIGHT.—*L'eau froide*. On the land plat 16 S. 17 W. this name is spelled "Low Freight" (1856). Dunbar and Hunter call it "Bayau de l'eau Froide" (p. 137) Stream in Clark county.

LUFRA.—This name of a post-office in Ouachita is, in all probability, another form derived from "Low Freight" and *l'eau fraîche* or *l'eau froide*. (*Camp de l'or. fraie*, fish-hawk, Rose).

MADDRY.—Possibly *Madre*, of Spanish origin. Post-office in Hot Spring county.

MAGAZINE.—*Magasin*, a barn or warehouse. The name was probably given the mountain on account of its peculiar house-like form, and the town took its name from the mountain. Mountain and town in Logan county.

MARIE SALINE LANDING.—*Marais salin*, salt marsh. Dunbar and Hunter mention the "marais de saline" near this place and state that: "the salt lick marsh does not derive its name from any brackishness in the water of the lake or marsh, but from its contiguity to some of the licks, sometimes called saline" (p. 130). Landing in Ashley county.

MASON.—*Maison*, a proper name.

> "On this part of the river lies a considerable tract of land granted by the Spanish government to the marquis of Maison Rouge, a French emigrant, who bequeathed it with all his property to M. Bouligny." (*Dunbar and Hunter's Observations*, p. 126.)

Bayou in Chicot county.

MASSARD.—This word is variously spelled on the old land plats: on 7 N. 31 W. (1829), and on 8 N. 32 W. it is "Massara" and "Massaras," evidently due to a mistake of the draftsman of the final *d* for an *a*. On 7 N. 32 W. (1827), it is "Massards prairie;" on 8 N. 31 W. (1827), it is "Massard Creek" and "Massards prairie;" Nuttall speaks (p. 121) of the *Mazern* mountains; and this, it seems, was the name formerly applied to what is now called the Massard. The name appears to have originated as suggested below for the Mazarn.

I quote from *Long's Expedition* (ii, 264). On leaving Fort Smith to go to Hot Springs the writer says:—

"Our route lay on the south side of the

Arkansas, at considerable distance from the river, and led us across two small creeks, one called Massern, or Mount Cerne and the other Vache Grasse."

In a foot-note to this statement it is said:

"The word Masserne applied by Darby as a name to the hills of the Arkansa territory, near the boundary of Louisiana, by Nuttall to the mountains at the sources of the Kiemesha and the Poteau, is supposed to be a corruption of *Mont Cerne*, the name of a small hill near Belle Point, long used as a look-out post by the French hunters."

Stream and prairie in Sebastian county.

MAUMELLE.—*Mamelle*, breast. It is spelled *Mamelle* in *Long's Expedition*, ii, 345. A conical hill in Pulaski county which has given name to streams also.

MAZARN.—*Mt. Cerne*, Round mountain. A mountain in the region southwest of Hot Springs is called Mt. Cerne on the map accompanying Pike's report.[21] This reference is to the streams and mountains southwest of Hot Springs.

METO or METER.—*Bayou mi-terre* (Rose). This stream is about half-way between the White and the Arkansas, and nearly parallel with both. On the land plat of 2 N. 10 W. it is called "Bayou Netto" (1818-19). A stream in Lonoke and Arkansas counties.

MORO.—*Moreau*, feed-bag. Probably a proper name. On the original land plats it is spelled "Moro," "Moroe," and on one sheet "Moreau" (1832). Stream and village in Bradley county.

OSAGE.—Father Membré of La Salle's party in 1680-81 makes mention of the *Ozage river*, while Father Douay speaks of the river of the *Osages* and of tribes of the same name.[22]

"The name of this nation, agreeably to their own pronunciation is *Waw-sach-e*, but our border inhabitants speak of them under the names of *Huz-zaws* and *O-saw-ses*, as well as *Osages*. The word *Wawsashe* of three syllables has been corrupted by the French traders into *Osage*. . . . .[23]

Stream in north Arkansas.

21 *An Account of an Expedition to the Sources of the Mississippi, etc.* By Major Z. M. Pike. Philadelphia, 1810.

22 *Discovery and Exploration of the Mississippi Valley, with the Original Narratives of Marquette, Allouez, Membré, Hennepin and Anastase Douay.* By J. G. Shea, New York, 1852. Pp. 166-7; 222.

23 *Expedition from Pittsburgh to the Rocky Mountains.* By Stephen H. Long. 2 vols. Philadelphia, 1823, Vol. ii, p. 244.

OUACHITA or WASHITA.—Indian origin.

"Between the Red River and the Arkansas there is at present no nation. Formerly the Ouachites lived upon the Black River and gave their name to it; but at this time there are no remains of that nation."[24]

On the maps accompanying Du Pratz's history the Ouachita is called Black River in the English translation, and Riviere Noire in the original French. Du Pratz tells why the stream was called Black River and adds (English, p. 169; French, ii, 304-5): "It is sometimes called the river of the Wachitas, because its banks were occupied by a nation of that name who are now extinct." Pike spells it Wascheta (appendix to part iii, p. 56).

OZAN.—*Aux ânes.* Prairie d'Âne or "De Ann" is near Ozan. The old land plats call the creek Ozan. Town and stream in Hempstead county.

OZARK.—Featherstonhaugh who traveled in the state in 1834-5, says this word is a corruption of "Aux arcs," the French abbreviation of "Aux Arkansas."[25] Schoolcraft thinks it "to be compounded from Osage and Arkansas."[26]

PALARM.—*Place des alarmes* (Rose). Pike mentions (p. 128, appendix 41) Babtiste Larme, and the place name may have come from a personal name. Town and stream in Faulkner county.

POINT REMOVE.—*Remous*, an eddy. In *Long's Expedition* (ii, 274) mention is made of "*Point Remove* or *Eddy Point* creek, which enters the Arkansa about thirty miles above the Cadron." Nuttall spells it "Remu," which suggests that the word was so pronounced in his time. It is spelled Point Remove on the original land plats. Stream in Conway county.

POTEAU.—*Poteau*, a post, possibly some old land-mark, as Professor Coues suggests. Pike and Nuttall call it "Pottoe." "The Poteau, so called by the French, from the word signifying a post or station."[27] Mountain and stream in Scott county.

QUAPAW.—Kappas and Cappas. (Indian.) In

24 *The History of Louisiana.* Translated from the French of M. Le Page Du Pratz. A new edition. London, 1774, p. 318. See also Dunbar and Hunter, p. 121.

25 *Excursions Through the Slave States*, p. 89.

26 *Scenes and Adventures in the Ozark Mountains.* By H. R. Schoolcraft. Philadelphia, 1853, p. 246.

27 *Long's Expedition*, Vol. ii, p. 260.

1687 M. Joutel[28] of Salle's party spoke of "Cappa," an Indian village. The name of a land line near Little Rock.

SALINE.—This name, of such common occurrence in South Arkansas, is best explained by Dunbar and Hunter in speaking of the Saline River that enters the Ouachita between Ashley and Bradley counties.

"It has obtained its name from the many buffaloe salt licks which have been discovered in its vicinity. Although most of these licks, by digging, furnish water which holds marine salt in solution there exists no reason for believing that many of them would produce nitre" (p. 131).

See also *Marie Saline*.

SALISAW—Nuttall (p. 168) has "Salaiseau"; in *Long's Expedition* (ii. 225) reference is made to "*Bayou Salaison*, or meat salting Bayou," which is probably the correct derivation. It might have come, however, from *Sales eaux*, dirty water, or from *Salissant*, that soon gets dirty. Stream in Indian Territory near the Arkansas line.

SMACKOVER.—*Chemin couvert*, covered road. The original land map surveyed between 1838 and 1845 has this spelled "Smack overt:" this suggests that the original might have been *Chemin overt*, open road. Dunbar and Hunter, however, speak of it as follows: "A creek called Chemin Couvert, which forms a deep ravine in the highlands, here enters the river." (p. 133.) Stream in Union county.

SPADRA.—(?) Village and stream in Johnson county.

TCHEMANAHAUT.—*Chemin à haut*, or *Chemin à eau*. The old land plat of 19 S. 7 W. spells it "Chimanahaw" (1842). Stream in Ashley county.

TEAGER CREEK.—Probably from a proper name. Dunbar and Hunter (p. 142) say: "'Fourche au Tigree' (Tyger's Creek.)" Stream in Hot Springs county.

TURNWALL.—*Terre noir*, black land. This stream runs through the "Black lands." Featherstonhaugh speaks of it[29] as Tournois, and philologists suggest that Turnwall would not be derived from *Terre noir*.

28 *Op. cit.*, pp. 142, 149, 155, 159, 160.

29 *Geological Report of an Examination made in 1834.* Washington, 1835, p. 73.

Terre Rouge is the name of a stream in the same region, and this stream flows through the tertiary red lands. The Terre Noir flows through the chalky cretaceous black lands, and I think there can be no doubt about the explanation here given. Some of the maps of the state put it down "Terre noir." The old land plat of 9 S. 19 W. (1819) has it "Terre noire;" others have it "Terre noir." Creek in Clark Co.

WASHITA, see *Ouachita*.

WAVER LIGHT.—*Wavellite*. The mineral of this name is found in Garland county. Formerly post-office in Garland county west of Hot Springs.

JOHN C. BRANNER.
*Stanford University.*

## *ANGLO-FRENCH WORDS IN ENGLISH.*

BEHRENS[1] proposes some interesting questions in regard to the relation between the Anglo-French or, as he would have it, Norman-French and Germanic elements of our English vocabulary, which, he says, either remain unanswered or have been answered very unsatisfactorily. He himself attempts no definite answer to any one of his questions but contents himself with some general observations, along the line more fully developed by Skeat in his *Principles of English Etymology*, Second Series, 1891. A careful study, however, of the smallest portion of our English vocabulary, with the view of arriving at a definite answer to any one of Behrens's questions, shows that some of the general statements both of Behrens and Skeat must undergo very sensible modifications before they can be said to fairly represent the facts.

Skeat, for example, says that our Anglo-French words came in to fill a want, and that when this want was supplied the borrowing ceased.[2] Undoubtedly with the new civilization brought in by the Normans, many words were necessarily adopted with the thing or conception for which they stood. But only a small portion of our Anglo-French vocabulary entered in this way, as an examination of either Skeat's or Behrens's lists of Anglo-French words in English will show. The vast

1 Paul's *Grundriss*, vol. i, p. 812. 2 *L. c.*, p. 13.

majority came into the field and competed with Old-English words, expressing approximately the same idea. In the struggle for existence that ensued, many of the OE. words were worsted, fell into disuse, and died; others shared their territory with the new-comers, but in the course of centuries have been driven into closer and closer quarters; while still others live with them on an equal or at least amicable footing.

A striking example of this borrowing where there was certainly no want, is seen in the series of OE. words, found in the oldest texts as well as in the later ones, *here*, *werod*, *ferd*, for which the Anglo-French words, *host*, *army*, were borrowed to the complete discomfiture of their OE. synonyms. Again, the OE. had *þeod*, *leode*, *folc*, two of which the Anglo-French *people* and *nation* have already conquered, while the third *folc* has been shorn of much of its power. The people, the army, *par excellence*, being that of the conquering host, these words might be regarded as significant of the accuracy of Behrens's statements: "So sind' französiche hauptsächlich Bezeichnungen welche Bezug haben auf Verfassung, Verwaltung, Hof, Kunst, Wissenschaft, Titel u. Würden. Vorwiegend germanisch sind Ausdrücke welche sich auf Ackerbau, Schiffahrt, die umgehende Natur beziehen."

But the fact that '*dales* became *valleys*, *streams*, *rivers*, and *worts*, *herbs*' (Sehele de Vere) indicates that no such line of demarcation can be drawn. Rather is it true that, then as now, every man carried a dictionary of synonyms in his head. As he learned new words, he inserted them among the words which he already knew. It is not at all astonishing if the latter underwent a displacement either partial or complete. This displacement was determined by the principle stated by Bréal in his *Semantique*:[3]

"Toutes les fois que deux langues se trouvent en présence, il se fait un travail de classement qui consiste à attribuer des rangs aux expressions synonymes. Selon qu'un idiome est considéré comme supérieur ou inférieur, on voit ses termes monter ou descendre en dignité. La question de linguistique est au fond une question sociale ou nationale."

These assertions are well illustrated in an attempt to partially answer one of Behrens's questions:

"In welchen Fällen sind germanische Wörter, welche denselben Begriff ausdrückten u. dieselbe Sache bezeichneten wie das eingedrungene fremde Wort durch dieses ganz oder partiell verdrängt worden?"

If for this purpose the vocabulary of Henry Sweet's volume of *Oldest English Texts*, published in 1885 by the Early English Text Society, be examined, some interesting results may be obtained. These texts all belong before 900 A. D. and are printed from contemporary manuscripts. The question, then, in reference to these texts presents itself in this way: what words in this vocabulary, still living at the time of the Norman conquest, have been wholly or partially replaced by words borrowed from the Anglo-French?

1. Oldest English words wholly displaced.

The OE. word as it appears in these oldest texts will first be given, then its form as it appears in texts of the period of the Norman Conquest or later, and lastly, the French-English word, expressing the meaning of the OE. word, and which, we may reasonably suppose, had much to do with its disappearance. The French-English word must, of course, in every case be one introduced during what is generally known as the first period of French influence, or from the Norman Conquest to the latter part of the thirteenth or beginning of the fourteenth century, according to Emerson, or to the middle of the fourteenth or at least before the fifteenth century, according to Skeat. The quite appreciable vocabulary common to OE. and OFr. (I have noted sixty-four OE. words in Chrestien de Troyes) will not, then, be included in this discussion.

Here, *Ormulum*, *here*=host, army.

Werod, Ælfric on the *Old Testament*, *werod*; *weorede* in Layamon's *Brut*=host, army.

Ferd, Lay, *ferde*=host, army.

Geteld, Ælfric's *Lives of the Saints*, *geteld*, Lay. *teld*=tent.

Stefn, *Orm. steffne*=voice.

Gewitan, *Orm.* (*witenn itt*)=to depart.

Forwurd, *Orm. fortwurrpenn*=perished.

Frip, *Orm. fripp*, Lay. *frip* (*pais* in the later Lay. text)=peace.

Sibb; Lay. *sibbe*=peace. *Sibb* came to be used particularly for family peace. Hence our obsolete *sib*=family relation, and adj. sib=akin.

Wlite in *Vespasian Psalter*=beauty; in *Orm.*=face.

[3] P. 30.

Ond-wlite in *Vespasian Psalter*=face.
Fremð, *Orm. fremmde*=strange.
Arian, Ælfric's *Homilies*, *arian*=to honor.
Gebed, Ælfric's *H. gebed*, Lay. *bed*=prayer.
Bi-swīcan, *Orm. biswickenn*=to deceive.
Cwēman, *Orm. cwemenn*=to please.
Ēað-mod, *Orm. eadmod*=humble.
þēod, *Orm.* and Lay. *þeod*=people, nation.
Lēode, Lay. *leoden*=people, nation.
Ēa, *Orm. ae*=river.
Ēam, Ælfric's *Lives of the Saints*, *eam*=uncle.
Tǣlan, *Orm.* and Lay. *taelan*=to (accuse), blame.
Æpele, *Orm. apell*=noble.
Ofer-fechtun=conquered.
Dysig, Ælfric *dysig*=foolish.
Cerran, Ælfric's *H. cierran*=to turn.
Casere, Ælfric's *H. casere*=emperor.
Twēon, Ælfric's *H. tweonian*=to doubt.
Spēd, *Orm. spedd.*=riches, abundance.
Lēas, Lay. *laes*=false.
Gīsl, Lay. *gisles*=hostages (itself in the later Lay. text).
Wynn; Lay. *win*=joy.
Ed-wit, Lay. *aed-wit*=reproach.
Sīð, *Orm.* and Lay. *sið*=journey.
Fūs, *Orm. fus*=eager.
Froefran, *Orm. froffrenn*=to console, comfort.
Atur, *Orm. atterr*= poison.
Feorm, Lay. *feorm*=feast (in the later text of Lay. *mid-festen*).
Gegenga (=fellow-traveler) Lay. *genge*=company, people.
Dēor-wyrðe, *Orm. deorwurrpe*=precious.
On-rǣs, Lay. *raese*=attack, assault.
Win-berge, *Ancren R.*=grape.
Cumb (survives in proper names)=valley.
Denu, *Ayenb. denu*=valley.
Nift, Manning's *History of England*, *nift*=niece.

2. Oldest-English words, which still survive by the side of French-English words, originally synonyms, but which are of specialized, rare, or poetical use. M. Bréal in his review of Noreen's *Om. sprakriktighet*, says that which sticklers for Saxon words may well ponder upon:

"L'anglais s'est de tout temps montré facile aux importations. Il y a gagné de doubler son vocabulaire, ayant pour quantité d'idées deux expressions, l'une saxonne, l'autre latine ou française. . . . . Il faudrait être bien entêté de "pureté" pour dédaigner cet accoissement de richesses: car il est impossible qu'entre ces synonymes il ne s'établisse point des différences qui sont autant de ressources nouvelles pour la pensée."

These differences have here not only been established as under number 3, but they have so far accentuated themselves that the language of to-day is here seen in the process of stripping itself entirely of many of them. Were one to use exclusively Saxon words, he would often find himself talking to the majority of people unintelligibly. Even Bréal seems unaware of the fact that between *kindred* and *family*, by which he illustrates the second of his above-quoted sentences, *kindred*, as a substantive, is fast disappearing from common speech (at least in this part of America).

An-fald—simple.
Wiht—creature.
Pliht—danger, state.
Metan—to measure.
Dǣl—part.
Stede—place.
Bi-bude—commanded.
Folc—nation, people.
Hiw—color.
bēn—prayer, request.
Leoran—to pass, depart (p. p. lorn).
Hord—treasure.
Dæl—valley.
Wyrt—herb.
Weald—forest.
Lyft—air.
Clyppan—embrace.
Nēten—beast.
Cynn—race, family.
Dōm—judgment.
On-wendan—to move.
Wrecan—to avenge.
Bliss—joy.
Getæl—number.
Brūcan—to enjoy, use.
Werian=to defend.
Ealdor-mann—chief.
Gelīcian=to please ("It likes me not" is old but considering its later use of an active verb, it might have been put under number 3).

3. Words in Oldest Eng. with French-English synonyms, both still in common use, though more or less differentiated.

(Ge)feoht—(fight)-battle.
Cild—infant.
Stician—pierce.
Settan—place.
Wundor—marvel.
Wyrð—honour, dignity.
(Ge)þeaht—counsel, advice.
Milde—gentle.
Ryne—course.
Grimm—fierce.
Gest—stranger.
(Ge)gripan—seize.
D man—to judge.
Feoh—money.
Lust—desire.
Willinian—to desire.

Lucy M. Gay.

*University of Wisconsin.*

---

## *Sedere*, **Essere* AND *Stare* IN THE *POEMA DEL CID*. (Conclusion.)

### Syntax of *estar*.

1. It forms the periphrastic conjugation as in modern Spanish:

v. 2, Tornaua la cabeça e *estaua*-los *catando*.
154, Sonrrisos Myo Çid, *estaua*-los *fablando*.
541, Los moros e las moras *bendiziendol estan*.
1058, Pagado es Myo Çid que lo *esta aguardando*.
1243, Myo Çid don Rodrigo en Valençia *esta folgando*.
1746, Reçibien-lo las duennas que lo *estan esperando*.
2218, *Estan parando* mientes al que en buen ora nasco.
2305, Mager los *estan lamando*.
2439, Alço sos oios, *esteua* adelant *catando*.
3123, *Catando estan* a Myo Çid quantos ha en la cort.

As already observed, there are seven examples of the same use of SEDERE. The copula *ESSERE could not be employed in such locutions. The auxiliary in:

v. 786, Ca en alcanz sin dubda les *fueron dando*,

is to be regarded as the preterit of *ir*, which may still be used with the pres. part.

2. *Estar* denotes residence in a place.

(*a*). This use is very frequent in the epic formula *Dios* (or *Padre*) *que esta*(*s*) *en alto* (or *en çielo*):[27]

v. 8, Sennor padre que *estas en alto*.
330, Padre que *en çielo estas*.
497, A Dios lo prometo, a aquel que *esta en alto*.
792, Grado a Dios, aquel que *esta en alto*.
1297, Por aquel que *esta en alto*.
2126, El padre que *esta en alto*.
2892, Plega al Criador que *en çielo esta*.
2324, El padre que *esta en alto*.
2456, Al padre que *esta en alto*.

As opposed to these nine examples of *estar*, there is one of *es* from *ESSERE:

27 Cf. the *Bible*, *San Mateo* vi, 9: Padre nuestro, que estás en los cielos, etc.

v. 1094, Aludol el Criador el Sennor que *es en çielo*.

Here, by emending to *esta* and eliding the *e* of *que*, we obtain a hemistich of the Cornu system, a good *romance* verse: él Sénnór quẽ está én çi͡lo. In another isolated case, where *Parayso* is the place mentioned, *es* is used instead of *esta*;

v. 350, El vno [that is, one of the robbers crucified with Christ] *es en Parayso*.

There is no obvious reason here for the use of *es*. The modern editions of the *Bible*, as that of New York, 1826, have, *San Lucas* xxii, 43, "Y Jesus le dijo: En verdad te digo, Que hoy *serás* conmigo en el Parayso;" so that the Biblical passage seems still to exclude *estar* here.

(*b*). *Estar* denotes residence in a well-determined place; as, in a city, etc.:

v. 239, Y [—en San Pero] *estaua* donna Ximena.
294, Vansse pora San Pero do *esta* el que en buen punto naçio.
485, Fellos en Casteion o el Campeador *estaua*.
623, Myo Çid con esta ganançia en Alcoçer esta.
903, *Estando* alli [—sobre el Poyo] mucha tierra paraua.
1392, Adelino pora San Pero o las duennas *estan*.
1398, Saluda-uos Myo Çid alla ond de [—*onde*,[28] that is, en *Valençia*] elle *esta*.
1406, Enviolos a Myo Çid a Valençia do *esta*.
1484, Su mugier e sus fijas en Medina *estan*.
1537, Ondrado es Myo Çid en Valençia do *estaua*.
1621, De aquel rey Yuçef que en Marruecas *esta*.
1304, Dieron le en Valençia o bien puede estar rrico (—where well he may dwell in might).
1827, Legan a Valadolid do el rey Alfonsso *estaua*.
2853, Mucho uos lo gradeçe alla do *esta* Myo Çid [that is, en *Valençia*].
2854, Assi lo ffago yo que aqui *esto* [—en *Santesteuan*].

In contrast with the fifteen examples of STARE there are two of *ESSERE:

v. 1559, Apres *son* de Valencia,
2947, Afelas sus fijas en Valençia do *son*.

In v. 1559, the hemistich will become a good *romance* verse of seven syllables, if we read *estan* for *son*: Áprés éstán dé Válénçia.

In v. 2947, *son* is in assonance and may not easily be expunged from the text. Is it used here by poetical license? See below similar examples of *son*, where we expect *estan*.[29]

3. *Estar* indicates a more or less temporary

28 So Restori, *Propugnatore* xx., *parte sec.*, p. 163.

29 V. 2858, Minaya va uer sus primas do *son* [that is, *en Santesteuan*], probably belongs to this category. Here also the assonance makes it difficult to deal with the *son*.

situation in a definite place (not a city or country):

v. 351, *estando* en la cruz, vertud fezist muy grant.
606, Dando grandes alaridos los que *estan* en la çelada.
722, Todos fieren en el az do *esta* Pero Vermuez.
2431, A las tiendas eran legados do *estaua*
El que en buen ora nasco.
1672, Por las huertas adentro *estan* sin pavor.
2512, Aqui [=en la corte] *esta* con Myo Çid el obispo don Iheronimo.
2929, Adelino poral palaçio do *estaua* la cort.

Cf. also:

v. 385, Todas sus duennas que con ellas *estan*.
305, Plogo a los otros omnes todos quantos con el *estan*.

In a considerable number of cases which appear to belong to this category *ESSERE is used instead of STARE:

v. 61, Assi poso Myo Çid commo si *fuesse* en montanna.
1103, En sus tierras somos.
1772, Mynaya Albar Fanez fuera *era* en el campo.
2003, Dentro *es* su mugier.
2182, Todos essa noch *fueron* a sus posadas.
3548, De-mas sobre todos yes el rrey don Alfonsso [y=at the place of combat].
1258, De los que son aqui.
2428, Aquis ondro myo Çid e quantos con el son.

Where the verb occurs within the verse, it is usually easy to substitute forms from STARE for those of *ESSERE. Thus, we may read:

v. 1103, En [las] sus tierras *estamos*. (For *las sus*, cf. v. 19 *las sus bocas*).[30]
1772, [E] Mynaya Albar Fanez fuera *esta* en el campo. (As v. 1775 shows, the present tense is natural here).
2003, Dentro *esta* su muger.[31]
2182, Todos [toda?] essa noch *estauan* a sus posadas.[32] (Here the impf. tense suits better.)
3548, De-mas sobre [ellos] todos y *esta* el rrey Alfonsso.[33] (Cf. v. 3554 *al rrey Alfonsso*.)
1258, De los que aqui *estan*. (Or *De quantos aqui estan*).[34]
2428, Aquis ondro Myo Çid e quantos con el estan. (Here *son* is out of place, as the assonance is in *a*. The natural emendation is, therefore, *estan*.)[35]

Only v. 61 seems to defy emendation. Perhaps *fuesse* is there the impf. subj. of *ir*.

In a number of cases, *son* is found in assonance in a laisse in *o*, where *estan* cannot well be substituted: thus,

v. 1998, Todos los otros que y *son*.
3072, Los buenos que y *son*.
3162, Sus parientes e el vando que y *son*.

*Son* in assonance is especially frequent in the formulæ:

vv. 2561, 2079, 2032, Quantos aqui *son*.
2060, 2064, 2302, 3037, 3100, Quantos que y *son*.

So, to recapitulate, where it is not a question of residence in a fixed place, but of a rather temporary situation, it seems that the usage in the *Cid* varies. In the latter case, there are numerous examples of *ESSERE. Assuming that the metric system of the *Cid* is that of the *romances*, we can correct some of the instances by substituting the forms of *estar*, but the cases of *son* in assonance will still remain. May we appeal here again to a poetic license?

For want of a better place, we may mention here two instances of *ESSERE, instead of the more natural STARE, in interrogations:

v. 1804, Do *sodes*, cabos[o]? Venid aca, Mynaya.
2618, O *heres*, myo sobrino?

4. *Estar* indicates the situation of things with reference to the order in which they are found. Here, there is only a single example of *estar* where the situation is a permanent one:

v. 868, La terçera Teruel que *estaua* delant; (that is, the third city was T., which was further on.)

On the contrary, the forms of *ESSERE are used in at least six cases of this kind:

v. 435, Dizen Casteion el que *es* sobre Fenares.
552, A Teca que *es* adelant.
635, Siloca que *es* del otra part.
863, Un poyo que *es* sobre Mont Real.
867, Molina que *es* del otra part.
1150, Prisieron Çebola e quanto *es* y adelant.

Cf. also.

2499, Ala dentro en Marruecos, ó las mezquitas *son*.

Judging from this state of affairs, we may believe that *ESSERE is preferred to designate a geographical situation and one that is necessarily permanent. The single instance of *estar*, in v. 868, is probably an error. In the verse immediately preceding, we see *es* performing the very same office. We may read, then,

v. 868, La terçera Teruel que [y] *era* [a] delant. (Cf. vv. 552 and 1150.)

Where the situation is a temporary one, the

30 Cornu, *l. c.*, p. 484, would read: En suas tierras *estamos*.

31 Cornu keeps *es* and reads *sua*. Our reading seems more natural.

32 Cornu; fueron a suas posadas.

33 Cornu: Demas sobre todos yes el [buen] rrey don Alfonsso.

34 Cornu reads: De los que comigo son.

35 Lidforss changes to: Aquis ondro myo Çid e quantos con el *van*. Cornu accepts his emendation, simply lengthening *el* to *elli*.

examples of STARE are more numerous:

v. 1655, Creçem el coraçon por que *estades* delant.
2038, E a estas mesnadas que *estan* a-derredor.
3174, Dargelas queremos dellant *estando* uos.
3482, Que fagan esta lid delant *estando* yo.[36]
3622, Cadran muertos los que *estan* aderredor.

But beside these five cases of STARE, there are at least five of *ESSERE:

v. 2596, Delant *sodes* amos.
2137, Commo si *fosse* delant.
3611, Salien los fieles de medio ellos, cara por cara *son*.
532, Cerça *es* el rey.
1003, Vieron la cuesta-yuso la fuerça de los francos,
Al fondon de la cuesta, cerca *es* de lanno.

Of these verses, some may be remedied; for example, in v. 2596 the situation is identically that of vv. 1655, 3174, 3482, which have *estar*. We may, then, read:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Delant [uos] *estades* amos. (Or [*adelant*] *estades a*.).

V. 532 may be corrected to:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Cerca *esta* el [buen] rey (cf. v. 3024);

and v. 1003 to:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Cerca [ya] *esta* del llano.

V. 3611 is exceedingly corrupt,[37] and v. 2137 not easy of emendation.

5. *Estar* with the original sense *to stand*. It is difficult to establish just where this sense has persisted. It is perhaps present in:

v. 3629, Ffirme *estido* Pero Vermuez. (But cf. vv. 755, 3525).
637, Tres rreyes veo de moros derredor de mi *estar*.
100, Rachel e Vidas en vno *estauan* amos;

in vv. 2038 and 3622 cited above, and possibly also in vv. 1655, 3174, 3482 likewise mentioned above.

In v. 2017:

A todos los sos *estar* los mando,

there seems to be a weakening of the sense *to stand* to that of *to remain, stay there*, a weakening which is found also in the Old-French *ester*. But Cornu,[38] basing his emendation on the corresponding passage of the *Crónica*, corrects to:

A todas suas compañas *estar quedas* las mando.

6. *Estar* expresses existence in a more or less transitory state, the possession of more or less transient qualities, etc.:

v. 1494, E en Medina todo el rrecabdo *esta*.
1618, Myo Çid e sus compañas tan a grand sabor *estan*.
1601, Todas las sus mesnadas en grant deleit[39] *estauan*.
2311, Ellos en esto *estando* don auien grant pesar.
2032, Assi *estando*, dedes-me uuestra amor. (Here Cornu would read: Assi estando [delant], etc., a correction which brings the verse into class four above, and is in itself quite plausible. Otherwise the verse means: Assi estando [la cosa]=*the case being thus*.)
964, Agora correm las tierras que en mi anpara *estan*.

In expressions similar to the last, *ESSERE is used in vv. 3407, 3487, 3536, 2001, 189, 1760, 2105. In each case, it is probably a matter of fact as to whether the condition is permanent or transient, and the verb to be employed depends thereupon.

7. *Estar en*+a verbal substantive=*to be on the point of*+a pres. part.:

v. 270, Yo lo veo que *estades* uos en yda.

This is parallel to the Italian locution *stare per*+an infinitive. The *Cid* has *ESSERE in a similar instance, v. 2591, En espedimiento *son*, where the assonance may be responsible for *son* instead of *estan*.

8. *Estar a=to suit, become:*

v. 3089, Al puno bien *estan*.[40]

J. D. M. FORD.
*Harvard University.*

---

## *LINGER and LUNGERN, LONG and VERLANGEN.*

AT first sight, it seems natural enough that Skeat regards *linger* as "formed by adding the frequentative suffix *-er* or *-r* to the M. E. *lengen* 'to tarry,' . . . A. S. *lengan* 'to put off.'" He would probably have been even more convinced of the correctness of this explanation, had he thought of English *long*, OE. *langĭan*, 'yearn for,' which is a sister verb to *lęngan*, and had he known that German *lungern* sometimes has the meaning 'watch eagerly for,' besides the usual 'loiter.' But, in the first place, the fact that the *ng* of linger is not sounded *ndʒ* shows that, were the word a derivative of OE. *lęngan*, it must have been

36 For the metre's sake [*a*]*delant* might be read in vv. 1655, 3174, 3482.

37 In his conferences at the Collège de France, 1897–1898, M. Morel-Fatio proposed the reading: *Salidos son los fieles* [*ca*] *cara por cara son*. *Son* being in assonance, a poetical license may be invoked here.

38 *L. c.*, p. 498.

39 The manuscript has *delent*. Damas-Hinard proposed *deleit*, which is accepted by Lidforss and Cornu. The latter reads: Todas las suas mesnadas en grant deleit [ent] estauan.

40 In the January number, col. 16, ¶ 6, the words *of the Latin etymon* should be struck out.

formed before the time when palatal *ng* became *ngʒ* before vowels;[1] that is, that it was formed at a very early day, which is not at all likely, when we consider that *lɛn̡gan* is itself a derivative in *-jan* from *lang*. No similar *r*-derivative from a derivative in *-jan* can be cited, and it would be difficult to conceive what form it would have had in Old English. Secondly, German (*herum*)*lungern* 'loiter' is evidently the same word as *linger*, and could in no way be derived from OHG. *lɛngen*, the German correspondent of OE. *lɛn̡gan*.

Kluge derives *lungern* from OHG. *lungar*, MHG. *lunger*, 'active,' 'swift.' This is evidently correct, and English *linger* is similarly derived from OE. **lungor* implied in the adverb *lungre*, 'swiftly.' That is **lyn̡gran* : **lungor* : : hyn̡gran : *hungor*. As the noun *hungor* persisted, it was able in time to assimilate to itself its companion verb, so that we now say *to hunger* rather than *to hinger*; but the early loss of **lungor* left **lyn̡gran* to its natural development. That the palatal *ng* of *lyn̡gran* remained palatal *ng* before the consonant *r*, and did not pass on to dental *ndʒ* (as it did before vowels, and hence in *lɛn̡gan*, *sɛn̡gan* 'singe,' etc.) is regular; cf. *England* < *Ɛn̡glaland*.

Kluge and Paul do not explain how they get from the idea of 'swift' to that of 'loiter,' but they regard 'gierig aufpassen' as the earlier idea, and suppose the more common meaning 'loiter' to be a later development. This is a mistake, as I shall show directly.

√ *lengh*.

(1) Lith. *leñgvas* 'light,' Sans. *laghú-ṣ* 'light,' ελαχύς 'slight,' 'small'; also English *light* and German *leicht*. Whence the verbs Sans. *lañgh raṅh* 'leap,' 'run,' OHG. and MHG. (*ge*)*lingan* *-en* 'advance,' 'make progress,' 'succeed.'

(2) 'ελαφρός 'active,' 'nimble,' 'swift,' OHG. and OS. *lungar*, 'active,' 'swift,' OE. *lungre* 'quickly.' Whence the verbs German *lungern* and English *linger*.

The semasiology of the words *lungern* and *linger* is very interesting, making, in fact, a complete saltus.

OHG. *lungar*, OE. *lungor*: 'lively,' 'quick.'

[1] In an other paper I intend soon to show that this took place in the seventh century.

German *lungern*, English *linger*:—

(1) 'be active,' 'move rapidly,' 'run about.'

(2 *a*) 'keep running about instead of going straight on with the others, or instead of attending to any business in hand.'

(2 *b*) 'run or stroll about in search of prey.'

(3 *a*) 'loiter behind,' 'linger.'

(3 *b*) 'hang around, watching for something to eat.'

(4 *a*) 'lounge about,' 'be idle.'

(4 *b*) 'be hungry.'

The meanings (2) and (3) arise particularly when speaking of children and dogs. As Paul says, the meaning 'linger' is most common in *herumlungern*; this form may go back to the time when the word meant 'run about.' A similar development of the idea of 'slow movement' out of that of 'rapid movement,' and of 'inactivity' out of 'activity is shown by English *leap*, German *laufen* 'run,' dialectically 'walk,' Pennsylvania German *lōfə* 'walk,' English *loaf* 'loiter about,' 'be idle.' Prof. Learned writes me that English *loaf* 'loiter about,' as well as *loafer*, have been taken up by the Pennsylvania Germans, so that they have *lōfə* 'walk' and *lōfə* 'loaf.'

---

Under *verlangen*, Kluge, speaking of OE. *langīan*, OS. *langōn*, OHG. *langēn*, etc., says:

"Man fasst sie meist als alte Ableitung zu *lang*, wobei die Bedeutung auffällt; eher dürfte man die Sippe von *gelingɛn* vergleichen, deren Grundbedeutung 'streben' ist."

I cannot see how the development 'be long,' 'make one's self long,' 'reach out for,' 'long for,' can offer difficulty; it seems to me one of the most natural. Besides, the words actually have not only the meaning 'long for,' but also that of 'be long,' 'stretch,' etc., which it would be difficult to explain if we regard the idea 'to long for' as the more original and as derived from 'to strive after.' Moreover, we have seen that it is a mistake to say that 'streben' is the fundamental idea of *gelingen*. The original meaning is 'be lively,' 'leap,' 'advance.' The idea of 'striving' is simply suggested by the meaning 'succeed,' and there is no evidence or likelihood that the word *gelingen* ever had the meaning 'strive,' to say

nothing of this being its original force. We have, therefore, no reason whatever to associate *gelingen* and *verlangen*. We have simply to recognize that, as in many other cases,[2] two sets of derivative verbs have been formed from the adjective *lang*:—

(1) First weak conjugation:

OHG. *lengen* 'make long,' 'delay,' OE. *lęngan* 'extend,' 'delay.'

(2) Second or third weak conjugation:

OHG. *langēn* 'become *or* seem long,' 'stretch,' 'reach,' 'long (for),' OS. *langōn* 'long (for),' OE. *langian* 'become long,' 'long (for).'

GEORGE HEMPL.

*University of Michigan.*

## *THE ISLAND OF AVALON.*

ONE of the most attractive among the legends that group around King Arthur tells how that monarch, wounded in the last great fight with Modred, was carried off to Avalon to be healed of his wounds. Some day he will return, the Britons say, to ransom his people and redeem his land. The first appearance of this tradition in literature seems to be in Wace's *Brut*:

> En Avalon se fist porter
> Por ses plaies médiciner.
> Encor i est, Breton l'atandent,
> Si com il dient et entandent;
> De la vandra, encor puet vivre. 13683–13687.
> . . . . . .
> Livra son raine, si li dist
> Qu'il fust rois tant qu'il revenist. 13703–13704.

The first two lines quoted here are translated from Geoffrey of Monmouth. Those that follow are additions made by Wace himself, and have always been adduced to support the opinion that there was a popular belief among Celts that Arthur was biding his time in a place (more exactly in an island) called Avalon. Other passages confirming this theory have been cited from Chrétien's *Érec* (line 1955) and Marie de France's *Lanval* (lines 659–662).

In the October number of the *Romania* for 1898 (pages 552–564) Ferdinand Lot arrives at conclusions entirely different from these, and would have the idea of a region called Avalon come down through literary channels only. He does, however, admit the possibility of oral popular sources (*op. cit.*, page 555 end). The chain of reasoning by which he establishes his position is this. There was a mysterious island in the western seas which was ruled in Celtic mythology by the god Avaloc. In process of time and through linguistic confusion this name became Avalon or Avallon, yet was still applied to a person and not a region. So that when Geoffrey of Monmouth writes "in insulam Avallonis" in his *Historia*, he is speaking of Avalon's island and not the island Avalon. But Wace translating this phrase supposes it is a place called Avalon. Chrétien and Marie perpetuated his error, and thus it was continued down into modern literature. That Wace knew about such a region by any other way than through Geoffrey is not admitted.

It was hardly possible for the editors of the *Romania* to allow this assumption of M. Lot to go unchallenged, and we are not surprised, therefore, to find a protest lodged against it by Gaston Paris in a note subjoined to M. Lot's article (*op. cit.*, page 573). In that note M. Paris advances two reasons against M. Lot's position. First, that Wace does not speak of Avalon as an "island," whereas Chrétien and Marie do, and, therefore, they cannot have followed him. Second, that the context in the *Brut*—quoted but disregarded by M. Lot (see lines 13685–13687 above)—as well as the context in *Érec* and *Lanval*, points to popular beliefs in the island Avalon, which were known to the authors of those poems.

The first argument of M. Paris, unfortunately, is due to an inadvertence. It is true that in the passage quoted Wace does not say that Avalon is an island. But earlier in the poem (line 9516) in speaking of Excalibur he adds "En l'ile d'Avalon fu faite," a translation of Geoffrey's "in insula Avallonis fabricato." So that subsequent writers might very well have borrowed from Wace their topography of Avalon. But the other argument, the assertion that the context in the *Brut* implies that Arthur's sojourn in Avalon was a common tradition among the Celts, and that the French knew of Avalon as a place and not as the abode of a person named Avalon can hardly

2 Cf. *hycgan* 'remember', *hogian* 'think about'; *mengan* 'mix,' *mangian* 'trade'; *weccan* 'wake up,' *wacian* 'be awake'; *scyttan* 'remove *or* discharge (a debt),' *scotian* 'move rapidly,' 'shoot'; *wendan* 'turn,' *wandian* 'turn aside,' 'be ashamed,' 'neglect'; *wegan* 'move,' 'stir,' *wagian* 'move,' 'wag;' etc., etc.

be overcome. The lines of Chrétien and Marie point, indeed, to this same conclusion.

There is another witness in this case who has not been hitherto cited, but who may well be. It is the author of the epic poem *le Couronnement de Louis* (edited for the *Société des anciens textes français* in 1888 by Ernest Langlois). This author, whose name is unknown, is supposed to have come from the Ile-de-France, and rather from the east of that province than from the west (see edition, page clxix–clxx); and to have written about the middle of the twelfth century (see *Romania*, vol. xxv, page 379). In other words, he was not a Norman, nor was his birthplace near the borders of Brittany, while as a poet he was a contemporary of Wace, who finished his *Brut* in 1155, as is stated in the closing lines of that poem. So that the author of *le Couronnement* could hardly have profited by the *Brut* in writing his epic, and may, therefore, stand as an independent authority on the point at issue regarding Avalon. Now he uses the name twice in the same episode, and both times as a locality. The hero of the poem, William of Orange, is ordering his nephew, Alelme, to summon Açelin to render homage to Louis. If he does not

> Qu'ainz l'avesprer en sera si hontos
> N'i voldreit estre por tot l'or d'Avalon. 1795–1796.

The summons is given. Açelin answers with a proposition which aims at detaching William from the king. But Alelme replies:

> Il nel ferait por tot l'or d'Avalon. 1827.

It is clear that the poet means a region—whether island or not—and also that his readers (or hearers) knew that region to be endowed with unusual gifts. Furthermore, it is evident that the lines in the *Brut* where Avalon is mentioned could not have been the source of this specific characteristic of gold, even if *le Couronnement de Louis* is the later of the two poems in date.*

F. M. Warren.

*Adelbert College.*

* It may be well to call attention to the fact that Wace is credited in his *Brut* with a longer poem than he really wrote. The only edition published, the one by Leroux de Lincy, gives the number of lines as fifteen thousand three hundred. But there are several errors in the enumeration, which are continued, and affect the sum-total. Line 1120 is printed 1130, line 1770 reads 1780, line 9970 is displaced by 9980, and line 11700 by 11800. So that the actual length of the *Brut* as represented in this edition is to be reached by deducting one hundred and thirty lines from the printed fifteen thousand three hundred.

## *THE INTERNATIONAL CORRESPONDENCE.*

England, France, Germany, Italy, The United States, and Canada, and to some extent also Spain and Portugal, are now connected by a system of International Correspondence, beginning among students of the different countries, and gradually extending to mature men and women in the various walks and occupations of life. The system as now inaugurated was first practically introduced, about three years since, by Professor T. Mieille, then of the College of Draguignan, France, now of the Lycée de Tarbes, Hautes Pyrenées. Being an experienced Professor of English in his own country, and having a wide acquaintance in England, where he had spent some years, he began his work by interesting in it the *Review of Reviews* in London, and the *Revue Universitaire* in Paris. This correspondence was at first undertaken by the students of the schools and colleges of these two countries, but later through the co-operation of the *Manuel Générale de l' Instruction Primaire*, published by Hachette et Cie, there was established, between teachers and Professors, what was called the Correspondance Pédagogique Internationale. The following extract from a letter received from Prof. Mieille, the inventor of this system, cannot fail to be of interest at this point:—

"Since you are collecting statistics, I will tell you that for the French-English correspondence alone the official figure is over three thousand on each side. Moreover, allow about one thousand for Germany and Italy. These two latter countries will soon greatly increase their correspondence with France, since several journals have earnestly espoused the cause. I add, as information useful for your report, that the figures above given are exclusively French. I know from a reliable source that already a certain number of Italians, English, and Germans are engaged in active correspondence among themselves. There is, besides, the international correspondence for adults, in which many are engaged in the countries above mentioned. So that it is within, rather than beyond, the bounds of truth to say that the whole number of correspondents on the various lists is now about ten thousand. Is not that splendid? And the results, by common consent, are excellent. See upon this subject the *Review of Reviews* of London. They write me from Germany the most satisfactory letters. In France the system meets universal approval, and it is now officially recommended in the classes."

This report from Prof. Mieille is certainly very encouraging, and the more so as the system is, as yet, only upon its third year. In the United States it was introduced in Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee, two years since, and last year continued in Vanderbilt, and introduced in Swarthmore College, Pennsylvania. The success attending it in these institutions being widely noticed by the public press, it is being gradually introduced, at least so far as French and German are concerned, into other institutions.

Between the European countries engaged in this correspondence letters can be written and answered about twice in each month, or, in some cases, even weekly; but at the greater distance of the United States, it is scarcely possible to exchange letters oftener than once a month, at least if each writer waits for an answer, but some prefer to write more frequently, without waiting for replies. After the introductory letters are passed, this would seem to be quite practicable, even at the great distance of three thousand miles of ocean travel.

A simple statement of the method pursued, in beginning and carrying on this correspondence, will not be found void of interest. An International Committee of fifty-six members has been established in France, representing a large number of literary institutions there, with one representative, thus far, in England, and one in the United States. Of this committee M. Buisson, Professor at the Sorbonne, is President, Miss Williams, Professor at the Schools of Sèvres and of Fontenay, is Vice President of the English Section for women and girls; and M. Mouchet, Professor at the School Colbert, is Vice President of the English Section for men and boys. When fully organized there would thus be two Vice Presidents for each of the languages represented. Teachers in the United States can send the names and ages of their students who wish to correspond to Mr. Mouchet or to Miss Williams, or to her assistant, Mme Rossignol,[1] who will promptly assign suitable correspondents to such applicants, and direct them to write first a letter in French to the assigned person. On receiving this first letter the American students answer in English, and (the correspondence being necessarily slow at so great a distance) prompt replies should always be sent. Thus each person has, at this stage, a model letter in the foreign tongue, as something of a guide in the form of a reply. The next letters exchanged are both written in the tongue foreign to the writer. These should be written without the aid of the teacher, carefully corrected by the receiver, and the results forwarded to the writer with the next letter sent. Some return the letters corrected, but most naturally prefer to retain these, and copy and send back only the corrections.

It is proper here to remark that while men and women, boys and girls, enter profitably into this correspondence, it is manifestly necessary that students should address always those of their own sex. In the beginning it was customary to publish in the *Revue Universitaire*, and the *Manuel Général*, lists of the names and addresses of all engaged in this correspondence. This publicity of the names of young women was offensive in France, and while the names of the young men continue to appear, the initials only of the young women are generally given. In our two years experience at Swarthmore, we have, in a few instances, had young men apply to us for lady correspondents, which applications, it is perhaps needless to say, were promptly declined.

With regard to the management of the letters when received, different teachers will doubtless pursue different methods, and it is the very flexibility of the system which is one of its great advantages. Some teachers have read and commented upon them in class, and this course has been suggested to me by the inventor, Prof. Mieille himself. Last year, with fewer letters, I had most of them read, either translated in the class, or preferably read in the native language. But this year, with an improved arrangement of program, and a larger number of letters received, I have found this impracticable and undesirable. Of the four periods of recitation per week, I now give two to conversation, and pronouncing and writing French, under a native Parisian; and two to the study of grammatical construction, the fluent and polished English translation, and the Study of the Literature of the

[1] 117 Rue Notre Dame des Champs, Paris.

Language. All of this, while I deem it very important, crowds out the reading in class of the larger number of letters received. But the interest in the correspondence seems to be not one whit diminished by it; and the whole system of instruction as now arranged, after a long life-time of experiment, seems to me more nearly an ideal system than any which I have hitherto reached. It surely requires *two* instructors to teach *to the best advantage* any foreign spoken language, each rendering what to him (or her) is the foreign language, into his mother tongue.

One question has often been asked which should have a reply. Should special *subjects* be set for this correspondence. I should say decidedly no—nothing would more surely take the life out of it than to make it thus an allotted task. As in ordinary letter writing, let the daily lives of the writers, and their surroundings,be the ever fruitful theme. Thus, too, will they learn the more rapidly the ordinary spoken language of every day life. Later, the language of science, literature, and art will come in due time. Again I have heard it suggested that a special charge be made for this correspondence. This would seem very inappropriate, for the writers pay for their instruction by correcting letters received. It is an arrangement for mutual benefit; and the only expense should be the materials used and the postage paid.

It will be of interest to know the situation of the correspondence at Swarthmore at this date. I took the record last week for the past three months, with this result: number of students in French, exclusive of beginners, fifty; number of these fifty who correspond, thirty-five; number of letters passed in twelve weeks, one hundred and twenty-five; additional students requesting correspondents last week, twelve.

In German, twenty-five students are now corresponding; this having been very satisfactorily introduced this year into that department.

Before closing this paper I will briefly refer to a modification of this system of International Correspondence which has been suggested by Prof. Mieille, called the "exchange of students;" upon this subject he writes as follows:

"I am at this time occupied with an important project, which I have much at heart. I am considering the establishing of a Bureau of exchange, intended to encourage and facilitate the sojourn of students abroad, by way of exchange between families. My project has the support of many eminent men, and I make it the subject of an article in the July number of the *Revue Universitaire*. This article is addressed to the Inspecteur Général des Langues Vivantes; and is as follows:

Monsieur l'Inspecteur Général:

I have the honor to submit to you a project for the organization of a Franco-Anglais Bureau of Exchange, the object of which would be to give the benefit of a sojourn abroad to the greatest possible number of our students of the living languages

Although the first idea of an organization of this kind dates from the foundation of the International Correspondence, nothing had yet been tried,systematically at least, to reduce to practice this idea of exchange, and establish the means of carrying it out. But a great step has recently been taken in this direction. Mr. Stead, the director of the *Review of Reviews*, whom the idea of this Exchange Bureau had attracted from the first, has made an investigation of this subject among twenty or thirty of the directors of the principal Public Schools of England; and he has kindly communicated to me the result of this investigation, asking me to do the same in France. The idea of an organization which should promote and facilitate the sojourn in France (in a Lycée, or a French family) of a certain number of young English students, in exchange for which the same number of young French students should sojourn in England, has met, from the directors interviewed, with the most favorable reception.

Would it be the same in France? I believe so, and it is because I am persuaded of it, that I permit myself, in submitting to you at once the idea and the project, to solicit your encouragement, and your effective support.

These would be the outlines of the organization projected:

1st. A Bureau d'échange interscolaire is created between France and England. This bureau serves as a medium of communication between parents or directors of schools of the two countries, who desire to send their children or their students abroad, to make a sojourn there more or less long, including the vacations.

2d. These exchanges are reciprocal, and involve no other expense than the journey and the small sundry expenses. The schools and families of the two countries ensure, to the young strangers, board and instruction free.

3d. The seat of the bureau is for England, the office of the *Review of Reviews*, London: for France, to be determined,perhaps,the office

of the *Revue Universitaire;* perhaps a committe composed of the professors of languages in the principal Academies or Universities.

4th. A sum of ten francs will accompany each request. This sum will serve to cover the expenses of correspondence, and the slight expense occasioned by the arrival or departure of each child.

I should be very grateful to you not to judge too severely, by this outline, a project which I desire to recommend to your especial favor. The support of the administration is, in view of the central organization of our secondary instruction, a condition perhaps indispensable to success. I reasonably expect a favorable reception for this application, after your kind consideration of the International Correspondence, of which this Bureau of Exchange is, in a manner, the necessary conclusion, or rather the natural development.

In fact, as I said in the beginning, from the idea of the Correspondence the idea of Exchange has grown. What more natural than the desire to perfect the acquaintance begun by letter? Do they not already half know each other, when they have written long friendly letters, after they have exchanged portraits and photographic views? And do not most letters show a reciprocal desire to visit each other?

How many parents, notwithstanding their tender regard for their children, would gladly send them to pass several months abroad, but who are prevented by the great expense, the difficulty of accompanying them themselves, and especially by the fear of the danger of exposing them, without proper care, to a sojourn in a foreign land!

With our Exchange-bureau all is very simple. The parents enroll the names, or have their teachers do it. The exchange is arranged. The young stranger, received at the station by the family or the committee, is affectionately introduced, follows the courses of the Lycée or the College, while his French comrade, having become his substitute, is treated in like manner at his own home in England.

The Bureau of Exchange would also occupy itself with adults, Professors and students, who would exchange in their vacations. And this would be an excellent means of economy, without speaking of the advantage to be derived, in a pedagogical estimate, from sojourning in the foreign family of a colleague."

We shall probably hear, before the end of the coming year, of the full development of this ingenious method of Prof. Mieille's to facilitate the acquisition of foreign languages.

I may say, in conclusion, with reference to our correspondence at Swarthmore, that, so far as known, all who began it last year, and who have now completed their course (with perhaps one or two exceptions), continue the correspondence. This communication with foreign lands, thus begun in school and college days, can scarcely fail to be a source of great satisfaction, and of essential service in many ways, in after life. Few subjects of study can be rendered more interesting and profitable than the study of modern foreign languages under such auspices.

EDWARD H. MAGILL.

*Swarthmore College,*
*Swarthmore, Pa.*

## *VARIATIONS IN FRENCH PRONUNCIATIONS.*

*Results of a pedagogical experiment made by comparing the examples given in Matzke's* PRIMER OF FRENCH PRONUNCIATION *with their equivalents in the Michaelis-Passy* DICTIONNAIRE PHONÉTIQUE DE LA LANGUE FRANÇAISE.

### I.

"THE pronunciation of French," says Professor Matzke, "is confessedly the most difficult subject which the student meets in undertaking the study of the language." It has also been my experience that it is one of the most difficult subjects that the student meets during his entire study of the language. The importance of the subject, whether for reading, particularly poetry, for understanding the spoken language or for speaking it, must appeal to any teacher earnestly desirous of imparting to his students the essence of the original. The contribution of Professor Matzke, dealing directly with this phase of the subject, is in its way the most serious attempt to call attention especially to this trying feature, although it has been dealt with as scientifically and completely in Professor Grandgent's *Short French Grammar* and in Professor Bevier's *French Grammar*, as the limits of these treatises permit. Such works in this country and such a work as that of Rossmann und Schmidt, *Lehrbuch der französischen Sprache*,[1] show what the feeling is in regard to the importance of the matter at home and abroad, and are attempts to place the study of language on a more satisfactory scientific basis.

In what measure the study of language sounds can be combined with the study of the

1 Leipzig, 1896.

language itself, is a question of how far theory and practice can be combined; so many factors enter, that no single statement can answer for all cases; the knowledge, ability, and interest of the teacher in such work are most vital factors, not to mention others. In my own case, I have little confidence that I could use Professor Matzke's *Primer* effectively with a class of beginners, and in such matters each teacher must, I believe, be his own judge of how satisfactorily he can deal with a subject. My own experience leads me to believe that the simplest, as well as the most natural method for the beginner is merely as close imitation of the teacher as possible. One thing at a time, and first a practical familiarity with the sounds obtained by hearing them,—after which the study of sound symbols, tongue positions, etc., may contribute whatever it can. If a teacher can teach both effectively at once, he may prefer to do so. While it is not my belief that phonetics and language should be separated, yet, on the other hand, I doubt whether at all stages they should always be taught together. While I have tried to teach more or less of the science of language and pronunciation both in the college and in the graduate school, the results have been so different, and so much in favor of emphasizing this feature in the latter rather than in the former, that I am inclined to believe the graduate school the proper place for the systematic treatment of the sounds as distinguished from the study in general of the entire subject. Thus it is that I have there, with a class keenly interested in the subject, taken up Professor Matzke's *Primer*. We have gone through it, scrutinizing everything carefully, with a view of getting all possible knowledge in regard to the pronunciation of the examples there recorded. Notwithstanding the fact that much of such work has necessarily been in the nature of a book review, I desire to state that the task has not been taken up in a captious or fault-finding spirit. Indeed, my hearty appreciation of Professor Matzke's good work has already been publicly expressed in an article in the *Maître Phonétique*.[2]

The number of variations met with in studying the examples suggested the idea of going over them all and stating the results in tabular form. In doing this we have had the advantage of some works not to be had when the *Primer* appeared, notably the Michaelis-Passy dictionary, portions of the Hatzfeld-Darmesteter dictionary, and the Passy-Rambeau chrestomathy. The titles of quite a number of other works consulted were given together with comments, more or less extended, in footnotes referring to the examples as they occur in the *Primer*. Such a study, of course, Professor Matzke did not contemplate, certainly with students of the elements; and did I not believe that such a study must be directly useful to teachers of French and post-graduates rather than to under-graduates, the comparisons would have no *raison d'être*.

As is well-known to those interested in the scientific study of the French language, the latest and most important contribution to the science of French pronunciation is the Michaelis-Passy *Dictionnaire Phonétique*.[3] The time spent in its preparation by scholars so competent for their task must naturally rank this work as an authority, which, unless the promise that is reasonably to be expected fails, and that is unlikely, must be quite as weighty as any that exists on French pronunciation. Accordingly, while in our examination all available authorities have been consulted, the M.-P. dictionary has throughout been made the basis of the comparison. The results compared with those obtained here by other classes in this field have proven by far the most profitable and the most interesting, which is one reason, in the first place, why I desire to make them known. Secondly, if this article can contribute anything toward directing attention to these two important contributions to the study of French pronunciation, Prof. Matzke's *Primer* and the excellent M.-P. dictionary, so that they may possibly be used in our colleges and graduate schools in some such way, for example, as that set forth here, it will not have been written in vain.

Professor Matzke's sound symbols differ somewhat from those used by the *Association Phonétique Internationale* with which the comparison is here instituted. Although they answer the purpose, I do not believe they answer as well as do the symbols of the *Association*,

2 Sept.-Oct., 1897.

3 Hannover, 1897.

and, to my mind, it is to be regretted that scholars cannot unite upon one system, the advantages of which, as I have already pointed out in the article, above referred to in the *Maître Phonétique*, must be obvious to all interested.

Taking up first the "Explanatory Table of Phonetic Symbols,"[4] the symbols representing the vowel sounds are given with the key-words, while just below, for convenience of comparison, I have merely given the symbol used to represent the above sound by Michaelis-Passy, without their key-words, which are not essential.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| a (passe); | *ɑ* (page); | *ɛ* (tête); |
| *ɑ;* | a; | *ɛ;* |
| *o* (rose); | *u* (rouge); | *œ* (heure); |
| *o;* | *u;* | *œ;* |
| ã (chambre); | *ɛ̃* (pain); | *ɔ̃* (bon); |
| *ɑ̃;* | *ɛ̃;* | *ɔ̃;* |
| *e* (épée); | *i* (dire); | *o* comme; |
| *e;* | *i;* | *ɔ;* |
| *œ* (feu); | *ü* (mur); | |
| *ø;* | *y;* | |
| *œ̃* (un); | *e* (le); | |
| *œ̃;* | *ə;* | |

: sign of length.
: sign of length.[5]

As may be seen, with the exception of *i*=Fr. *i*, and *u*=Fr. *ou*, the signs for nasality and for length, each symbol differs from its correspondent in the other system more or less.

The symbols representing the consonants in each system are more nearly alike: *b*, *d*, *f*, *g*, *k*, *l*, *m*, *n*, *p*, *r*, *s*, *t*, *v* and *z* being alike in both systems and representing, respectively, the corresponding French consonants. *x* is given as a symbol=*ks*. As it is not used in the *Primer* as a symbol at all, and as both *k* and *s* are used as symbols, why it should appear here is not clear. In regard to *h*, Professor Matzke says: "*h* whether it stands at the beginning or in the middle of the word, is never pronounced in French."[6] Consequently its non-appearance in the *Primer* is phonetically exact. Of course if there be a slight aspiration audible, then it should surely be recorded by some symbol denoting aspiration. In such forms as Fr. *hache* and *je hais*, it can undoubtedly be heard in the pronunciation of many French people. Michaelis-Passy, who use the symbol *h*, say: "*h* indique que la liaison et l'élision ne se font pas, et qu'on peut aspirer."[7] This to my mind is more satisfactory, because one has a safe guide in the perplexing cases of elision and linking, even though the *h* is absolutely silent.

The symbols which differ from each other in the two systems, but which represent the same consonantal French sounds are:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *s̬*=(sh in E. sham); | *z̬*=(s in leisure and z in azure); | *ñ*=(ni in union); |
| *ʃ* . . (*ch*at, ha*ch*e); | *ʒ* . . (*J*ean, rou*g*e); | *h* . . . (reg*n*er, pei*gu*e); |
| *i̯* (semi-consonantal i) | *u̯* (semi-consonantal u) | *ü̯* (semi-consonantal ü); |
| *j* . . . (*y*eux, b*i*en); | *w* . . (*ou*i, p*oe*le); | *y* (*hu*ile, n*u*age). |

*i̯ u̯* and *ü̯*=semi-consonantal *i*, *u* and *ü* have a reference,[8] where by means of examples these symbols are explained. The corresponding M.-P. symbols *j*, *w* and *ɥ*, *with their keywords*, if not so readily transparent as some of the other symbols of the *Association Phonétique*, nevertheless convey at once a rather more intelligent idea of their values than do Professor Matzke's *i̯*, *u̯* and *ü̯*, *without looking up the reference.*

The sign ~ is used in the *Primer* to denote vowel nasality; that is, to show that a sound not nasal is made so by the air partly deflected through the nose. This same symbol, however, is placed over the character representing French *gu*, which sound is already in itself nasal. Inasmuch as lip nasal *m* and point nasal *n* are distinguished by different symbols, why palatal Fr. *gu* sound should not be is not clear; and that point nasal *n* should do service as a palatal nasal by putting the tilde (~) over it is using the sign to indicate position, a function different from that originally assigned to it.

The first criticism in particular which my class made, was in regard to the symbols a (p*a*sse) and *ɑ* (p*a*ge). Professor Matzke has chosen the common symbol a to represent the less common variety of Fr. *a*, that is, Fr. back *a* in *passe*; and he has chosen the comparatively rare symbol Greek alpha (*ɑ*) to represent

4 P. vi.

5 Used, as on p. 46, note 3, to indicate *consonantal* lengthening, although almost invariably throughout the *Primer* vocalic length is meant.

6 P. 40. 7 P. 120. 8 Cf. § 42.

the more common variety of Fr. *a* in p*a*ge. It would be more natural and more logical that the common symbol a should represent the very frequently occurring sound, front *a* as in p*a*ge, while the comparatively rare symbol Greek alpha (*α*) should represent the less frequently occurring back *a* in p*a*sse, about as in the Michaelis-Passy, or exactly if *α* of the *Primer* can be considered as Passy's *a*. I quite agree with the class. It must be remembered in this comparison, then, that when in any given word, which is transcribed in each system, the symbols for the Fr. *a* sound are alike, that is, either a and a or *α* and *α*, the sounds in each word in the two systems are *different;* and when the symbols for the Fr. *a* are *different*, that is, a and *a* or *α* and a, the sounds in the two systems are *alike*. Thus in the *Primer*,[9] we have *vu̯a:r*=voir, M.-P. *vwa:r; teritu̯a:r*=territoire, M.-P. *teritwa:r; nu̯a:r*=noir, M.-P. *nwa:r;* in each of which three cases the a in question in the *Primer* is of the less common variety or Fr. back *a*, while in the M.-P. pronunciation, it is of the commoner variety, or strictly speaking, phonetically *front a* in distinction to the former sound *back a*. On the same page we have *ruα* (*ru̯α* should have been printed),=roi, M.-P. *rwa*, where again the vowel sound in the two systems is different; but in the form for moi=*mu̯α*, M.-P. *mwa*, the vowel sounds in each case are identical. In addition to the criticism made by the class in regard to the use of the Greek *α*, another has since been made to me by a Professor of Romance Languages at a neighboring university who kindly looked over some of our work, to the effect that there is something to be said in favor of the æsthetic side of typography and that the needless introduction of the Greek *α* mars an otherwise pretty text.

Another symbol which the class criticised, and rightly too, I believe, was the one for the so-called *e* mute, or the *e* which is not mute (*ɛ*). It is a less effective symbol than the M.-P. inverted *ə*, because it is so easily confused with *ɛ*, the symbol for the open sound in Fr. tête.

Coming now to page 1, the alphabet, the letters are given and their names thus: *a* (a); *b* (bé), *c* (cé), *d* (dé), *e* (é), *f* (effe), *g* (gé), *h* (ache), etc., just as in the past they have been given in most grammars. It seems to me, however, that as it is now customary to name the letters by their sounds in the word that is spelled, the consonants being pronounced with the so-called *e* mute following, it is eminently appropriate to mention that fact in a treatise on pronunciation. It would appear, too, if one may venture in this connection a criticism on the M.-P. dictionary, that the letters of the alphabet be treated as words might have been, as in the H.-D. dictionary, where both the old and the new pronunciation of the letters are indicated; but M.-P. do not give sound equivalents for them in the body of the dictionary, and one's information on that point is only to be had on page 319, where over the table appears: "Chaque lettre doit se prononcer comme la lettre italique du mot mis en regard."

J. Geddes, Jr.
*Boston University.*

9 P. 28.

## *ANGLO-SAXON READER.*

*Anglo-Saxon Prose Reader for Beginners in Oldest English.* Prepared with Grammar, Notes, and Vocabulary. By W. M. Baskervill, Ph. D., and James A. Harrison, LL.D., L.H.D. New York: A. S. Barnes & Company, 1898. 12mo, pp. vi+176.

The purpose and spirit of this book for "beginners in Oldest English" is good, and in a later edition it may easily be worked out so as to become its own justification. But as the volume stands, it shows signs of hurry in parts, as if rushed through to be ready for the autumn school-trade.

The volume can become useful to those schools and colleges where the time given to the course in English, and particularly in English linguistics, is necessarily limited, and the desire is to present as practical a knowledge of forms and principles of the "Oldest English," with ability to translate, in as short a time as possible. It may, perhaps, be contended, from this point of view, that the standard Anglo-Saxon Readers like Sweet's and Bright's contain more material than can be made use of in the time at disposal, and that an elementry work, guided by judgment, may prove better adapted to these particular needs. Some such plea may be urged, and it

is a little surprising that the editors nowhere make this avowal. Their aims seem hardly clear to themselves. They seem to be more ambitious, without quite marking definitely the limits of their own intentions. The result is, their work is not so successful as it ought to be, and can become. A revision for a second edition will probably bring out more distinctly the aims and limits of the work, will produce a more practical presentation of the subject having perfect regard to the means and ends involved, and will prove of real service to many pupils who are "beginners in Oldest English."

It is with the purpose of urging this future edition that the following points are raised.

Here is the statement in the Preface:

"The editors have had in view several things: first, the supply of new and fresh elementary *prose* texts for the use of students and teachers desirous of varying the Anglo-Saxon primers and readers now before the public; second, a more complete and practical presentation of working forms in the grammar proper. Along with these items of fresh texts and more detailed grammatical treatment, it seemed appropriate to associate an elementary Syntax and a few Notes, giving explanations and references where these seemed necessary, but leaving to a full Vocabulary more explicit information on particular points."

It is somewhat misleading to emphasize the "new and fresh" texts: fifty-seven pages of the book are devoted to Grammar, forty-five to Texts, twelve to Notes on the Texts, fifty-eight to the Vocabulary. The latter portion of the Texts, as giving those pieces adapted for the advanced reading, is necessarily the more important in any book of extracts. Of the forty-five pages of Texts (pp. 59–104), the final twenty-eight consist of the three well-known pieces: the Voyages of Ohthere and Wulfstan, pp. 76–81; the Legend of St. Andrew, pp. 81–92; and the Reign of King Alfred (from the Chronicle), pp. 92–103. These are all in Bright's Reader, save about five of the eleven and a half pages taken from the Chronicle; that is, fully one half of the Texts are already in Bright's book. Farther, somewhat more than four pages (The Lord's Prayer, Luke xi, 1–4; The Sower, Luke viii, 4–8; and the whole of Luke ii) are taken from Bright's Gospel of St. Luke, accessible to many who use this with Bright's Reader, to acquaint them with a larger amount of easy reading. The remainder of the Texts consists of a paragraph of Short Passages, taken from miscellaneous sources; of Matthew vi, 26–33; Genesis ii, 7–25, iii, and xxvii; Exodus xx; and of four pages from the Old English version of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* (Miller's edition, pp. 30–34 and 56-60).

The emphasis on prose and the exclusion of all poetry is perhaps ill-advised. Old English as literature, as the medium of interpreting the spirit and life of our 'Earliest English' ancestors, found its truest and final expression in its verse; and however brief the course, the pupil who is merely carried through the forms and the syntax of prose—oftentimes a very formless thing—and has obtained no glimmer of what this apparently crude instrument was capable of in its enraptured poetic expression, has very possibly received an entirely false conception of the character and genius of that which he has gone to much pains to acquire. The intellectual pleasure of having a knowledge of Old English forms and of being able to trace certain words down to their present form and meaning is worth a good deal, but it does not make up for the loss of the other. The spirit of Sweet's and Bright's Readers in including some verse after an acquaintance with prose, seems the only true one, even for a book not intended to cover the ground those readers were designed for.

The assertion, "a more complete and practical presentation of working forms in the grammar proper," involves almost a contradiction. The effort to be "more complete" than is demanded for the pupil's clear understanding of the accompanying Texts (the proportion of fifty-seven to forty-five pages could perhaps without loss be reversed), renders the grammar less "practical." In the Phonology dialectal forms find a place in remarks when there is no demand for them in the Texts. Condensation and omissions would here be a an advantage. Cook's Siever's *Grammar* is referred to in several places making the assumption the stronger that the grammatical introduction is not intended to be final, but merely serviceable for "beginners." Take an instance: *sleacnes* (p. 10) is "a rare excep-

tion," but is nowhere associated with the following Texts. On the other hand, a special form like that (on p. 11) of *mihte* (earlier *meahte*) ought to receive the emphasis it does, as both in the Texts and of frequent occurrence.

The Brief Syntax is a happy feature, and would be still further improved by illustrations of each principle taken from the Texts, as suggested for the Phonology.

But the great need of the Grammatical Outline, for beginners particularly, is the rhetorical (and mechanical) device of spacing, or massing, so as to catch the eye. It is uninviting to see paragraph after paragraph of small type filling pages on phonological changes and grammatical forms. The matter seems hard and uninteresting even before reading a page; and the editors are right in believing that it ought not to be hard. A better system of spacing, therefore, and the use of large type for essentials, and of smaller type for explanations and remarks on exceptions and preculiar forms, would add greatly to the mechanical execution and appearance. With the condensation and omissions indicated above, no more space would be needed for the material. Bright's "Outline of Grammar" accompanying his *Reader*, is, in its mechanical form, apart from other grounds, a model.

Some special points in the Grammar seem worthy of note.

Page 1. The statement "modern literary or standard English is more directly traceable to the Mercian," as expressed, may lead to a misinterpretation. It was the growth and importance of London at a much later time than the Anglo-Saxon period and the influences in and about London—and among these not the least was that Chaucer was a London child—that ultimately made Modern English.

Page. 2. *ę* and *ǫ* are used in the Phonology as distinguished from *e* and *o*, but not in the Texts. This seems to be a loss in definiteness, and may be confusing to the beginner in applying the principles of Phonology.

Page 2 has a slip making a loosely constructed sentence:

"The determination of vowel-length has been arrived at by careful investigation, *and* particularly by comparison with the cognate Germanic dialects."

This "and" does not connect co-ordinates.

Section 5. Pronunciation. Pages 3–5. "*ǣ=a* in *glade*: *hǣlan, heal;* before *r=ai* in *air: wǣron, were.*" Is the difference so great, and does *glade* best reproduce this sound of *ǣ?* "*y=i* in *miller* (with lips rounded): *wyllen*, woolen. *ȳ=ee* is *green* (with lips rounded): *brȳd*, bride." These are intended merely as practical rules, but they are not scientific. Likewise the statement that the second element (of a diphthong) is so obscured that only a sound like *-uh* is heard, is merely approximate. With palatal vowels *c* is given "as *k* in *kind*,"—but *kind* is apt to be pronounced differently by students in the same class.

It is doubtful whether that which is unscientific is ever really practical. In any discussion of pronounciation we shall ultimately have to agree upon some system of designation like Sweet's or Passy's (note a recent book for beginners by A. W. Burt on *Elementary Phonetics*), and teach pupils the elements at least of phonetic principles and of distinctions in sounds. This practise would at once eliminate remarks like the one quoted with approval from Wyatt's *Old English Grammar* as to "the practice of many teachers," confessedly inaccurate "that the beginner adopt one value for each letter, giving *g* the sound of *g* in *get* everywhere." Similarly, remark 2 on page 4, seems even to cast doubt on the importance of distinguishing between closed and open vowels, which has so far been put into practice, as stated, in not making the usual distinctions between *e* and *ę*, *o* and *ǫ*, in the Texts.

Page 7. Exceptions to the law of breaking occur in the Texts, but no remark is made as to these.

Page 8. Naturally a few signs of quantity have been left off by the printers: **haljan=*hāljan; *dali=dāli; *hearjan=hēarjan.* Also p. 12 Goth. *sokjan=sōkjan;* p. 35 *begen=bēgen.* Again, p. 9 in **blowith, *cumith, th* is used in Germanic forms, and the sign *ð* is employed in a Gothic word.

Page 9. The relation between **cuning* and *cyn* is not clearly designated.

Page 14 ff. In the inflection of Nouns the general masculine and neuter declension is called the *a*-declension, and the feminine the *ō*-

declension. It is unfortunate that the different books cannot agree, but inasmuch as Sievers is referred to as standard, it would be better to follow the system there laid down and generally adopted. The naming of a large number of illustrations under each declension is decidedly helpful, for beginners usually find it difficult at first to apply the distinctions of the different declensions. Would it not be still better to indicate the examples specifically from the Texts and Vocabulary, applying the rules practically?

The statement of rules involving principles is often very loose, leaving the principle obscured and even omitted. For instance, p. 16 Rem. 4.

"Words ending in a double consonant often lose one consonant in the nominative and accusative, but it remains in the oblique cases."

But the principle involved is one of final double consonants, and not a matter of case construction. The same thing is virtually repeated on page 21, Remark.

Again, page 25, Remark 3—"When the final consonant is lost, contraction takes place"—does not clearly bring out the circumstances of the contraction.

Similarly, page 38,—"When the Plural Pronoun follows the Verb . . . . the form of the Verb is most frequently changed"—but how and why changed is not stated, merely left to be inferred from an example.

So, page 40, "Grammatical change" is very inadequately presented, and not at all explained.

Further, the statement as to the three classes of weak verbs is very brief, and nowhere is there a clear presentation of the *j*-presents in verbs.

Page 17. The form *hirde* is the one chosen in declining the noun, although it is the form *hyrde* that is found in the Texts, and *hierde* that is regarded as normal. So p. 19 *gifu*, though p. 11 in the Phonology *giefu* is declared normal. Similarly, under the Verb are p. 41 *gifan* and *gifen*, p. 42 *hlihhan*, and p. 56 *nillan* (*sic*), when only *nyllan* (nellan) is found, On the other hand p. 21 writes *gyrd*, p. 24 *nȳd*, and p. 33 employs the normal spelling, *ieldra*, *ieldest*, etc.

Page 18. Under *j*-stems in nouns, in speaking of "the gemination of the consonant," the exception of *r* should be noticed. Will beginners understand the true meaning of the remark: "For *e* the oldest *monuments* have *i*?"

Page 20. Abstract nouns in *-u* (*-o*), *-ðu* (*-ðo*) are classed with dissyllabic feminine *ō*-stems. It seems better to follow again the special classification in Sievers and others.

Page 21. "Taken into the *a*-declension," should be *ō*-declension, to be consistent.

Page 28. The attention given to the declension of Proper Nouns is praiseworthy and necessary for the understanding of the Texts; likewise the Notes refer explicitly to them; the more surprising, therefore, that the Vocabulary is negligent on this head.

Page 31. *hēa*(*h*), Gen. *hēa*(*g*)*es*, etc. *g* is not explained.

Page 33. A superlative in *-ma -dema* (*sic*).

Pages 40-43. The fulness of examples so conspicuous in the case of nouns and weak verbs is strangely accompanied with an extreme paucity in the case of strong verbs, in the six classes and the reduplicated class. It is just here that the pupil needs help. To refer to Cook's Siever's for further examples is to beg the question. For instance, the numerous verbs of the Third Class with their peculiarities, are represented by four: *bindan*, *helpan*, *steorfan*, *bregdan*. These exemplify four types, true, but by no means illustrate all the phonological changes in this class that are apt to confront the beginner. This unexpected compression at certain points, side by side with expansion at others, without any special relation to the needs of the beginner in the use of the accompanying Texts, seems apparently to lack system.

Page 42. *hlihhan* has the form *hleahhen* given for its participle; marked wanting by Sievers.

Poge 47. *Willan* is classed as a Preterite-Present verb, yet with the admission that it is "not strictly" so to be classed.

The table of Preterite-Present verbs is admirably presented to the eye. The classes under which they fall as "old strong preterites" could also be indicated.

The clearness and excellence of the type of

the Texts and the succinctness and value of the Notes on these, reveal the care bestowed by the editors upon this part of the work. The result is highly satisfactory, and it is easily seen that what the editors personally attended to is of the right standard; where the work was left to pupils and assistants who were not always trustworthy, as seems to be the case with the Vocabulary, negligence is exposed. For the Texts the sign of circumflex is used to indicate vowel length rather than the macron. *þ* seems to be used consistently wherever the sound is initial, elsewhere *ð*. As observed, the forms *ȝ* and *ǥ* are not distinguished; for example, in the well-known Voyage of Ohthere there is written: *ond, ponan, longe, mon, from*, etc., and *Ôhthere, mehte, lengra, elna, erede, ettan, erian, meras, hergiað, stent, Dene, Engle, Sillende*, etc.

The indication of one or two signs of quantity seems to be omitted or is at fault: p. 60, 7 *dæghwâmlican=-līcan;* 60, 23 *heofonlica=-līca;* 69, 23 *heofonlices=līces;* 80, 11 *pǣt=pæt;* 100, 27 *āweg=aweg;* 101, 3 *forbǣrndon=forbærndon;* 102, 3 *stǣlwyrðe=stælwyrðe*. Similarly 94, 3 *ædrǣfdon=ādrǣfdon;* 93, 32 *pǣr fore=pǣrfore*, as in Vocabulary; 101, 3 *ūpon=ūp on*.

Greater consistency seems to be needed in the treatment of proper nouns. *Sǣfern* (p. 100) is used without sign of quantity in the Text; the Vocabulary gives it sometimes with and sometimes without the mark; Bright's text uses it throughout with this word, Sweet's omits it. There seems to be less excuse for omission in cases like 101, 33 *Lēgaceastre;* 101, 35 and 102, 6 *Cwātbrycge;* 102, 15 *Swīðulf;* 102, 16 *Hrōfesceastre, Cēolmund;* 102, 18 *Hāmtūnscīre;* 102, 19 *Eadulf*, etc.

Far from being "full," the Vocabulary is faulty. Unfortunately, the worst case of negligence occurs in the paragraph intended to be read first by the beginner—that of Short Passages, p. 59:

L. 1 *On anginne*. Vocabulary says, "*Anginn*, see *Onginn*"—but there is no *onginn*. Similarly there is nothing corresponding to l. 4 *fōtsceamel;* l. 5 *prymsetl;* l. 7 *tǣhte;* l. 7 *mancynne;* l. 9 *mēde;* l. 9 *geearnungum;* ll. 10, 11 *synnum;* l. 15 *rōde-hȩngene;* l. 16 *wælhrēowan;* l. 18 *mægen-prymme;* l. 19 *underfēngon;* l. 19 *tōgēanes*.

Not only these, but particular forms and spellings which might cause difficulty in the first attempt at reading, are not given under their respective words; for example, l. 2 *seofeðan*, reduction of unaccented *o* to *e;* some third person singulars—l, 5 *ymbscīnð*, l. 6 *gesihð*, l. 8 *sylð*, l. 19 *cymð*. [True, the Notes refer to these verbal forms, but the Vocabulary as such remains defective.] L. 13 *māre*, not given separately, and under *micel* this particular form is not given.

The Vocabulary may be tested in two other places, page 72, the first 18 lines of the excerpt from Bede, and p. 93 the first complete page from the *Chronicle*.

Page 72, l. 7 *uncūð*, not in vocabulary.

L. 7 *oð ðæt*, not treated by vocabulary in conjunction. L. 8, *ōðre naman* (also repeated l. 2 of the next page), an instrumental case worth mentioning under *nama*. Not every form need be named, but the characteristic ones ought to be mentioned, and preferably those occurring earlier. The different pieces seem to have been worked up detachedly, and hence many inconsistencies.

L. 13 *pā ȩalond*, the acc. pl. form unchanged is worth distinguishing from the nom. and acc. sg. on the same page. None of these is referred to, but a dat. sg. three pages beyond is given.

As with accent in the Texts, the treatment of Proper Nouns has in it a certain degree of irregularity. For page 72, *Breotene, Rōmānum, Crīstes, Rōmware, Rōme* are inserted in the Vocabulary; but not *Orcadas, Claudie* with OE. endings, and not *Agusto, Neröne*, Latin oblique cases; also, not *Gāius, Jūlius, Clandius, Uespassiānus*, Latin nominative forms.

Page 93. L. 5 *unwīsum*; not in Vocabulary.

L. 5 *þegne*; dat. sg. form not given, but nom. sg., nom. pl. and gen. pl. which occur later on pages 100, 102.

L. 27 *sigelede*; this particular form is not given, but *siglde* p. 76 is named.

L. 29 *gehorsudan*; this form is not given, but *gehorsoda* a few lines above is referred to.

The same treatment of Proper Nouns is observable as on page 72. The nominatives of *Rōme, Angelcyunes, Miercna, Hreopedūne, Norðhymbre* (but not *Norðanhymbre* l. 24), *Peohtas, Grantebrycge, Wesseaxna, Escan-*

*ceastre* are inserted in the Vocabulary; but not of *Burgræd*, *Sca Marian*, *Healfdene*, *Tinan*, *Strælcled*, *Wālas*, *Godrum*, *Oscytel*, *Anwynd*, *Ælfred*, *Werham*, *Swanawic*, *Ceolwulfe*. These illustrations will serve to indicate the degree of inconsistency, which is apt to produce some confusion and worry. And all these things can be better managed in the Second Edition.

J. B. HENNEMAN.

*University of Tennessee.*

## *ENGLISH LITERATURE.*

*William Shakespeare*, a Critical Study. By GEORGE BRANDES. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1898. 2 vols. 8vo.

NOT until his last page does Mr. Brandes state definitely the aim of his *William Shakespeare*. Here he says that the purpose of his book is

"to declare and prove that Shakespeare was not thirty-six plays and a few poems jumbled together and read pêle-mêle, but a man who felt and thought, rejoiced and suffered, brooded, dreamed, and created."

So far as this statement goes, there is nothing especially new in Mr. Brandes's purpose. Biographers innumerable have taken this for their aim. Every earnest student of Shakespeare has sought to find the man in his plays, and has noted line after line that rings too sincerely not to phrase the writer's own belief. Brandes, however, goes beyond his words. Accepting in most instances the results of modern scholarship as regards the order of the plays, he elaborates his theory that each play reflects the mood of its author at the time when it was written. If we admit the truth of his implied premise that Shakespeare wrote only what was in harmony with his mood, then has the Danish scholar led the way to a rich mine of material for the higher biography of sequence of thoughts and feelings rather than of mere outward events.

In pursuit of support for his position, he describes the times of Shakespeare, and how they would probably affect such a man as he thinks him to be; he studies some of the prominent men of the day, and tells us how Shakespeare probably felt toward them; he discusses the plays, and pictures the mood in which the man "must" have been when he wrote them. His plan is ingenious and worthy of a highly sympathetic imagination, but are we sure that we know Shakespeare well enough to pass infallible judgment on the effect that people and events would have upon him? Moreover, is it not arguing in a circle to assume this knowledge when we are avowedly in pursuit of acquaintance with him? And was it necessarily Shakespeare's mood that gave its tone to the play? Must we look upon the rollicking fun of the *Merry Wives of Windsor* as indicating a time of special merriment in the life of its author? Is it fair to argue, as does Brandes, that the successful dramatist felt his life to be in the sear and yellow leaf because he lays the scene of the *Tempest* in the autumn? or to infer "a sickly tendency to imbibe poison from everything" because he wrote *Troilus and Cressida*? How far the consummate skill of the artist, whose practical success depended upon being in harmony with the times, would allow personal feeling to control his pen, seems hardly a matter upon which we can pass unerring sentence.

One would hesitate before accusing our author of turning his judgment over into the hands of his imagination, but there is certainly a not infrequent flavor of the credulity of the middle ages in his readiness to accept analogy as proof. It is a little difficult to believe that Shakespeare chose Cleopatra as his subject because the lady of the sonnets was also of a dark complexion. It seems hardly proof positive of his having read Ariosto in the original solely because in *Othello* he uses the phrase, "in her prophetic fury," while Ariosto says in *Orlando Furioso*:

> "Una donzella della terra d'Ilia,
> Ch'avea il furor profetico congiunto
> Con studio di gran tempo."

Again, Brandes's specially weighty argument in favor of Shakespeare's having visited Italy is that Jews were not allowed to reside in England; and though he admits in a footnote that there may have been a few, why is he so sure that "it is not probable that Shakespeare knew any of them," especially after making the statement that the "internal evidence of his writings" proves that he lived a Bohemian life? In like manner, he finds it "unreasonable" to doubt the old story of Shakespeare's poaching adventures. In one place he says,

"There is every probability in favor of the tradition" that Sir Thomas Lucy "had him oft whipt and sometimes imprisoned;" and further on he refers to this tradition as an established fact. Reasoning from a supposition as if it were a fact, is a far more serious fault than the mis-statement that he makes on his first page in regard to the coincidence of date of the death of Shakespeare and of Cervantes. He is much too ready to accept any plausible theory as fact if no absolutely contradictory reasons have appeared. Far too frequently do the phrases "no doubt," "certainly," "without hesitation" appear; for example, in a case where Dowden says cautiously, "The weight of authority inclines to the opinion," etc. Brandes says that there is no question about the matter.

But it is ungracious to play the part of fault-finder with a book that can afford its reader so much genuine pleasure. It is full of information; I can hardly imagine a student of Shakespeare, however well informed, finding in it nothing that is new to him. Often the reader comes upon a short paragraph that is an epitome of the result of many hours of thought and study. Here and there are brief summaries, laying no claim to originality, but presenting facts with unusual clearness and definiteness. Even if we are not in harmony with Brandes's biographical theory, the book is, at least, a collection of interesting chapters on Shakespeare by one whose appreciation of him is warm-hearted and sincere. Could there be a more sympathetic thought than this:

"It is none the less astounding how much right in wrong, how much humanity in inhumanity, Shakespeare has succeeded in imparting to Shylock?"

or a finer appreciation of Shakespeare's rhythmical effects than this: "One can feel through his (Shylock's) words that there is a chanting quality in his voice?"

With all Brandes's reverence, he has the courage of his convictions. He blames the poet for not comprehending the character of Caesar, and calmly points out to him that the Caesar of history is far more true to the man than the Caesar of the play. He chides him for robbing the finest scenes between Hector and Andromache of their beauty because he was in the mood "to dwell upon the lowest and basest side of human nature;" and tells him that the unequal merit of *All's Well that Ends Well* is due to his failing to give his mind to all parts of the play.

Sincere he certainly is, and to my mind it is the charm of the book that it is so frank a revelation of the thoughts of a student of Shakespeare. There is in the man a kind of incorruptible originality, and even when he tells us the plot of the play, or with all the naïve pleasure of a discoverer, brings forward the evidence as to Hamlet's age, or notes the connection between the "Fair is foul, and foul is fair," of the witches and Macbeth's first speech, we can hardly help fancying that he must have seen all this for himself, even if other men have also seen it. And so he sometimes tells the story, sometimes reflects upon the play and its beauties, sometimes discusses political situations, but is always striving to find Shakespeare, is always interesting and always himself.

Faith in the probability of Brandes's biographical theory is so much a matter of the personal equation that the book in its chief aim is bound to produce a differing effect upon its different readers. The result of it as a picture of Shakespeare cannot be called pleasing. The impression left is that he was sometimes made unhappy and sometimes bitter, by his marriage, his profession, and the lack of appreciation shown by his family, and that the latter part of his life, at least, was lonely, if not gloomy and morose.

This is not good. We do not wish to think of Shakespeare as a misanthropic, disappointed man, who leaves London when there is no longer any friend who grieves to bid him farewell. Power should move with ease. Transcendent ability should have a certain tranquillity. "On every height there lies repose," and if it was not so in Shakespeare's case, perhaps even then, in the absence of the strongest evidence to the contrary, some concession is due to our ideals, mistaken though they may be.

Eva March Tappan.

*English High School,*
*Worcester, Mass.*

## *ENGLISH LITERATURE.*

*John Donne, Sometime Dean of St. Paul's*, A.D. 1621–1631, by AUGUSTUS JESSOPP, D.D., Rector of Scarning. With two portraits. Methuen & Co., London, 1897.

WRITING adequately about Donne is so difficult a matter that those who have undertaken it have often been overcome by fate, in one form or another, before the completion of their task. Walton's *Life* was composed, as we know, out of materials collected by Sir Henry Wotton, just before his death. The recent (1896) two volume edition of Donne, by E. K. Chambers, in *The Muses' Library* was originally undertaken by Dr. Brinsley Nicholson, and embodies material left behind by him. Mr. Grosart gave over a very considerable amount of new biographical matter, intended for his *Fuller Worthies'* edition (1872), for the 'Life and Introduction' to the edition of the 'Complete Prose Works of Donne,' Dr. Jessopp was hoping (in 1872) soon to publish.

Dr. Jessopp has successively abandoned his hope to make editions of Donne's complete works, of his prose alone, and then of his letters. Now, after having for many years, like the Abbé in *Consuelo*, enjoyed credit for the book he had in preparation, he comes forward with the present 'sketch,' and resigns his last task, that of preparing "an adequate and elaborate biography of Donne," to Mr. Edmund Gosse. What fate awaits Mr. Gosse, or his readers, remains to be seen.

Dr. Jessopp's sketch appears as a volume in the "Leaders of Religion Series," and being intended for "the generality of readers" omits all citations of authorities. Its sources, however, are not far to seek. To an expansion of the author's article on Donne in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, giving in extent what was implied or suggested there, has been added Walton's *Life*, quoted entire, a reprint of Donne's will, thirty pages from his correspondence, and some excerpts from his prose works. Much of the new material we learn, although not from Dr. Jessopp, was that collected by Dr. Grosart.

Donne's poetry receives but small attention, Dr. Jessopp having "never been able to feel much enthusiasm for Donne as a poet." No use has been made of the biographical material embodied in the *Fuller Worthies'* and the *Muses' Library* editions of the poems, or in Bullen's (1884) edition of Walton's *Lives*.

While Dr. Jessopp corrects some of Walton's mistakes, he, himself, frequently makes less pardonable ones. Being unsure, he writes in several places 'very few' where 'none' is correct. He states his likely, although mistaken, conjectures as facts. He repeats opinions long shown to be untenable. He is careless, as when he makes Bishop Morton only one year older than he really was, rather than two, as Bullen did: or as when he dates the marriage of the Princess Elizabeth, and St. Valentine's day on February 15th, instead of on the 13th as he had it in the *Dictionary of National Biography*.

The author also neglects his opportunities for correcting, by consulting records, the habitual carelessness concerning the dates of Donne's life. Parish records must certainly give the the facts regarding the life and death of Miss Drury, celebrated in the *Anatomy of the World* of 1610. But while Dr. Jessopp escapes Bullen's mistake of confounding her with her younger sister Dorothy, he repeats from the *Dictionary of National Biography* his statement that she died "in her sixteenth year." The apparently more correct when "only fifteen" or "at the age of fifteen" are given by Grosart (1:69), and Chambers (2:235). Ecclesiastical or civil records should also yield the exact date of Donne's marriage. Although Dr. Jessopp quotes (p. 31) one of Donne's letters saying that the ceremony took place "about three weeks before Christmas," he makes no effort to fix the date beyond correcting his earlier statement of the year from 1600 to 1601. Chambers also (2:221) repeats the 1600 error, although he usually (1:xiv; 1:220; 2:221) gives the correct date.

The poetry, as has been said, receives but small attention in the volume. It apparently fits ill with the conception of Donne his biographer chooses to entertain. The stock quotations are reprinted from Walton, along with some funeral pieces and marriage songs not too inconsistent with clerical character, but the bulk of the poetic product of the man who "wrote more profound verses than any

other English poet save one only" is to Dr. Jessopp only "more or less frivolous." He ignores most of the pieces; arbitrarily denies that Donne could have written others; and concludes that if any are considered good it is surely for the sake of the poet and not because of the poems. In short, it is not John Donne the poet, nor yet John Donne the man in whom Dr. Jessopp is interested, and of whom he writes. It is the Reverened Doctor Donne, Vicar of St. Dunstans, Rector of Sevenoaks and Keyston, Preacher of Lincoln's Inn, Dean of St. Paul's, and Prolocutor of Parliament.

Perhaps this is as it should be in a consideration of Donne as a "leader of religion." Yet the student who wishes to know of the poet or of the whole man, cannot but be disappointed to find two-thirds of his life dismissed as insignificant, while the other third is magnified as all important. Nor is there given any new view of even the selected third. Instead there is presented so much theological and ecclesiastical matter, so many incidental disquisitions upon human weakness, prayer, martyrs and the like; and such frequent employment of technical pulpit phraseology that the book seems to be written rather around Donne than about him. Lay representation among Donne's friends, even, is discouraged. The Woodwards are not mentioned, the intimate Brooks are passed with occasional words; his life long friend Sir Henry Wotton is dismissed in twenty lines,—the church acquaintance, Bishop Morton, occupies seven pages.

Donne's prose theological work is, however, given just attention; and in some parts of the book there is commendable fulness of detail. While no new glimpses of Donne's personality are given, the many things told concerning the people who touched him help a conception of his immediate surroundings, and of the atmosphere of the times. An account of Donne's *Essays in Divinity*, edited by Dr. Jessopp in 1855, but now long out of print, is welcome. It was a service to make easily accessible in the volume the handful of selected letters, one of them never before published, the woodcut of Donne's house at Mitcham (p. 58), and the two portraits. Marshall's "Oct. 18, 1591" portrait, taken probably from Dr. Grosart's quarto, and the "Winding-sheet portrait" are given. Dr. Jessopp nowhere comments upon these, but a description is to be found in Chambers (1:237). Dr. Jessopp's appendices are useful in giving the poet's pedigree, his will, and his descendants.

In conclusion, Dr. Jessopp's work may lend some service to students by its incidental contributions and by its presentation of an idea of the cleric which may be embodied along with the more familiar idea of the poet into some future study of the entire man. On the whole, however, the sketch will probably have its greatest usefulness among the "generality of readers" for whom it was intended.

CLYDE B. FURST.

*Philadelphia, Pa.*

---

## *GERMAN LANGUAGE.*

*German for Beginners.* A Reader and Grammar, by L. HARCOURT. Second Edition Revised and Enlarged. Marburg: N. G. Elwert. London: Whittaker & Co., 1898.

THIS book consists of three parts: about one hundred pages of reading matter, thirty pages of grammar, and forty pages of explanatory and grammatical notes. The first part is well done; it contains a great variety of selections from excellent German authors, and is well adapted to the needs of all kinds of beginners. The second and third parts are not badly done, but, like many other attempts to palliate or mitigate the severity of systematic grammar study, are somewhat arbitrary, and would therefore be rather difficult to use for anyone but the author herself, or those acquainted with her method.

CONRAD BIERWIRTH.

*Harvard University.*

---

## *MARGUERITE DE NAVARRE.*

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—In MOD. LANG. NOTES, xiv, cols. 1–8, appeared an article, entitled *The Infinitive with Subject Accusative in Marguerite de Navarre*, by J. Charles Walker, Ph. D. I beg leave to offer a few suggestions in regard to this study.

The title might be looked upon as confusing. Saintsbury[1] says the author of the *Heptaméron* is generally spoken of in literature as Marguerite d'*Angoulême*, to distinguish her from the wife of Henri IV. The construction, too, under discussion, is more frequently alluded to as the *Accusative with Infinitive* (*Accusativus cum Infinitivo*), not as 'Infinitive with . . . Accusative.' It is the accusative taking on an infinitive, and not the infinitive taking on an accusative, that constitutes the phenomenon.[2] Again, every example cited of the acc. w. infin., is the acc. w. infin. used as *object*. The writer has not seen fit to mention the acc. w. infin. used as *subject*,[3] or of the acc. w. infin. *after prepositions*.[4] His study, therefore, deals with only one of the three natural classes in which the construction is divided. This might have been announced in the title.

The arrangement of the writer's material, also, would appear eccentric to many scholars. He announces three divisions for the construction, and follows up this announcement with four typographically coördinated classes (*a*, *b*, *c*, *d*). Division *b* ('The Subject Accusative Omitted') is put as near as possible in the middle of the other divisions where the acc. w. infin. is found,—possibly as a compromise between the two ends. Again, it is hardly advisable to see a phenomenon like the acc. w. infin. in cases where it is not manifestly present. Of the three divisions left, *a* ('The Subject Accusative a Reflexive') does not appear to have any reason for its existence; since, *d* ('After Verbs of Thinking, Knowing, Saying, etc.') is subdivided according to the different parts of speech, the three examples given under *a* being *se uionstrer*, *se dire*, *s'estimer*.

The value of the material itself is seriously impaired owing to frequent mistakes in the quotations. In reading the article, I happened to have at hand four of the works cited. I went over the first eleven citations from these four texts, and of the eleven passages, I found eight were incorrectly quoted. I did not continue the work of verification. The following are the passages in question: D. P. 249 does not contain the example cited; D. P. 303 does not contain the example cited; N. Let. 187 does not contain the example cited; N. Let. 25 does not contain the example cited; in Let. 406, the words *n'y aura jamais personne quy tant ait désiré et quy plus* have been suppressed between the *il* and *se* (of Walker's text), making thus *il* the subject of *se contente*, when in the original it is the subject of *aura*; in M. i. 58, *que* is the beginning of a new verse and should read *Que*; in D. P. 264, *lit* should read *lict*; in D. P. 363, *Avoir* should read *avoir*.

The presence of the acc. w. infin. in all languages where the infinitive exists, has caused much to be written on the construction, considered as a general syntactical phenomenon. Wulff[5] says the views of Jolly[6] and Curtius[7] are similar, at least in part, to those of Apollonius Dyscolus.[8] It might have been well if the researches of these workers had been utilized to arrive at a clearer insight of the construction that attracts the writer. Then, too, the French side of the question has not been wholly neglected. I have been fortunate enough, myself, to collect fifteen dissertations and programmes dealing exclusively with the French infinitive, many of which discuss the acc. w. infin. The writer should have taken cognizance at least of some of this work before trying to fight his battles alone; Klausing's[9] dissertation, especially, would have been serviceable, inasmuch as not only the acc. w. infin., but also Marguerite d'Angoulême is dealt with. Then, too, a worker in French syntax should always follow up Diez with Tobler. The latter[10] would have prevented the writer from asserting[11] that the acc. w. infin. after verbs of thinking, know-

1 Cf. *A Short History of French Literature*, Third Edition, Oxford 1889, p. 192, foot-note.

2 Cf. Jolly, *Geschichte des Infinitivs im Indogermanischen*, Muenchen 1873, p. 243f; also Curtius, *Erlaeuterungen zu meiner Griechischen Schulgrammatik*, Dritte Auflage, Prag, 1875, p. 190f.

3 For examples, cited from the *Heptaméron*, cf. Klausing, *Zur Syntax des Franzoesischen Infinitivs im xvi. Jahrhundert*, Diss. Giessen Barmen, 1887, p. 16.

4 For examples and discussion cf. Tobler, *Vermischte Beitraege zur Franzoesischen Grammatik*, Erste Reihe, Leipzig 1886, p. 74f.

5 Cf. *L'Emploi de l'Infinitif dans les Plus Anciens Textes Français*, Diss., Lund, 1875, p. 41.

6 *Op. cit.* 7 *Op. cit.*

8 See for the doctrines of this father of syntax, Egger, *Apollonius Dyscole*, Paris 1854.

9 *Op. cit.*

10 *L. c.*, p. 73f. 11 Cf. col. 4.

ing, saying, etc., 'is foreign to Old French'; Diez[12] would also have prevented the mistake. Mätzner,[13] too, might be able to clear up some of the writer's difficulties in regard to the identity of the French with the Latin acc. w. infin.; and Lücking[14] might be consulted for verbs of making, hearing, seeing, etc., though Tobler,[15] his master, is better. Mätzner,[16] Englaender,[17] and Modin[18] would possibly have suggested to the writer a different appreciation of *voir* (*page 4*), *s'adresser* (*au bureau*), etc.[19]

RICHARD. H. WILSON.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

## *NOTE TO LA MARE AU DIABLE.*

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—In the issue of this publication for June, 1898, the *Note to La Mare au Diable* discusses the form *gagnerois* which occurs in the quatrain quoted at the beginning of the novel.[1] It seems that this form should be *gaigneras*.

The quatrain accompanies the engraving of the plowman in numerous editions of Holbein's *Dance of Death*, including the first, namely, *Les Simulachres & Historiees Faces de la Mort*. . . Lyon, 1538.[2] The thirty-eighth plate is as follows:[3]

"In sudore vultus tui vesceris pane tuo.

GENE. I

[Engraving.]

A la sueur de ton uisaige
Tu gaigneras ta pauure uie.
Apres long trauail, & usaige,
Voicy la Mort qui te conuie.
G iij"

The quotation from the Vulgate (iii, 19) seems corroborative of the future in the quatrain. The characters are clear, and admit of no doubt. Examination of numerous later editions and copies of the engravings has not revealed an instance of the conditional. Also, the original edition of *La Mare au Diable*, Paris, Desessart, 1846,[4] has the form *gaigneras*. Thus it seems that future editions should print this form.

LUCIEN E. TAYLOR.

*Harvard University.*

## *EUGÉNIE GRANDET.*

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—In your number for May, vol. xiii, 1898, under the heading '*Eugénie Grandet*' I notice a communication signed C. C. Clarke, Jr., concerning the expression: "Aller voir si j'y suis," and containing the following passage:

"Whether the phrase has disappeared from the popular speech in France I cannot say, though it seems reasonable to suppose that it is still in use there."

The writer is quite correct in this conjecture, for this familiar phrase is in common use at the present day in Paris.

Moreover we find it noted in Littré's *Dictionnaire de la langue française*, under *voir*, 14°:

"S'informer. Voyez s'il est chez lui. Je vais voir s'il est revenu. || Familièrement. *Allez voir si j'y suis*, se dit à i une personne, ordinairement inférieure, dont on se débarrasse. Taisez-vous, péronnelle i Rentrez; et là dedans *allez voir si j'y suis*." Regnard, *le Distrait*, i, 4.

E. GALLOO.

*University of Kansas.*

12 Cf. *Grammatik der Romanischen Sprachen*, Fünfte Auflage, Bonn, 1882 (vol. iii), p. 945 (pagination of single volume).

13 Cf. *Syntax der neufranzoesischen Sprache*, Erster Theil, Berlin, 1843, p. 15, § 10; also his *Franzoesische Grammatik*, Dritte Auflage, Berlin, 1885, p. 445.

14 Cf. *Franzoesische Grammatik*, Zweite Ausgabe, Berlin, 1883, p. 305.

15 *L. c.*, p. 167f.

16 Cf. *Gr.* (as cited above), p. 446, d.

17 Cf. *Der Imperativ im Altfranzoesischen*, Diss., Breslau, 1889, pp. 14 and 15.

18 Cf. *Om Bruket af Infinitiven i Ny-Franskan*, Diss., Upsala, Westeras 1875, p. 13.

19 Cf. col. 1.

1 As in the Calmann Lévy edition, 1896.

2 Michael Bryan, *Dictionary of Painters and Engravers*. London, 1886.

3 Holbein Society, *Facsimile Reprints, I.* Manchester, etc., 1869. (Photo-lithographic.)

4 Otto Lorenz, *Catalogue Général de la Librairie Française*.

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

**Baltimore, March, 1899.**

## *STUDIES ABOUT THE YOUNGER TITUREL.**

THE era of the great M.H.G. epic poets, which began with Heinrich von Veldecke, was a glorious one, but of short duration. By 1250, none but mediocre talents were cultivating the field of German poetry. With little originality they composed new epic poems, obtaining their ideas from the works of the great masters, and copying the peculiarities of style they admired in them.

The most important epic production of this period, if we may judge from contemporary opinion and that of all the latter Middle Ages, is the long poem, usually called *The Younger Titurel*, composed by a certain Albrecht between the years 1250 and 1270. The celebrity of Albrecht's work is, in a great measure, due to the fact that almost the entire poem was issued as the work of Wolfram von Eschenbach. With this in view, Albrecht must have studied Wolfram's works and poetical style with devout care and accuracy, for, as far as it was possible to this quite inferior poet, he has truly reproduced all the singularities of Wolfram's style and manner, and nearly all the long drawn-out adventures, that fill the framework of the poem are based upon incidents and suggestions which Wolfram has casually inserted in his works.

We may go yet a step further: even the details in Albrecht's poem, which are not immediately connected with the progress of the action, but rather retard it, as, for instance, long descriptions and digressions, put in for the purpose of proving the author's indebtedness to Wolfram. This will appear clearly from an examination of the *descriptions of real objects*, which Albrecht has inserted in his poem.

One thing should be borne in mind however; namely, the freedom with which our poet appropriated the words of others. In this respect all M.H.G. epic poets show a striking similarity, for even Wolfram, the most individual and greatest of them all, has not disdained to use descriptions copied from Heinrich von Veldecke's *Eneit*. It would, indeed, be a very interesting and fruitful theme to collect and compare all the descriptions of armor, horses, dogs, tents, etc., that occur so frequently in the M.H.G. court-epic poems since the time of Veldecke and which, very often, are found running but slightly modified through several of them. Of course, the French sources of many of these poems ought not to be overlooked. The following is intended as a small contribution to our knowledge of this subject.

The chief hero of Albrecht's poem is young Schionatulander, whose chivalrous deeds fill the Orient and Occident with his glory. Naturally, the poet has not failed to give us an accurate description of his equipment, which he does in the passage where the loving Sigune is sending away her knight for the precious rope, the *brackenseil* (T. 1210+): The harness is a gift of the valiant Gahmuret to whom it was presented by the *bâruc* of Baldac. Wolfram relates to us nothing concerning it in the first two books of his Parzival, but the inference which his imitator draws is not a difficult one. The rings of the harness (str. 1223) have been wrought in Assigarziunde out of steel from India* (cf. Wh. 356, 16–17 and T. 5598, 1–3, 3698, 5). From this same country renowned for its smithies, Schionatulander's sword Valzone comes (T. 1228 and 3482, 1–3). It is a present from the *bâruc* also, but the clever narration of its history which Albrecht gives us in str. 3482–86, is decidedly different from the history of a renowned sword Wolfram tells us of (Wh. 77, 24–78, 3). Schionatulander's spear, Duranz, has been wrought at Trois (T. 1230, 5, cf. 1324, 5, 1377, 5=P. 288, 16–18, cf. 271, 10; Wolfram's words *daz veste und daz*

* *List of Abbreviations.*

T.—Titurel, that is, The Younger Titurel.
W. Tit.—Wolfram's Titurel.
P.—Parzival.
Wh.—Willehalm.
A.D.—the first print of the Titurel (de anno 1477) after the copy in the library of the University of Göttingen.
H.—Hahn's edition of the Titurel (to str. 5899a literal copy of the Heidelberg manuscript No. 383).

Strophes, wanting in H., but found in A.D., are marked by a, b, c, etc.; as for example, T. 3311a is a strophe wanting in H. after str. 3311, but appearing after the corresponding passage in A.D. (=A.D. 24, 249).

*zœhe, von varwen daz wæhe* re-echo distinctly in T. 1230, 1–4). His horse Trakune (T. 1220, cf. 1255, 1) comes from Spain, a country, in Titurel, renowned above all others for its fine horses (see below, col. 142); it is compared with Prahange, the excellent horse of Terramer in Wolfram's Wh. (T. 1220, 6–7=Wh. 360, 13, etc.); the words which Albrecht uses here in enumerating the good qualities of this horse (T. 1220, 1–3) have been taken from P. 41, 1–3; cf. T. 1667, 6–7. 2992, 6–7. 6073, 5. Schionatulander wears the anchor, the old coat of arms of Gahmuret, his chivalrous educator and paternal friend, which he put on, when he left his native country in search of adventure, *der anker ist ein recken zil*, as Gahmuret said himself, when he again laid it aside upon receiving the lands of his father after the death of his elder brother (P. 99. 15), and since Schionatulander is a *recke* in the proper sense of the word, the anchor justly belongs to him. But to this is added the splendid crown, Sigune's present, which the poet amply describes (T. 1210–14). This crown is analogous to the ornament worn by Nöupatris of Orastegentesîn in Wolfram's Wh. 22, 26–27, the young Nöupatris, like Schionatulander, having been sent out into the world by the woman he loves, whose *minne* he has to earn by heroic deeds.

Another favorite hero of our poet is Secureiz, the kind-hearted ruler of the rich gold-fields in the Far East. This figure is merely a copy of Wolfram's Feirefiz and, naturally, the description of his splendid armor (T. 2955–69) is but an imitation of that given by Wolfram in describing the costly equipage of Feirefiz (P. 735–736, 741); in details, as well, traits of similarity are not lacking: T. 2958: The shaft of the spear is made of *lignum von alôê des waldes* (=Wh. 375, 24. 379, 25); *von Yndia des stâles was diu gleve.* This reference to the steel of India has been taken from Wirnt's *Wigalois;* cf. v. 4754 and Peiffer's note to v. 7381. Albrecht mentions the excellence of this steel, T. 1223, 6 (see above; H. is corrupt) 1284, 6 and 1339, 5. T. 2959: The banner attached to the spear is *von Tasmê ein pfelle* (cf. P. 736, 17–18, and further below). The symbol of Secureiz' coat of arms, the wonderful *ecidemon*, shines forth from this banner and waves upon the helmet of the hero (=P. 741, 15–20 and 736, 9–10). Wolfram's account of the *ecidemon* and its wonderful power (P. 736, 11–14) is given by Albrecht in another part of his poem (T. 3311–11[a] =A.D. 24, 248–249); instead of this account here, Albrecht has added (T. 2960–61) an accurate description of the forged device upon Secureiz' helmet (compare with this the description of the *bracken* upon the helmet of Ekunat, T. 5800–5802, 5811. Both are very interesting as they show the character of such work at the poet's time. T. 2962: The helmet has been made from a stone called *atraxate* or *clarifunkel* (carbuncle), cf. P. 741, 12–14 and particularly Wh. 376, 29–377, 1: *Poydjus der künec unervorht/sîn helm mit listen was geworht/ûz dem steine antraxe* [*atraxe* n and p, the form of Wolfram's Willehalm used by Albrecht]. T. 2963–64 are a digression which Albrecht makes concerning the nature of the carbuncle. T. 2965: The description of the mantel which was worn over the armor, the *wâpenroc*, is taken almost literally from P. 735, 23–30: *Sô hât alsohe blenke sîn wâpenroc der tiure ist gar ein ougenkrenke* (=P. 735, 23); *in worhten salomander in dem fiure* (=P. v. 24–27); *dârûf gestrent der steine vil von tngende* (=P. v. 28–29), *daz drîer künege rîche ir werdekeit an gelt niht wæren mugende* (cf. P. v. 15–22). T. 2966–68: The shield of Secureiz also answers to the description of that of Feirefiz (P. 741, 2–14). Both are made from *aspindaye*, a kind of wood, which will not burn (T. 2966= P. 741, 2–3). Albrecht adds, as a convincing proof of the excellent qualities of this wood, that Noah's ark, which even to-day still rests upon the top of Mount Sinai, had been built of *aspindaye.* The shield is covered completely with the most precious stones (T. 2967=P. 741, 6–10), while a carbuncle crowns the center, or *buckelhûs* (T. 2968=P. 741, 11–14). T. 2969: *halsperc, golzen, harsenier* are *lieht gelûtert golt von Arâbîe* (cf. P. 17, 22, 23, 5, T. 945, 3, 972, 1–2).

There are still two other descriptions of armor in Albrecht's poem. That of the equipment of Orilus, Albrecht found in P. 261–262, and inserted in his account of Orilus' last struggle, T. 5797+(cf. particularly str. 5814, 5825, 5828). Orilus wears the dragon as an armorial emblem upon his shield and helmet, while many small dragons adorn his *kursît* and

the blanket of his horse. These small dragons are of gold—their eyes are rubies (T. 5814, 1–2=P. 262, 10–12, cf. T. 1363).—*Den helm mit dem trachen, den Trêbuket dô worhte* (T. 5825, 1–2=P. 261, 1; cf. T. 3698, 5).—*Diu plat von Hessen rîche* (T. 5828, 1=P. 261, 26, where we find the better reading *Sessân*=*Soissons*).—*Der halsperc von Anschowen* (T. 5828, 2=P. 261, 17, 20–21).

Finally, Agor's armor is described (T. 5598 and 5607–09): *Sîn helm was ûz golde von Assigarzinnde* (5598, see above, p. 6), *der schilt derselben koste*, both are covered with many precious stones.—5607: *kursît und roc der wâfen*, made from precious silk-stuffs (*pfelle*) of Tasmê (see below, col. 139) came from the celebrated treasury of Secundille, daughter of Secureiz and mighty queen of Tasmê and Tribalibot (=India). Concerning Secundille's *krâme* cf. especially Wh. 279 and P. 616–17. Wolfram relates to us in detail how this treasure had passed through the hands of Amfortas and Orgeluse, and finally into the power of the great necromancer Clinschor, while Clinschor, as Albrecht adds (T. 5597), had given it to Agors.

We have already said something concerning the coats-of-arms, which the heroes, whose armor Albrecht describes, wear upon their shields, banners and helmets. Let us now study this custom more closely, for Albrecht never neglects to tell us of his hero's coat-of-arms and war-cry (*krîe*), although the rank of the warrior may be little above the ordinary, and we must not place too much credence in the words of our poet, when (T. 1829) he declares once for all to leave such descriptions to the *krâcrer* (boys, who, at a tourney, ran before the knights calling out their *krîe* and armorial emblems). Albrecht, with his predilection for descriptions of this character, is a forerunner of that armorial poetry which made them the chief object of its poems. We have already mentioned Schionatulander's anchor and crown, Orilus' dragon and the *ecidemon* of Secureiz, all of which were taken from Wolfram. The coat-of-arms, also, which Ackerin, the *bâruc* (caliph) of Baldac (Bagdad), wears upon his shield (T. 3645–46, 4132, 5) "Kâhûn, the god riding on a griffin" is the old coat-of-arms of the Saracen Kings who fought against Charlemagne; for example, Terramer in Wolfram's Willehalm (cf. Wh. 441, 6–7, 12–18). Ackerin, however, wears them only on his shield, for his banner (*sturn vane*, T. 3641–43[1]), bears the likeness of Gahmuret, who lost his life for the *bâruc*, and is worshipped as a god by the inhabitants of Baldac, as Wolfram relates in the second book of his Parzival (cf. particularly P. 107, 19–20).

Gailet wears *den strûz sunder nest* upon his helmet (T. 4485+=P. 50, 6; 68, 7), Hardig *den halben grîfen* (T. 2597, 5=P. 68, 9). The symbol of the Grail, the turtledove (P. 540, 27; 474, 5–7; 792, 26) acts again as the coat-of-arms of Anfortas (T. 2088). The banner of Sabillus von Sabae, whom *minne* sent abroad, shows god Amor upon it (T. 3980+=Wh. 24, 4–7, where Wolfram relates the same thing of Nöupatris of Orastegentesîn [cf. Wh. 25, 14–18]). Here is a passage where Wolfram himself has drawn from Veldecke's description of the god Amor (cf. Eneit, v. 9910–47). Albrecht, without doubt, noticed this and was led to study this passage of the Eneit for himself, the proof of this lying in the fact that he has added to his own account a detail from Veldecke's description, which Wolfram has entirely ignored. Wolfram simply mentions one spear (*gêr*) and the quiver (*bühse*) of Amor (Wh. 24, 6; 25, 15), while Albrecht omits the quiver but takes from Eneit the description of the two spears (*gêre*-he calls them *strâle*=arrows) of the little god, one being golden, the other leaden,[2] and hence producing very different effects. As regards this old fiction, which may be traced back to Ovid's Metamorphoses i, 468–713 (cf. Lichtenstein in *Zeitschrift f. deutsches Alt.* 27, Anzeiger 9, 23 note). T. 3982, 5–85 are a tedious moralizing correction of the vulgar explanation of the two spears.

Where Albrecht failed to find the armorial insignia of his hero in Wolfram, he created it himself. Thus Ekunat in Wolfram's second Titurel-fragment, receives the *bracken* with the famous *brackenseil*, which Clauditte, his

1 *In diutsche was man sehende von goede ein schrift*, for Gahmuret is a Frenchman from Anschowe (Anjou).

2 T. 3980, 7 correct *blicke* into *blî*, cf. Haupts *Zeitschrift f. d. Alt.* 13, 176.

3 "Eque sagitti fera prompsit duo tela phareta / Diversorum operum, fugat hoc, facit illud amorem. / Quod facit hamatum'st et cuspide fulget acuta: / Quod fugat, obtusum'st et habet sub harundine plumbum."

mistress, sends him (cf.; for example, T. 4485–86, 5800+). Lucius, the Roman emperor, naturally, wears the eagle, the insignia of the Holy Roman Empire; and it is this fact alone, I believe, which makes Albrecht attribute to King Arthur the eagle cut in two (T. 1825–28; 1954; 2194, 2; 4483; 4644, 6–7). Is it possible to prove an older source for this coat-of-arms?—The example of Gahmuret, who, before Baldac, wore the chemise of his wife Herzeloyde as *zimiere* (ornament of the helmet) (W. T. 81; P. 101, 9–13) is followed by some of Secureiz' knights (T. 4016, 4–7). Various kinds of strange *zimiere* are enumerated by Albrecht as well as Wolfram (T. 3972–73 and Wh. 400, 24–401, 5).

Of the numerous war-cries (*krîen*) which Albrecht mentions, the following have been taken from Wolfram: *Nantes* (Artus) T. 4494,5; 4540, 4=P. 382, 12–13; *Munschoye-Tervigant*, the war-cry of Titurilone and his heathen adversaries (T. 115=Wh. 18, 28–19, 1); *florîe Amor* (Anfortas) T. 2089, 1=*amor* P. 478, 30; *Tasmê*, *Tabrurût* (Alexander, the vassal and messenger of Secundille, Secureiz' daughter) T. 4697, 1–2= P. 739, 24–25 [Feirefiz, the original of Secureiz]; *Samargone* (the princess of Persia) T. 3470, 4= Wh. 374, 18; *Cordes* (the king of Salenie) T. 4196, 3=Wh. 401, 29; imitating these examples, Albrecht himself has formed *Graswalt* and *Anschove* (Schionatulander) T. 4494, g, 4529,1–2, 4699, 6, 4708, 3, etc.; *Dôlet* (Gailet) T. 4497, 2; *Lalander* (Orilus) T. 4868, 1; *Hüete der verte* (Ekunat) T. 4495, 3, taken from the fatal inscription upon the *brackenseil* (cf. T. 1845+; W. T, 143-+).

In turning, now, to the description of renowned individual weapons, we have first to mention the two celebrated swords which Wolfram places in the hands of Parzival. The sword of the Grail, which Parzival accepted from Anfortas, the king of the Grail (P. 239, 18+), plays a very important part in Albrecht's poem, for it is only by the aid of this sword that Ekunat is enabled to overcome the powerful and furious Orilus de Lalander and thus avenge the death of Schionatulander, the chief hero of our poem. The good sword of Kahefiez, which Parzival had won from Ither von Kahefiez (P. 155–157), in Albrecht's narrative, still remains in Ither's hand, a much praised weapon (T. 3462, 5). When Parzival, however, gives the sword of the Grail to Ekunat, as mentioned above, and retains the weaker sword of Kahefiez, the exchange is a fortunate one, as Albrecht expressly states (T. 5760), for had he done otherwise, Feirefiz, his brother, would have been killed by the sword of the Grail (cf. combat between Parzival and Feirefiz, P. xv) and Schionatulander's death would not have been avenged.

The *rœrînen lanzen von Orastegentesîn* possess wonderful qualities, for when the heads have been broken off, the *trunzen* (splinters) of the shaft continue to cut (cf. P. 335, 21–23; 385, 6–7; Wh. 23, 22; 341, 19 and particularly 362, 21–26). Albrecht uses these spears (T. 3606, 5–7; 3921, 6–24, 4; 5699c 5–d (=A.D. 39, 207–08) and perhaps 1284, 5), but they are surpassed in usefulness by the lances of Arminzidore (T. 3269–72; 3989), which have no heads at all, but whose shafts, nevertheless, cut through the thickest steel-harness. What Albrecht tells us concerning the origin and growth of the wood for these spear-shafts, is but an embellishment of Wolfram's statement concerning the wood of Orastegentesîn (P. 335, 23).

The *musical instruments of war* mentioned in Titurel have nearly all been taken from Wolfram's Willehalm, although the names of some of them may be found in works of an earlier date, for most of these terms appear in Albrecht's descriptions of the great battles between the inhabitants of Baldac and the Babylonians, which, even to the slightest detail, are but exaggerated copies of the Saracen battles described in Willehalm (cf. *Arbeit* page 64). The following is a complete list of these musical instruments of war, as they occur in Titurel.

*busîne:* T. 843, 3; 1571, 6; 1578, 2; 1681, 2; 1807, 4; 1945, 4, etc., etc. (16 times); from Willehalm, but found in Nibelg. and Athis A. 3.

*tambûr* (often accompanied the *busîne*); T. 842, 7; 1578, 2; 1678, 2; 1681, 2, etc. (16 times); from Wh., but found in Eneit, v. 12963, and in Eraclius 4828.

*pûke:* T. 3991, 1; 4092, 1; from Wh. but of earlier origin.

*trumbe:* T. 1962a (=A.D. 15, 46) 1; cf. P. 571, 2, but earlier in Rulantsliet, Eneit, Nib., Gudrun.

*rottumbes:* T. 2786, 2; 3879, 2; 3907, 3; 3991,

2; 4017, 2; 4033, 5; 4049, 1; 4069, 6; 4092, 5=*rotumbes* in Wh., but always *rottu*[*m*]-*bumbes* where the manuscripts o.p. have it so written—another argument for the opinion that the copy of Willehalm which Albrecht used was of the o.p. class (cf. *Arbeit*, page 59 (Algoes) and above, col. 132 of this article). This instrument is found also in Lohengrin 4573 and Landgraf Ludwig's Kreuzfahrt 1382 (*rotumbet*). Both of these men were of Wolfram's school and came before the time of Albrecht. A detailed description of the *rottubumbes* (a large kettledrum) is found in T. 3879–80.

*runet* (a bell attached to the *rottubumbes*): T. 3880, 6=Wh. 382, 15.

*floitieren*: T. 4092, 2. The entire passage (T. 4091–93) is but a copy of Wh. 40, 1–7 to which Albrecht has added, for Wolfram enumerates only (*von*) *busînen* (*dôze*), *pûken*, *tambûren* (*schal*), while Albrecht includes *vil floitieren*. This expression occurs in Wh. 34, 6 in combination with the same instruments enumerated above—also P. 511, 27: (*da hœrt ir . . .*) *tambûren*, *floitieren* (cf. Nib. 1456, 1); 764, 27: (*man hôrt dâ*) *pusînen*, *tambûrn*, *floitiern*, *stîven*; 63, 8: *der don* (of the trombones and drums) *iedoch gemischet wart mit floytieren*. Is it necessary in every case to read *floitieren* as an infinitive? Or may we admit of a noun *diu floitiere*, as the name of an instrument?

We find a parallel case in *schantieren* T. 2786, 2: *Busîne und tambûre*, *schantieren*, *rottubumbes* are all genatives depending upon *het er sich gewarnet* in the preceding strophe. Hence *schantieren* here cannot be a verb, as the *Mhd. Wörterbuch* ii,[2] and Lexer ii say. They failed to perceive the construction of the sentence, as the following literal translation will prove:

"The *bâruc* (wishing to receive Schionatulander with as much pompousness as possible) had provided himself with trombones, drums, *singing* (?) and rottubumbes."

We hear nothing afterwards concerning a performance of singers, although Albrecht describes at length (T. 2793–98) the skillful dancing and nimble movements of a hundred girls before Schionatulander. Hence we must admit the existence of an instrument called *diu schantiere*, named so, perhaps, on account of the resemblance between its tone and the human voice, and in this case, *diu floitiere* also wins probability. The *schantiere* does not appear in Wolfram; *diu heidensche phîfe* is also lacking, T. 2183, 2 and 1962[a] (=A.D. 15, 46) 2; cf. Rulantsliet 272, 13 and Eneit.

I add below, a list of the quieter musical instruments of peace, which are to be found in Albrecht's poem. These the poet himself, in one passage, has contrasted with the harsher military instruments, while twitting the ladies because of their refusal to view the tournament of the knights and their preference for dancing: "*weder mit tambûr noch mit busîne / wolten sich die frouwen lân betôren, / Videln, herpfen, rotten / und ander süeze dœne sie wolten hôren.*" (M. 1807, 4–7).

*herpfe*=also T. 412, 2; 6078, 5 and *rotte*: 4541, 4; 5151, 4; 6078, 5.

*zimbal*: T. 356, 7; 6078, 5. Mlb. 23, 2.

*psaltôrie*: Mlb. 23, 2; cf. Turlin's Krône v. 22103.

*citorie* (from the Lat. *cithara*): Mlb. 23, 2. T. 5151, 4; 6078, 5; cf. Hagen iii, 150[a]: *tambur*, *zitôl und orget ktank* Kreinfried, Bartsch . ed., v. 23294 (Lexer iii, 1140).

An abundant supply of the rarest and most precious cloths and stuffs was indispensable to a poet of Albrecht's time and school. The more gorgeous the ladies and knights of his poem were made to appear, the more honor the poet obtained for himself. To us, this tendency of the epic poets of the time is of great interest, for it enables us to become familiar with the customs and fashions of the knightly circles as well as those of the public at large. There is much, however, which must be considered simply the fantastical descriptions of the poets.

I give below, arranged in alphabetical order, a complete list of the cloths and stuffs, mentioned in Titurel, with a short note concerning the origin of each.

*achmardîn*, a green silk from Arabia, first mentioned by Wolfram, cf. T. 14, 23; 36, 29; 71, 26; 235, 20; 810, 11.—T. 962, 4; 1504, 4; 2301, 2; 2308, 5; 3326, 5; 3330[a] (A.D. 24, 274) 6; 3723, 2; 5790, 2 (*akmardente*: *Adrybente*). Albrecht, with one exception, al-

ways places this word in the rhyme.

*baldikîu:* T. 1418, 4; 1504, 5; 2301, 4; 2786, 7; 4412, 4; not found in Wolfram's poems, but cf. Eneit 12941. Gudrun 301, 3.

*blîât:* T. 1250, 1: *Ûz plîât sîden wolgevar . . . von Lunders einen borten klâr;* Sigune's *borte von Lunders* here was copied from Alyze's *gürtel von Lunders* Wh. 154, 26, although it somewhat resembles another passage in Wolfram, P. 313, 10–11: *von Lunders ein pfæwîn huot, gefurriert mit einem blîalt* where *Lunders* and *blîalt* appear in the same connection. Wolfram's form of this word (*blîalt*), confirmed by the rhyme here and in P. 235, 10, occurs also in the Rulantsliet 59, 4, Eneit 1255, Herbort 10508, Türh. Wh. 99b. Albrecht's form (*blîât*) is found in Wigalois 2406, Gottfried's Tristan 15203, 18152, Flore 1547, 5442, 5487, 6958, Krône often, Stricker's Karl 25a. Cf. Weinhold's *Deutsche Frauen*, p. 423.

*hermîn:* T. 1418, 6; 1504, 2; cf. Eneit, Nib., Parz.

*palmât:* T. 1221, 3; 3214, 4; 3535, 2 (used always as a smooth, protecting layer between the body and iron harness or coverture) from Wolfram. According to Schulz *Höfisches Leben*2, i, 332, it derives its name from the isle of Palma, one of the Balearian group.

*pfelle*[*l*]*:* a general term for a precious silkstuff, found in all the epic poems of chivalry. Albrecht forms the participle *überpfellet*, T. 3378, 7, cf. Lohengrin 2356.

*poufemîn:* the most precious stuff of Albrecht's collection. Only the richest of the royalty wear it; for example, Urrepanse, bearer of the Grail (T. 1767, 3); the wife of the *bâruc* of Baldac (T. 2805, 3); the kings of Marroch (T. 2302, 3; 2306, 6; 2312, 2) and Schionatulander (T. 2806, 2), who receives the precious stuff as a present from the *bâruc* himself (cf. T. 1657+). This *poufemîn* (the forms *poufemîe* and *poufemanse* occur in T. 1665, 6 and 1767, 3) without doubt can be identified with the *pfellel pôfâz*, whose radiant brightness Wolfram never tires of extolling: Wh. 364, 21–30 and 367, 26–27; cf. Schulz, *Höfisches Leben*.2, i, 341.

*purper:* T. 1418, 3; *purpervar:* 340, 6.

*rôsât:* T. 1418, 4; cf. Wigalois 74, 4.

*samît:* T. 334, 1; 1221, 4; 1418, 3; 3219, 4; 3419, 1; 3841, 7; 4482, 6; 4484, 7; 4625, 5; *samere* (*kamere*) T. 3326, 3 seems to be a form related to this word.

*saranthasmî:* T. 2301, 5; 2306, 4. This word is first found in Heinrich von Veldecke's Eneit 9310, but Albrecht follows Wolfram's odd interpretation, given in P. 629, 17–27, and writes *tasmê disarande*, T. 2306, 4. Wolfram tells us that the word *saranthasmê* is derived from the name of the learned master Sârant, who first manufactured this precious stuff at *Thasmê*, the fabled capital of the Far East. A stricter philological explanation of the word has been given by T. Lichtenstein in the *Zeitschrift f. d. Alt.* 27, 302. Lichtenstein derives the word from the Greek ἑξαραντιόμος, like *samît* from ἑξάμιτος; the *a* in *-asmê* is explained as the result of analogy with *drianthasmê* (Eneit 9309)=*pallium tricontasimum* from the Greek Τριακοντάσημος. Cf. also Schulz, i, 260.

*schamelît*, cloth made of camel's hair: T. 1418, 5.

*sîde:* Albrecht does not mention silk among the stuffs which his heroes wear; he uses the word only in the negative, and it has the meaning of a thread of spun silk denoting something very small, as in *niht ein sîden breit, niht einer sîden grôz, niht gein einer sîden*. I have noted sixteen similiar instances, cf. T. 135, 4; 339, 4; 403, 7; 659, 4; etc., etc.

*timît:* T. 1418, 4; cf. Wh. 125, 20; Eneit 12938, 9302, Trist. 11124, Wigal. 2233, 3906, Krone 732.

*zager*, one of the thinner kinds of leather (chagrin): T. 4094, 5: *sich rimpfen als ein Ungrisch zager wæhe*, where the word and comparison have been taken from P. 184, 14; *zager* is lacking in Lexer, but see MHD. *Wörterbuch* iii, 840b.

*zendâl:* T. 1418, 7; 1677, 3 (from Wh. 96, 17); 1717, 3; cf. P. 59, 6; 64, 30; 19, 1. 301, 29; 579, 23; 377. 30; Erec 377; Weinhold, *Deutsche Frauen*, p. 425.

*ziclât:* T. 1418, 3; 2301, 5; 2800, 1; 2801, 1; 2802, 6; 3378, 7; 3642, 1; 3723, 5; 3725, 1; cf. Lanz. 8484; Tristan 11106; Türh. Wh.

125ª; *ciclas* (: *was*) Krône 13089, *sigelât:* Erec 1954.

*zobel:* T. 720, 2; 1418, 6; found in OHG., cf. Graff 5, 580.

Albrecht deviates from Wolfram in enumerating but a few of the places from which these precious cloths come: *pfelle* from *Tasmê:* T. 1108, 5; 2959, 3; 5607, 6; cf. P. 736, 17 and *saranthasmê* above, *pfelle von Arabîe:* T. 4781, 3=P. 228, 3; 235, 9; 736, 17. *Ungersch zagor* (see above). Sigune's girdle is a *borte von Lunders* (T. 1250, 3), as was Alyze's (Wh. 154, 26); cf. T. 5583ª [=A.D. 39, 74] 2: *ein horn geworht zu Lunders, Borte von Almarîne*: T. 1211, 1; cf. *Zeitschrift f. d. Alt.* 5, 425, where the question is raised concerning Rulantsliet 260, 5; *in almerischer sîden*=Stricker's Karl 117ᵇ: *von Almerischer sîden;* Almarîne=Almeria in Spain. Of most importance, perhaps, is the origin of the snow-white *pfelle*, which the salamanders were said to weave in the fire inside mount Agremuntia. Wolfram gives us an account of them, P. 735, 24–27, cf. 790, 22; 812, 21; Wh. 366, 4–5; W. Tit. 121, 4. Quite a little is to be found in T. 945, 5; 1659, 5; 1665, 5; 2066, 4–7; 2965, 4; 3491, 7–3492. In T. 6064, 3–6069 Albrecht gives us a very accurate description of how these salamanders are caught; a similar account does not occur in Wolfram's writings, nor in the description which Albrecht gives of the land of Priest John, commencing with strophe 6030. Compare, however, Wigal. 191, 11–22; and Weinhold's *Deutsche Frauen*, p. 421, note 5.

The collection of precious spices T. 514ª (=A.D. 5, 40) printed in v. d. Hagen's *Germania*, vol. v, and by Zarncke in his Graltempel, is, in the main, a repetition of P. 789, 26–29 and Wh. 451, 21–22. When the ship of the Grail, on her way to India, passes certain morasses, a deadly vapor arises from them which, however, is dispelled by burning *alôê* (*davon so wart der bœse luft zutrennet* T. 6009); *lign alôê* also is burned upon the chimneys of the Grail castle in order to destroy the bad odor of Anfortas' wound (P. 230, 10–11). The dead body of Schoysiane is *gearomâtet und gebalsmet*, W. Tit. 21, 2; this phrase Albrecht repeats T. 438, 1–2; 960, 1–2; 5962a (=A.D. 40, 194) 1–2. Its source is Eneit 8249–50.

Wolfram, in describing Parzival's first entrance and meal in the castle of the Grail, tells us (P. 238, 8–17), that the Grail has the power to furnish all kinds of meats for its servants; Albrecht, upon a similar occasion (T. 599–599a, =A.D. 6, 33 printed in v. d. Hagen's *Germania*, vol. v), specifies these meats, giving a long list of strange and partly unintelligible words, which have been much corrupted in the sources handed down to us. The names of a few of these meats have been taken from Wh. 134, 9–14 where Wolfram has enumerated some of the more choice varieties. After the battle before the walls of Patelamunt the first meat served the exhausted Schionatulander is *pitemansier* (T. 2615, 16); compare this with the same situation in Wh. 103, 24, where the meat is called *petit mangeiz*. The form *pitemansier* also occurs; cf. Lexer ii, also compare T. 6117, 6: *ez sî môraz, kipper* (kinds of wine) with Wh. 448, 7–8; cf. P. 239, 1; 244, 13; Wh. 177, 5.

The finest horses, as Albrecht states on several occasions, come from Spain: T. 1220, 1; 1324, 5; 1565, 2; 3421, 2; 3435, 5; 4065, 1; 5624, 1; cf. P. 400, 4 (Tristan 9215; Mai 109, 27). Only those of Tabrunit are equally spirited: T. 3431, 1–4; 1667, 1; cf. P. 398, 16–17. Albrecht's description of an excellent horse, T. 1220 (cf. 1667, 6–7; 2992, 6–7; 6073, 5) agrees literally with that in P. 40, 30–41, 3.

A detailed description of the fatal *bracken*, whose rope causes the many fights and final downfall of Schionatulander is given in T. 1151, 1–5. This strophe, however, occurs only in recension i of the manuscripts of Titurel, to which H. (=Hahn's edition) belongs. Recension ii, whose representative is A.D., gives a similar strophe 11, 93 (=H. 1432a). Here, as often happens (cf. Zarncke, *Graltempel*), recension ii gives the better reading: the description of the dog is more accurate and agrees better with the similiar descriptions in Eneit and Wigalois, which without doubt served as models for Albrecht's account.

I insert here the strophe as found in A.D. which has, up to this time, never been placed in print:

*Der bracke rot zynober var/an seyten was der ainen,*
*die ander sam ain hermel gar;/kol schwartz an haubt auf rucke, wadel und baynen;*
*die fůsse blanck das maul und auch die stirne;*
*brust weit, satthalp?, die murre tieff, augen gross, oren lang, brait zů dem hirne.*

Such a fantastical description was peculiarly adapted to enchant an audience of the time of chivalry and particularly the ladies who were very fond of these little variegated dogs. It is probably for this reason that Veldecke inserted a similar description of such a dog in his poem. Dido's *bracke* (Eneit 1766–75) is an example of this species; it has one red and one black ear, its nose is black but the rest of its body is as white as ermine. Another instance of this fashion is the horse of Camilla (Eneit 5241+). The mane and left ear of this fine animal are white as snow, the right ear and neck raven-black; the head, one leg and one shoulder red; the other shoulder and legs are fallow; one zofe is dapple-grey, the other colored like the leopard, while the tail is uniformly black. Wolfram has given us no such descriptions, but Wirnt in his Wigalois has copied both passages of the Eneit: the little dog of Jeschute, Wigal. 2207–12 (=col. 60, 23–28 of Pfeiffer's ed.), has one fallow ear, while the other is red as blood; the rest of the body is white. The horse which Wirnt describes, Wig. 2543–52 (=col. 68, 40–69, 8), has its left ear and mane as red as cinnabar; the right ear black; a black stripe running along its back; the tail fallow, while the rest of its body is a pure white. Albrecht has followed Wirnt's example in the description of his *bracken*, which furnishes us with another very good illustration of a description, but slightly varied, passing through a number of epic poems since the time of Veldecke.[4]

The inscription upon the fatal *brackenseil* (rope by which the dog was led), concerning which Wolfram has said but little (W. Tit. 143-153), has been enlarged by Albrecht into a good-sized, independent, didactic poem, T. 1837–1890. The learned poet, finally, plainly forgets that he is describing the inscription upon the *brackenseil*, for even a much longer rope would not admit of such an extensive production.

Albrecht twice carefully describes to us a magnificent tomb. What he relates (T. 964–973) concerning the coffin and tomb of Gahmuret at Baldac goes back, without doubt, to Wolfram's short account in P. 107; but Albrecht has greatly enlarged this account with material taken from the Eneit's profuse descriptions of the tombs of Pallas (En. 8273–8408) and Kamille (En. 9385–9574). Even as these passages in the Eneit served Wolfram as a source for his account, so Wolfram and the Eneit combined gave Wirnt his description of the tomb of Jesute, Wigal. 8228–8324. The account of the funeral procession found in the verses just preceding those of the cited passage (T. 960–963) rests upon descriptions in the Eneit:

T. 960, 1–2=En. 8248–49; but cf. also W. Tit. 21, 2 (see above, col. 141) and P. 107, 5.

T. 960, 3–7: a very white silk cloth is brought with which to wrap the body, cf. En. 7990–92 and 9300–01.

T. 961, 1–2: the laces tied about the body are very costly, cf. En. 7988–89 and 9298–99.

T. 961, 5–7: the bier is made of ivory—the cover of gold, inlaid with precious stones =En. 7983-87, cf. 9294–97.

T. 962, 1–2: the body is laid upon the bier= En. 7993–95.

T. 962, 3–4: the body is covered with a very expensive cloth=En. 7996–99; 9310–13. But T. 962, 5–7=P. 236, 1–4, where six tall glasses filled with burning balsam are carried before the Grail. Wolfram obtained his idea of these burning balsam-lamps from the Eneit 8350+ and 9511+.

T. 963: six kings carry the body of Gahmuret from the battle-field; his chaplain (cf. P. 106, 21) precedes the procession; many noble Saracens follow bewailing the death of the hero (=P. 108, 22–23).

T. 964: the coffin is made from a ruby, profusely ornamented with gold and precious stones=P. 107, 1–4; 7–8, where Wolfram

4 Behaghel in the introduction to his edition of the Eneit, p. ccxxiii refers to the Alexanderlied 158, a poem older than those of Veldecke, where the poet has ascribed different colors to corresponding parts of the body.

more accurately states that the ruby was the cover of the coffin. Albrecht adds in his description that this magnificent coffin had originally been made for the *bâruc* himself. This idea was taken from the Eneit 8264–72.

T. 966: the description of the burial-vault is very short and somewhat obscure. There are four golden columns, richly adorned with precious stones, upon which the vault rests; the knobs (of the columns?) are of chrystal. Compare with the lengthy descriptions in the Eneit 8273–8301 and 9413–9481; also that of the tomb of Secureiz in the Titurel (see below, col. 146).

T. 967, 1–3: a wall of marble surrounds the coffin=En. 9416–17; Albrecht adds as an original suggestion that within this wall was a beautiful garden containing many rare trees and flowers.

T. 972: three crowns of gold from Arabî are placed at the hero's head; his helmet is laid under the cross and the epitaph is carved upon it=P. 107, 9–15; 29–108, 1. The words of this epitaph, so carefully given by Wolfram (P. 106, 29–108, 30), are not found in Albrecht's account.

The tomb of Gahmuret is again mentioned in T. 4318–20: in this account, the *bâruc* allows the Christian kings and princes of Schionatulander's retinue, who had fallen in the great battles against the Babylonians, to be buried near the body of Gahmuret; here Albrecht again refers to the wall of marble (4319, 3–4), the ornaments of gold and precious stones (4317, 4–7), and the garden with its valuable trees and flowers.

Let us add, in this connection, the description of another mausoleum found in Titurel; namely, that of Secureiz T. 4815–30. Albrecht, apparently, intends to surpass all his other efforts in describing the magnificence and splendor of this tomb, for Secureiz, with the exception of the kings of the Grail, was the richest among men. No direct source for Albrecht's description has been found, but, as in the previous case, much of his material has been taken from the two passages of the Eneit mentioned above:

T. 4816: the ground-floor of the building is *ein garte, rotunde sam ein schîbe*=En. 9417, cf. 8278.

T. 4817–20: this garden was surrounded by a wall three fathoms high and crowned with golden ornaments, shaped like acorns; the wall itself is made entirely of precious stones, held together by golden rivets and golden mortar. This same kind of golden mortar was also used at the palace of Priest John (T. 6147, 5–7). In this latter instance Albrecht obtained his information from the so-called "epistle of Priest John" [cf. *Arbeit*, pages 101 and 104; also Zarncke's edition of the Latin epistle, in *Leipziger Sitzungsberichte, philol.-hist. Classe.*, vol. vii, pages 909–934].

In the corresponding passages, T. 967, 1–3 and Eneit 9416, the wall is composed of marble.

T. 4821–24: the space enclosed by the wall is filled with beautiful trees and flowers; cf. T. 967, 4–7. Albrecht dwells at length upon the description of this garden, which (as was stated above) is an original idea of his own.

T. 4825–26: the mausoleum was built in the center of the garden. Its form is that of a huge vault; the substructure is composed of columns of different kinds of stone, richly ornamented with sculpturing; the vault itself rests upon very costly pillars of different colors; its ceiling is composed entirely of sapphires intermingled with carbuncles, like the vault of that magnificent temple of the Grail, which Albrecht describes in T. 311+ (cf. particularly str. 353). The poet himself refers to this latter description in T. 4826, 4.

The description of the mausoleum of Secureiz is quite short and incomplete, but the little he has given us proves that his model must have been the elaborate building which Veldecke has described to us with such detail (En. 9413+); namely, the tomb of Kamille. Compare also the short descriptions of T. 966 and En. 8273+.

T. 4827–28: under the vault's cupola stand three sarcophagi, the first of *krisolîtîrie*, the second of ruby (cf. T. 964), Gahmuret's sarcophagus, and the third of smaragd, which has been prepared for Secureiz. Albrecht enumerates three sarcophagi because the bodies of the father and grandfather of Secureiz have already been deposited in the vault. Similar examples of

tombs constructed from precious stones are those of Pallas (En. 8302–05: *ein prasin grœne*), of Kamille (En. 9482–85: *ein dâre calcidônje, dar op lach ein sardonje*) and of Gahmuret (T. 964, see above, col. 145). It is a striking coincidence that this same combination of precious stones found in Albrecht's description occurs, in another connection, in the Eneit: (9471–72) *van smaragden ende van rubînen, van crisolîten*, etc.

T. 4828: All the sarcophagi have moveable lids and are lighted by balsam-lamps; cf. En. 8350–57; 9514–20; Wigal. 8295–99; and above, col. 145, T. 962, 5–7.

We must also add here Albrecht's lengthy description of the temple of the Grail (T. 311–415), which, at all times, has attracted the attention of antiquarians, as the numerous editions of this part of the Titurel5 show.

Even Zarncke, however, has failed to discover the sources of Albrecht's description and it would be a very difficult and tedious task to fully answer the question. It may be plausibly conjectured, however, from what we have already observed of Albrecht's methods of description, that this account was not taken from any single source, but is rather a compilation drawn from a number of different sources.

The magnificent tent, whic Gahmuret received from Balakane (cf. P. 22, 17–18; 52, 25–53, 10; 61, 8–17; 62, 18–24; 64, 13–17) is mentioned by Albrecht T. 1580, 6–7. The pavilions of the Babylonian kings (T. 3323–31) are exaggerated accounts of such tents, descriptions of which are found in several of the epic poems of that time (cf. Eneit 9208+; Lanzelot; Erec 8900+). Even Veldecke in describing Eneas' tent, says: "*et stont, dâ man et verre sach, als et ein torn wâre*" (En. 9214–15) and "*et stont alse ein mûre*" (En. 9233); the inhabitants of the besieged city of Laurente believe it to be a real castle and are frightened at the power of Eneas, who can erect such a strong fortification in one night (En, 9259–71). This same idea has been used by Albrecht and the camp of the Babylonian brothers is a witness to the immense wealth of their land. It is a city in itself, with gates, walls, towers and pinnacles, in imitation of the capital Babylon. The pavilions of the kings are veritable palaces, with *vil türn, witer kamere von grüenen acmardînen; üzerhalp von sammere . . . . .; die knöpfe lieht karfunkel* (cf. En. 9224–27: *dat getelt was tweire varen, tweire hande samit*, but the knob is of gold, with a golden eagle upon it). The two brothers have a suitable palace, richest of all, in the center of which is the shrine of their gods.

This camp of the Babylonians, however, is surpassed in sumptuousness by that of Secureiz. It is called Tasmê after the capital of his kingdom (T. 3333–50). The twenty kings, subjects of Secureiz, have each their *sunderpalas*. These palaces, with their towers and roofs, are so covered with gold and precious stones, that they illuminate the night as brightly as do the stars. A net of pure gold, two fathoms high, surrounds Tasmê, the rings of the net hanging from golden poles.

This fantastical picture has already shown us one of Albrecht's numerous descriptions of the wonderful treasures and curiosities of the Far East. He dwells especially upon the immeasurable wealth of these far-away countries. They are the kingdoms of his hero Secureiz, who unites in his person the riches of Secundille in Wolfram's Parzival, of Poydjus of Griffâne and Friende in Willehalm (cf. *Arbeit*, p. 63–64). In a like manner, the mountains of pure gold (T. 2949) and the rivers lined with gold instead of gravel (T. 2950) are taken from Wh. 377, 12–23. There is still one other passage of the Titurel, where Albrecht has given us a description of these lands; namely, in the long report which Prince Alexander of India makes to his conqueror Schionatulander (T. 4790–65). He first describes the inexhaustible fertility of his own country and its production of plants and animals (T. 4760–61, 2); the gold which the people possess in such large quantities does not come from the soil of India, however, but is brought there in wagons drawn by griffins (accurately described in T. 4757–59; cf. *Arbeit*, p. 77+) from the fields of Tabrunit, Tasmê and Friende, the lands, which accord-

5 Sulpice Boisser.e in *Abhandl'gn der Kgl. Bayer. Akademie d. Wissensch., philol. hist. Classe*, vol. i (1834), page 307–392. 2. E. Droysen, *Der Tempel des heil. Gral*, etc., Programm of the gymnasium of Krotoschin 1871, one part. 3. Zarncke, *Der Graltempel*, etc., in *Abhandl'gn der Sachs. Gesellschaft der Wissensch., philol-hist. Classe*, vol. vii (1879), pages 375–554.

ing to Wolfram and Albrecht, are the possessions of Secureiz. As the soil of these three districts is entirely of gold, seed grows but slowly in it, and the inhabitants are glad to have the foreigner carry the useless stuff away.

Another account, telling how gold was obtained from the Far East, is given by Wolfram in P. 71, 17–27. Mount Kaukasas, which Wolfram speaks of in this passage, is of course not the European, but the Indian mountain of this name (the Hindukusch). There the golden soil is gathered up by griffins who preserve and watch over it even to the present day. Some, however, is obtained by the Arabs who visit the griffins and *mit listen*, as Wolfram says, know how to entice from them their treasure. This is of the finest kind. Wolfram's account does not correspond to Albrecht's description mentioned above which undoubtedly must have been derived from another source. In T. 3346-48, Albrecht has apparently endeavored to harmonize both accounts, explaining the discrepancies as the natural results of the time which has elapsed between the two descriptions. He begins with a strong invective against those who would doubt the veracity of his strange and wonderful statements (T. 3341, 3–42). These gold-lands still exist, he continues, but for many years they have been occupied by griffins, who have killed all the people who lived there. These strange monsters gather up the pieces of gold, carry them to Mount Kaukasas and place them upon the sea-shore, where they are exchanged for sea-cows and other worthless animals. This statement of Albrecht's is, of course, quite arbitrary, but it furnishes a good example of the method which this learned poet used in combining two contradictory descriptions, in order that neither might be lost.

Albrecht again mentions the mountains of Kaukasas as a rich possession in a comparison, T. 1389, 4;—the *golt von Arabî* (from P. 17, 22; cf. 23, 2) occurs in T. 945, 3; 972, 1–2; 2969, 5; *golt der kriechen:* T. 2581, 5; cf. P. 563, 7 and oftener in certain mediæval poems.

Among the wonders of the Orient are yet to be mentioned the *hürnînen* (horny people) *von kanjas*, who were placed in the ninth section of the Babylonian army, T. 3311c–3320 (=A.D. 24, 251–63). Albrecht has taken them from Wh. 35, 3–36, 4.

T. 3311c—Wh. 35, 13 (cf. 395, 23) their skin is formed of a greenish colored horn.

T, 3317, 7—Wh. 35, 14–17: the human voice has been perverted by them into a beastly roar.

T. 3318—Wh. 35, 18–22 (395, 24): they fight very skilfully with steel-clubs.

Albrecht has given us a very accurate account of their origin T. 3311c-17 (=A.D. 24, 251-60); this story, into which he has woven a theme from the *Siegfriedsage*, is on the whole but a variation of P. 518, where Wolfram, after a description of Malcreatuire (who is a native of Ganjos also) narrates to us the origin of all human monsters.

Differing from these *hürnînen von kanjas*, is that invention of Albrecht's—the fog-men *von der wilden monte* (T. 3134-36 and 4116–17). Their skin is the color of fog; their voices are a beastly *geu, geu;* they shoot with bows—whose arrows penetrate even the thickest armor (compare perhaps with Wh. 84, 14–16); they run so swiftly that only the birds can escape from them—Wh. 35, 23–28 [395, 16] where this quality is ascribed to the horny men from Kanjas. The name of the country of these fog-men is taken from Wh. 36, 18; 84, 14.

The picture which has passed before our eyes has certainly been a variegated one, but it may serve to give some little idea of the rich field for investigation, which the "Younger Titurel" offers to the student of mediæval realia.

Conrad Borchling.

*Göttingen.*

---

## *THE FOURTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE CENTRAL DIVISION OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA.*

It had been the hope of the Central Division in going beyond the Missouri River for its fourth annual meeting to reach a large constituency from its western territory, without sacrificing the presence of eastern members. But *l'homme propose et Dieu dispose.* Contrary to expectation, almost contrary to belief, most of the eastern members were present only in spirit. The University of Chicago

could muster but four,other institutions on the eastern border but five, and Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Northwestern, Illinois, and Beloit sent many good wishes and sincere regrets, but no delegates. The solid south gave but one representative; the western members, with a notable exception from Kansas, were all from Iowa, Missouri, and Nebraska.

Reduced rates by railroad which early in December had glimmered pleasantly on the eastern horizon proved a *fata morgana*; shortly before time of departure the secretary of the Central Division was taken gravely ill, and the special car which was to have carried many members from Chicago to Lincoln shrank to a three-section party in the Denver sleeper of the "Rocky Mountain Limited."

Arrived in Lincoln, the members were all but lost among the thousand teachers, chiefly women, members of the Nebraska State Teachers' Association, who completely filled the public eye and ear, the hotels and the streets—but the very smallness of their own body, added to the unfailing courtesy and attention of the local committee, made the gathering of the Central Division,socially,more than successful. The usual rigorous weather was absent during the entire session, the consequent mud which surfaced the streets in every direction was belittled by the omnipresent sunshine, and the pleasant hours between sessions spent in a circle of easy chairs in the hotel lobby, or in the discussion of literature as well as more material matters, in the hotel dining-room, added just the needed touch to the most pleasant convention of the Central Division since its inauguration.

The absence of the secretary was much regretted. Papers by absent members, which would otherwise have come to adequate presentation, were allowed to pass with barest mention, in order that the duration of the session might be shortened sufficiently to permit certain members to leave Lincoln on the afternoon train of Thursday. A joint convention of East and West in Indianapolis in 1899 was suggested, but, failing this, New Orleans was voted a desirable place of meeting.

Tuesday evening, Dec. 27th, at eight o'clock, the Central Division was called to order for its first session in the Library Hall by Prof. Lawrence Fossler of the University of Nebraska,to introduce Chancellor Geo. E. MacLean, who delivered an address welcoming the members to the University of Nebraska and to the city of Lincoln. After brief response to the courteous greetings of the chancellor, the President of the Central Division, Prof. C. Alphonso Smith of the University of Louisiana, gave the annual address, reviewing "The Work of the Modern Language Association of America," suggesting in what ways the Association was of permanent and essential value to its members, and showing how its organized effort was rapidly doing away with that intellectual provincialism in the study of language which invariably results from isolated effort. After the meeting, the members and guests of the Association attended an informal reception at the residence of Prof. Edgren of the University of Nebraska.

Wednesday morning, Dec. 28th, the second meeting was called to order by President Smith. In the absence of the Secretary of the Central Division, Dr. F. I. Carpenter of the University of Chicago was elected Secretary pro tem. The annual report of the Secretary and Treasurer having been received, and other routine business, such as the appointing of committees, etc., having been disposed of, the reading of papers was taken up. The first paper of the session was "Certain Peculiarities in the Structure of the I-Novel," by Miss Katharine Merrill of the Austin (Ill.) High School. By I-Novel was meant one related in the first person. Of these there are several classes, the most important being (1) the novel told in letters, (2) that told in continuous narrative: the latter class alone was considered in the paper. Directness and intensity are the leading characteristics of the I-structure, the inherence of these being proved by the difference in the nature of novels cast in this form. The story of adventure, such as Stevenson's *Treasure Island*, the tract novel, such as Kingsley's *Alton Locke*, and the novel of passion, such as Brontë's *Jane Eyre*, are all aided by the directness of the first personal form of discourse.

Owing to the structural importance given the narrator, the I-form compels unity: indeed, so inherent in the I-form is unity of structure that, in regard to material, it passes to the opposite

extreme and permits the greatest variety. Therefore a story verging on the picaresque order, like Smollett's *Roderick Random*, has structural unity, although it does not join with its breadth, subtlety, and delicacy of characterization, nor is it based on a series of incidents logical and unfortuitous. This fixed structural centre of the I-narrative has, then, its disadvantages, because it is likely to result in violation of probability. The narrator is at once a figure in the story and a representative of the author: as author, he must prepare the mind of the reader for the future, yet as fictitious personage he must oftentimes be ignorant of what he is himself doing—how is he to maintain with probability this double personality? Here there arises the problem of legitimacy, of rendering natural the narrator's knowledge and ignorance, his acting and his not acting, his presence and his absence.

The other form of legitimacy—giving the narrator all needed knowledge and moving him about — also shares many difficulties. Knowledge is often supplied by retrospective narrative; and by endowing the narrator with remarkable memory. The narrator's movements and acts also furnish him some knowledge: the problem of accounting for these acts is largely the same as the general problem of motiving the behavior of the personages, and this problem takes such different forms in specific cases that its solutions are difficult to generalize and classify.

The study of the problem of legitimacy in the many novels specially considered in Miss Merrill's suggestive paper cannot be given in detail—it must suffice to say that none of them entirely escaped improbability.

The second paper of the morning, "The History of the Sigfrid Legend," was not presented, owing to the absence of its author, Prof. Julius Goebel of the Leland Stanford University. Prof. F. A. Blackburn of the University of Chicago gave a brief résumé of the points discussed in it.

In the third paper, "The Stem-changing Verbs in Spanish," Prof. Edgren of the University of Nebraska said that it was not his object to trace the history and nature of the thematic vowel changes in Spanish verbs, but rather to find out how far the method of distinguishing the stem-changing verbs from others with a like thematic vowel may be simplified. Very little aid is to be had from historical consideration. Though it be true, with certain well-known modifications, that the changeable *e* and *o* vowels came from Latin *ĕ* and *ŏ*, yet this principle could not serve as a criterion of distinction, for the reason that the unmodified *e* and *o* are at least as often derived from Latin *ĕ*, *ŏ*, as the modifiable *e*, *o*. Besides dialectical borrowing or influence and analogical formations, a multitude of words have come into the language after the law of vowel-gradations had ceased to be operative in Spanish. Diez, who first formulated the theory (now somewhat modified) of the derivation of the variable vowels, added that they are usually followed by *l*, *m*, *n*, *r*, or *s*+another consonant. If this qualification, made use of in some grammars, were accordant with actual facts, it would furnish a most welcome aid in recognizing the stem-changing verbs. But it is absolutely valueless. But few more than half of the stem-changing verbs show the form described by Diez; and, what is more fatal, the unmodifiable *e* and *o* are also, with only sporadic exceptions, followed by the same consonants, or consonant groups, as the modifiable, and by few others. Nor does it appear that there is any other difference of form or phonetic surroundings that may serve as a basis for a broad, practical distinction.

The important and, apparently, hitherto unobserved fact, that in a vast majority of stem-changing verbs it is the radical and not, as so often in the modifiable verbs, the terminational tonic vowel that suffers gradation; and further, that the modifiable vowel is never in hiatus or followed by any other surd than sporadically *c*, *t*, and that when *e*, it is never preceded by *c*, *j*, or *ll*—this will help in a negative way to eliminate a great number of unchangeable stems from consideration. And, on the other hand, the fact pointed out by the grammar of the Spanish Academy that nearly all the stem-changing verbs have cognate nouns with diphthongized vowel, may be of some suggestive importance to the student as he advances, but will, of course, offer little or no aid to beginners.

Despite the incidental aid afforded by the

above considerations, we are for a positive determination of stem-changing verbs forced back after all on the necessity of full lists. But they should be so arranged as to be readily mastered (if desired at all) by the aid of some more suggestive method of arrangement than the alphabetical; by giving only simple verbs, by indicating any group that may happen to comprise only variable verbs, and by marking specially all verbs of more common occurrence. Such an arrangement was suggested by the paper.

The next paper of the session was "Leonard Cox and the First English Rhetoric," an abstract from the introduction to the Reprint of *The Arte or Crafte of Rhetoryke*, by Leonard Cox (or Cockes) which Dr. F. I. Carpenter is soon to incorporate in the *English Studies* of the University of Chicago. Some account of Cox' rhetoric has already been printed (cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. xiii, 292–294), and it is therefore sufficient to say that it is the first book on Rhetoric in English printed in England, that its date of publication was probably as late as 1530, instead of 1524 (as dated in Browne Willis' *View of Mitred Abbeys*, Watt's *Bibliotheca Britannica*, in the British Museum Catalogue, and elsewhere), and that it is a close copy of the *Institutiones Rhetoricæ Philippi Melanchthonis*. Hagenoæ. 1521.

The last paper of the morning session, "Notes on the Modal Auxiliaries in German," by Prof. W. H. Carruth of the University of Kansas, was especially valuable from the pedagogical view-point, in that it attempted to set up a logical basis for the confusing ramifications of meaning noticeable in these verbs. The paper was confessedly tentative in nature, but the wide discussion which followed it was sufficient proof of the deep dissatisfaction felt on every hand by teachers of German with the present text-book method of dealing with this difficult chapter in grammar. Along the line of English grammar as well, protest was made against the "potential mood," which unskilled grammarians had used as a common dumping-ground for all inflectional combinations not to be otherwise easily disposed of. Prof. Carruth was asked to have the results of his investigations published at an early date, that American teachers might have the benefit of his rational classification.

The Third Session, Wednesday afternoon, was opened by Prof. Tolman's paper, "The Poetic Value of Long Words," which, in the absence of its author, was read by Miss Katharine Merrill. For the purpose of the paper any word was considered long which was used in verse as equivalent to four syllables or more. There is a distinct presumption against the employment of terms of this kind in poetry, owing to their learned, intellectual character. Even in the case of the scholar "words of learned length and thundering sound" do not express his own feelings with power, nor do they appeal to those of others. It is the words that we learned from our mothers that are our true mother-tongue. Their roots are sunk deep in the soil of our past lives. When we use one of them the dim memories of a thousand experiences, scattered through a lifetime, from the mystic dawn of childhood until now, quicken into life, throng in the mind, and intensify the present emotion.

Since long words as a class, then, are strange, precise, and unemotional, while poetry is marked by an exuberant fulness of feeling and play of imagination, the natural antipathy between poetry and polysyllables would seem to be very distinct. Yet Milton in *Paradise Lost* uses long words abundantly and effectively—there must be, therefore, some conceptions which such words, in spite of the presumption against them, are well fitted to express and enforce. The mere quantity of sound in a polysyllable helps it to express such ideas as mass, abundance, grandeur and duration, while its physical peculiarities, when it is impressively used, will be found to emphasize the meaning by a sort of natural symbolism, as is the case with verse of Matthew Arnold's, where most of the words are brief and saturated with feeling, but where many-syllabled terms are employed with exquisite taste. The ideas of number, complexity and involution are also expressed with peculiar force by the use of polysyllables, and often the presence of a superfluous syllable in what Lowell calls "the huddling epithet" is highly expressive. In the pronunciation of every polysyllable there is, too, the subordination to one central syllable of all the others, and the ideas which long words, because of this peculiarity, are especially fitted to express are such as emphasis, importance, intensity and energy.

The larger number of the illustrations for

Prof. Tolman's paper were taken from Milton's great epic. In this connection he found it striking that important epic poets of our own day, Tennyson in the *Idylls of the King*, and William Morris in *Sigurd the Volsung*, use very few polysyllables, though Morris is fond of expressive compound words.

The object of the second paper of the afternoon session, "The Origin of Some Ideas of Sense-Perception," by Prof. F. A. Wood of Cornell College, was to rehabilitate the principles set forth by Bechtel in his *Ueber die Bezeichnungen der sinnlichen Wahrnehmungen*, and to supply some deficiencies. How is sense-perception expressed? Bechtel said, p. viii f:

"Die wahrnehmungen durch die fünf sinne werden . . . . sprachlich in der weise zum ausdruck gebracht, dass von der perception als solcher völlig abgesehen und statt ihrer die tätigkeit genannt wird, auf welche die perception erfolgt oder welche gegenstand der perception ist."

This is, according to Prof. Wood, because, in the first place, the proethnic man described sense-perception as an objective phenomenon and, secondly, because words come to connote much more than they primarily denoted, often indeed something entirely different from the root meaning. For example, when one says "I smell," it implies not only actually but also historically "it smells," and this meant originally "it smokes," "it reeks." It remains to discover the original meaning of "smoke," and here we find what we should expect, that a word for "smoke" may come from any root that may describe its appearance. It is evident, therefore, that the development of a meaning is often brought about by the extension and then the obscuration of the original idea. To discover this original idea, Prof. Wood sees no other way than to reduce the several words of a group to a common root, and by a comparison of the various significations, find out the primary meaning. This is based on the principle he has already discussed in *Amer. Jour. Phil.* xix, 40 ff., that "words of the same phonetic composition are presumably cognate" regardless of any difference in meaning.

In his paper, owing to the short space of time allotted, Prof. Wood considered only the words for sight, including color-names, and his examples were taken mostly from the Germanic dialects.

In "Modern Language Historical Dictionaries," the next paper of the session, Professor Edgren gave an interesting account of the origin and aim of five great Dictionaries: (1) That of Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm, (2) That of Littré, (3) The *Wordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal* by Vries, Winkel and others, (4) The Dictionary of the Philological Society of England and (5) The *Svenska Akademiens Ordbok*. To the brothers Grimm, of course, belongs the honor of first having clearly conceived the importance of such monumental national works, and of having begun their preparation.

The paper, "Dramatic Renaissance," by Miss M. Anstice Harris of Rockford College, Illinois, was a study of the contemporary drama, in which the attempt was made to determine whether the popular impression which obtains to-day, that a renaissance of the best dramatic art is at hand, be justified in fact, or whether the cooler judgment of the future will deny it. The problem of the modern drama, if it is to become dear and intimate to us, is, in Miss Harris' words, based upon the pursuit of the ideal in common life, the struggle for the ideal against the stifling *laissez faire* of indolence, selfishness, and pride; it will show the very body of our time, its form and pressure; its tragic hero will struggle and suffer overthrow in a cause that is vital to-day. In such connection one may hardly name Rostand's work, for he has not touched our life at its sensitive center; one may not name Maeterlinck's or Sudermann's—but is it not possible that on the work of Ibsen may be based a valid claim to lasting greatness in the drama of the nineteenth century?

At the opening of the evening session, Prof. E. P. Morton of the University of Indiana presented "A Method of Teaching Metrics," which he had pieced together because unable to find a text-book which pointed out systematically the rhetorical reasons which underlie metrical effectiveness. The essential features of the method are the beginning with blank verse, so that the student will be unable to apply any preconceived notions about poetry, and leading on from this to a study of the sharp contrast between differing measures: starting with

the heroic couplet, passing to the four-beat poems, where the approach to a rigid stanza form becomes closer and closer, and after taking up the shorter measures, turning abruptly to the very long six, seven or eight-beat lines; to return after a few lessons on these long measures to the five-foot and taking up in turn the elaborate stanza structure of the ottava rima, the Spenserian stanza and the sonnet. After the sonnet, the class reviews blank verse, this time historically. At the end of such a course, in Prof. Morton's opinion, the students would see that the versification of good poetry is not an arbitrary ornament, but an essential, organic part of the whole.

So much time was consumed in the discussion in detail of Mr. Morton's paper that space remained for but one other presentation: "Wilhelm Müller and Italian Popular Poetry," by Dr. Philip Allen of the University of Chicago. Here it was shown that Müller was not only the first to call attention to the treasures of Italian folk-song, but that he introduced many themes from it into his own verses.

After the session the members of the Central Division were most pleasantly entertained at supper in the Commercial Club by Chancellor MacLean.

The fifth session was opened, Thursday morning, by Prof. Starr W. Cutting of the University of Chicago, who presented to the meeting in a half-hour résumé the Preliminary Report of the Committee of Twelve of the Modern Language Association of America on Entrance Requirements in Modern Languages. The report was accepted with the understanding that the Committee would edit and publish the same without material change of essential features.

In "Le Covenant Vivien," Prof. Raymond Weeks of the University of Missouri, advanced the theory that the *Covenant* as it exists is a blending of two poems originally independent, in the first of which—the antecedent probably of the present *Enfances Vivien*—the action resulted favorably to the hero; in the second of which it resulted disastrously. The battle, as it is in the *Covenant*, is drawn mainly from the first of the above sources, hence it is not, as is currently asserted, the battle of Aliscans. Prof. Weeks' paper will be shortly published as part of a larger study in the *Romania*.

The third paper of the session, "The Relation of the Finnsburgh Fragment to the Finn Episode in Beowulf," by Miss Louise Pound of the University of Nebraska, was a study of the Finnsburgh Fragment and the various hypotheses concerning its relation to the Finn Episode in Beowulf, with a view to testing conclusions hitherto reached. A number of points were brought forward which seem to have escaped notice in the literature of this question, in favor of identifying the fight in the Fragment with the initial fight in the Beowulf narrative.

"Raoul de Cambrai," by Mr. Hugh A. Smith of the University of Missouri was read by title, owning to the absence of its auther, as were also for like reason "Pfeffer and Pökel," by Prof. George Hempl of the University of Michigan, "The True Relation of the Belfagor Novels of Machiavelli, Doni and Brevio," by Prof. A. Gerber of Earlham College, Indiana, and "The German Versions of the Speculum Humanæ Salvationis," by Prof. H. Schmidt-Wartenberg of the University of Chicago.

In "Poe's Critique of Hawthorne," Dr. H. M. Belden of the University of Missouri discussed the sources of Poe's statement, published in *Godey's Lady's Book* for November 1847, that Hawthorne, far from being original at all points, was not original in any sense: charging him by a most unmistakable implication with having learned his style and adapted his choice of subject from Tieck. Dr. Belden adduced ample proof of the contention that Poe was not the originator of this idea (as Schönbach, *Englische Studien*, vol. vii, seems to have thought), but that the suggestion had been made in print at least five times before Poe took it up and gave it the sharp expression quoted above. No attempt was made in the paper to determine whether Hawthorne was really influenced by Tieck or not.

The last paper of the Conference, "The Concord of Collectives in English," was by Prof. C. Alphonso Smith of the University of Louisiana. The author showed that the grammarians all state that when a collective noun is thought of as an aggregate, the dependencies (verb and pronoun) are singular; but that when the constituent members of the collective are

thought of, the dependencies are plural. Illustrations were cited from the grammars of French, German, Spanish, Latin, and Greek. Such a view leaves out of consideration, however, the transition in the syntax of collectives from singular to plural. If the collective be followed a little farther into the sentence or paragraph than the grammarians have hitherto done, it will be found that the normal tendency of the collective is from unity to plurality, never from plurality to unity. This, Prof. Smith showed to be but an illustration of the psychological law that to visualize a concept is at the same time to individualize it.

The following officers were elected for the year 1899: President, C. Alphonso Smith, State University of Louisiana; Secretary and Treasurer, H. Schmidt-Wartenberg, University of Chicago; First Vice-President, A. H. Edgren, University of Nebraska; Second Vice-President, E. P. Morton, University of Indiana; Third Vice-President, Miss Katharine Merrill, High School, Austin, Ill. Members of the Council: J. S. Nollen, Iowa College, Grinnell, Ia.; Ernst Voss, University of Wisconsin; F. I. Carpenter, University of Chicago; A. G. Canfield, University of Kansas.

Cordial thanks were formally extended to the University of Nebraska and to the Local Committee for hospitable entertainment.

PHILIP S. ALLEN.

*University of Chicago.*

---

## *VARIATIONS IN FRENCH PRONUNCIATIONS.*

*Results of a pedagogical experiment made by comparing the examples given in Matzke's* PRIMER OF FRENCH PRONUNCIATION *with their equivalents in the Michaelis-Passy* DICTIONNAIRE PHONÉTIQUE DE LA LANGUE FRANÇAISE.

(Conclusion.)

WE now come to the examples themselves; but in giving a brief analysis of our work, a few observations of a critical nature upon some of the subjects treated in the *Primer* are necessary. Indeed, anyone of these topics offers in itself material to the Romance student for an attractive seminary paper, and the object here is not so much to criticise Prof. Matzke's work, as to bring out pedagogically how useful his *Primer* may be made with advanced students,—for whom, it will be remembered, he did not intend it.

1. Syllabication. With certain combinations of consonants, there is a difference of usage which is troublesome if entirely unnoticed. For example, three of the words given as illustrations in the *Primer*[10] are pa-steur=*pɑ-stœ:r;* e-sca-lier = *ɛ-skɑ-liɛ̯;* at-mo-sphè-re = *ɑt-mɔ-sfɛ:r.* Littré gives the same, except that he carries the principle of beginning each syllable with a consonant so far as to write a-tmo-sfèr'. H.-D., on the other hand, indicates the following syllabification: pàs-teur; *ès-kà-lyé; àt-mòs-fèr.* This latter division is more in accordance with the principle generally observed of open *e* and *o* in closed syllables, and closed *e* and *o* in open syllables, which Prof. Matzke seems to be carrying out in *rester* and *espérer*, § 16, notwithstanding his rule under 4, p. 2.

2. The so-called *e* mute. This is explained under § 14, p. 10; but the examples of usage in the passage on p. 63 certainly in many cases differ radically from recognized conventional usage. Thus, p. 69, line 15, appears *z dœvɛ̯*= je devais; p. 65, line 18, *ün ptitɑfɛ̯:r*=une petite affaire, and on p. 67, line 3, *ɛ̃n ptitfilɛ̯* (the *t* final in *ptit* is, of course, a slip)=un petit filet, *dün ʃminɛ̯*=d'une cheminée (same line). It must be obvious, from these examples, that the principle which rules ordinary practice in such cases is ignored.

3. Diphthongs.[11] Inasmuch as H.-D. says that "... aujourd'hui notre langue ne connaît plus de diphthongues,"[12] and the leading authorities look upon the subject in this way, the use of the term *diphthong* is unfortunate.[13] The note on page 29: "There is another *-ien* which is bisyllabic, and which is pronounced *i̯ɑ̃* or *iɑ̃*," is very puzzling and seems to imply that the "diphthongs" previously discussed are not bisyllabic and, therefore, differ from the examples given in this note in that respect. Of the six examples there given but two are recorded phonetically as bisyllabic: client=

10 P. 2.

11 P. 27. 12 P. xxvii.

13 In modern text-books like Grandgent's *Short French Grammar*, the word "diphthong" appears to be carefully avoided.

*kliā* and science=*siā:s* (M.-P. writes *sjā:s*). If the combination *-ien* is bisyllabic, how can it be pronounced *i̯ā?* This at once opens up the difficult subject of bisyllabic and consonantal pronunciation.[14]

4. "Double consonants are pronounced like single consonants."[15] This disposes in a practical way of a most perplexing feature. The treatment seems like that of Passy in *Les Sons*,[16] where he states: ". . . mais il faut se rappeler qu'il n'y a pas en réalité deux consonnes." To indicate, however, a difference between the sound of the single letter and that of it doubled, the M.-P. dictionary uses the consonant doubled, while to denote the same sound Professor Matzke uses merely the single consonant, excepting occasionally, and in note 3 of page 46 where : indicates consonantal lengthening. Usage here seems hardly fixed, for Cauvet says[17] . . . "on doit faire entendre ces deux consonnes . . . . . dans les mots qui commencent par *ill, imm, inn, irr, syll.*" This usage, too, is supported by other authorities.[18] The disadvantage of writing phonetically but one consonant in such cases is the likelihood of a slovenly pronunciation, such as appears to me that indicated on the nineteenth line of page 65: là-dedans=*lɑd:ã*, and which Passy in the *Sons*[19] writes *laddã*.

5. Consonants. These are divided into consonants similar to English and consonants different from English.[20] It is precisely here and because of the similarity of the consonants in the two languages that the proper effect is just missed, because the dissimilarity is not understood. The subject has the cardinal importance that the French vowels have, which subject, by the way, Prof. Matzke makes clearer than its counterpart the consonants, but not until the subject of quantity is reached.[21] The essential difference between the French and English stops may possibly be divined from the table on page 33, but that the French are less explosive than the English is not brought out with the effectiveness which the importance of the matter warrants.

In regard to the Fr. uvula *r* and point *r*, Prof. Matzke says: "both are equally correct."[22] Prof. Grandgent says: "Students should select one of these, and practice it constantly until they can produce it without difficulty."[23] My experience with professional teachers, actors, and speakers, leads me to believe that it will be hard to find any who recommend the uvula *r* to their students;[24] but, of course, this is debatable.

6. Double forms. Except in the Illustrative Sentences Prof. Matzke rarely gives double forms, doubtless for the sake of simplicity. He does note double forms for Fr. *aurai, aurais, gens, heureux, plus, sens, tous* and *trop*. My class, to be sure not beginners, repeatedly represented to me that, for examples, either words which had but one well-established pronunciation should be offered, or otherwise all the facts in regard to the pronunciation of the example should be given. Throughout the *Primer* there are scores of words that have more than one pronunciation. I take from the lists some well-known cases to illustrate: *orgueilleux*,[25] *taureau*,[26] *spécimen*,[27] *examen*,[28] *automne*,[29] *juin*,[30] *Anvers*,[31] *poing*,[32] *Guizot*,[33] *cuiller*,[34] *Montaigne*,[35] *mauvaise*.[36]

7. Rare, antiquated or obsolete words used as examples. Such words, occurring occasionally as examples in the *Primer*, appear out of place. For instance, the pronunciation indicated for sanctuaire[37] is *sã-tɥe̯:r*, a pronunciation, according to Littré, current in the seventeenth century; *emmaigrir*[38] is given by H.-D. as *vieilli; épeautre* is quite a rare word despite the fact that Jean Richepin makes use of it in Act iv, Scene 1 of *Le Chemineau:*

> "Vous en avez écorché d'autres,
> Ah! dame! on a parfois la nielle en ses épeautres."

*resacrer*,[39] is not even given by Littré, and Larousse gives no author who uses it; *cheoir*[40] brings back to one's mind studies in Old French.

8. Colloquialisms, occurring in the selection on page 63. Cases like: d'une cheminée[41]=*dün šminç* have been commented on under *e* mute; and such pronunciation as là-dedans=*lɑd:ã* under double consonants. It only remains to speak of a number of colloquial expressions due most of them to assimilation.

14 Cf. Beyer, *Phonetik*, § 43; Lesaint, pp. 119–127.
15 P. 34. 16 § 126. 17 P. 70. 18 Cf. H.-D.
19 P. 69, line 3. 20 Pp. 33–49. 21 P. 31. 22 P. 45.
23 *L. c.*, p. 4. 24 See Cauvet, p. 66.
25 P. 18. 26 P. 21. 27 P. 23. 28 *Ibid.*
29 P. 24. 30 P. 25. 31 P. 26. 32 P. 34.
33 P. 40. 34 P. 43. 35 P. 44. 36 P. 48.
37 P. 3. 38 P. 23. 39 P. 38.
40 P. 39. 41 P. 67, l. 3.

In a number of cases, usually, *d* of *de* before *s* +front vowel is represented phonetically by t, thus: reluisants de céruse[42]=*rǝlüizā t sǝrü:z*; en train de sécher[43]=*ā trɛ̃ t seše*; m'arrivait dessus[44]=*marivɛ tsü*; bateau de pommes[45]=*bato t pɔm*; filet de fumée[46]=*filɛ t fümę*; au-dessus[47]=*ǝtsü*; pleine de soleil[48]=*plɛn t sɔlɛ:j*; et de si étonnant, de si renversant=*ǝtsi ętɔnā, tsi rāvɛrsā*. There is no doubt that such pronunciations are common, but whether they represent standard French and belong in an elementary treatise seems to me doubtful. To be sure, Passy indicates such usage, but his works and texts exemplify one phase of the language,—the spoken idiom. Given the chance, the student will fall into these ways quite quickly enough.

The examples which follow are taken from the qualitative list which my students were required to make. First the phonetical form as transcribed by Prof. Matzke is given, and on the same line, after it, his French translation of it, which the M.-P. phonetically written form immediately follows. The comparison speaks forcibly for itself. I merely give in this résumé of our work the first seven examples,[49] together with the footnotes which will illustrate the character of the work throughout, this one list comprising about three hundred words compared.

| M.'s *Primer.* | | | M.-P. *Dictionnaire.* |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. P. 1. | *avua:r*[50] | avoir | *avwa:r.* |
| 2. P. 2. | *ɛmę*[51] | aimer | *ɛ·me ou e·me.* |
| 3. " | *męzɔ̃* | maison | *mɛ·zɔ̃ ou me·zɔ̃.* |
| 4. " | *dǝklarę* | déclarer | *dekla·re.* |
| 5. " | *fęnɛ:tr* | fenêtre | *f(ə)nɛ:tr.* |
| 6. " | *pastœ:r* | pasteur | *pastœ:r.* |
| 7. " | *prizm* | prisme | *prism ou prizm.* |

[42] P. 63, l. 12.
[43] *Ibid.*, l. 13. [44] P. 65, l. 10. [45] *Ibid.*, lines 10, 11.
[46] P. 67, l. 3. [47] *Ibid.*, l. 10. [48] P. 69, l. 10.
[49] Pp. 1–2.

[50] H.-D. gives as a rule for the sound in Fr. *-oir* the commoner variety of *a* (or front *a*). As may be expected and as M.-P. notes (p. 315), the inversions between *a* and a are more numerous than the many between *e* and ɛ, *o* and ɔ, ø and œ. Prof. M 's usage with regard to words in *-oir* is the opposite of that given by M-P., as the forms for *avoir* illustrate; always bearing in mind that M's *a* stands for the less common variety (or back *a*), while the *a* of M.-P. stands for the commoner variety (or front *a*).

[51] .H.-D. [è-mé]. Alfred Cauvet, on p. 38 of *La prononciation française et la diction* (10me édition, Paris, 1889), says: "Il n'y a que les villages éloignés de la Basse Normandie où l'on prononce *é-mé, é-dé.*"

Many of the words occur over and over again; nevertheless with the class I have had a record made of every variation every time it occurred. This is laborious, but the discipline in the matter of accuracy will repay serious students, such as I have had, and will reveal the inherent character of the elements of the language,and the distinctions between them in mechanism and sound, in such a way as to leave a lasting impression. Take the Fr. forms: *enfouir* and *enfuir*. Written as in the Michaelis-Passy dictionary *ā·fwi:r* and *ā·fyi:r*,these two words become a lesson in themselves on quantity and position and on the mechanism of vowel sounds.

The second list which the class made,embracing between five and six hundred words, was a purely quantitative list,and its compilation was for the purpose of drill in *quantity*. If there is one thing more than another that even good students of French know absolutely nothing about, that is quantitative distinctions in reading and speaking. This is natural, for they hear it and speak it so little. It is on the stage, and in general in public, that these distinctions are more obvious than in familiar conversation.

Prof. Matzke says that: "for practical purposes it is sufficient to distinguish two degrees of length, the long and the short vowel."[52] To be sure, with beginners, any more distinctions might for the moment prove embarrassing; but with advanced students the making up of this quantitative list has proven as profitable as has the compiling of the qualitative list above. Much of the trouble in pronunciation arises from not recognizing the value of a *lengthened* vowel, which, while not quite so long as an accented one of *full* length, is nevertheless long enough to be unpleasantly missed if its time value is ignored by classing it as short. The difference between full length and short quantity must be palpable even to an untrained ear. There is, however, more difference between a short vowel and a so-called half-long than there is between the half-long and that of full length. If, instead of classifying short and long, we classify short and lengthened, it is a simple matter to remember that full length vowels occur only in the stressed syllable, and that the same vowel occurring in the unaccented syllable is, as a rule, half-

[52] P. 31, § 45.

long;[53] thus: banque=*bɑ̃:k;* but banquier=*bɑ̃·kje;* longue=*lõ:g;* but longueur=*lõ·gœ:r.* As this principle covers thousands of cases of nasal vowels in the unstressed syllable which are obviously long in the stressed, it becomes of immediate and wide utility. Take, for example, the French form: incompréhensibilité=*ɛ̃·kɔ̃·pre-ɑ̃·si-bi-li-te.* There is a whole lesson on quantity, and on that most essential matter, the division of syllables, (not to mention several other points) in that one word, when separated into syllables and written phonetically as in the M.-P. dictionary. The student who will take the forms which Prof. Matzke gives and supply from the M.-P. dictionary quantities for the unaccented syllables throughout the manual will, I believe, be effectively cured of ever bolting a French word.

Lastly, in going through the *Primer*, a large number of misprints or slips (well-nigh impossible to avoid in phonetic transcription) and examples for which, as it seemed to us, no adequate authority could be found, were noticed. Any of us who use text-books will, I think, agree that it is in the interest of all concerned to call attention to any such inadvertence, however slight, sharing on this subject the feelings of one of our MOD. LANG. NOTES critics "that for our students nothing should be thought too good."[54]

| | M.'s *Primer.* | | M.-P. *Dictionnaire.* |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | P. 3: *fɔ̃si̯ɔ̃* | fonction | *fɔ̃·ksjɔ̃.* |
| 2. | " *kɔ̃sɔ̃si̯ɔ̃* | consomption | *kɔ̃·sɔ̃psjɔ̃.* |
| 3. | " *sɑ̃tüɛ̈ɛ:r* | sanctüaire[55] | *sɑ̃(k)tɥe:r.* |
| 4. | P. 12: *nɛ* | net | *net.* |
| 5. | P. 14: *rɔti*[56] | rôti | *rɔti.* |
| 6. | P. 15: *ʒɔli* (4th phrase) | joli[57] | *ʒɔli ou ʒœli.* |
| 7. | P. 26: *rɛzɔ̃si̯ɔ̃*[58] | résumption | (*not given*). |
| 8. | P. 27: 2nd phrase: Nous irons en Europe juin prochain.[59] | | |
| 9. | P. 28: *ruɑ*[60] | roi | *rwa.* |
| 10. | P. 29: *ui̯n=üɛ̃*[60] | | |
| 11. | " *süɛ̃*[6] | suint | *sɥɛ̃ ou sɥœ̃.* |
| 12. | " *süɛ̃tɛ*[60] | chuinter | *ʃɥɛ̃·te ou ʃɥœ̃·te.* |
| 13. | P. 30: 9th phrase: Les fruits, etc., . . . . sont mûres.[61] | | |
| 14. | " 14th " *iɛ:r*[62] *sɥa:r* | hier soir | *je:r ou i(j)e:r swa:r.* |
| 15. | P. 32: *šü:t*[63] | chûte[64] | *ʃyt.* |
| 16. | P. 33: *rɛn* | rène[65] | *ren.* |
| 17. | " *tɛt* | tète[66] | *tet.* |
| 18. | " *sɛn*[67] | saine | *se(:)n.* |
| 19. | P. 34: *plɛ* | plait[68] | *ple.* |
| 20. | P. 36: *nœšɑtɛl* | Neufchatel[69] | *nø·ʃa·tel.* |

53 M.-P., p. 314, B.

54 F. De Haan in the NOTES for June, 1897, p. 182, column 364.

55 No diæresis over the *u*.

56 Cf. Grandgent, *l. c.*, note 2, p. 10.

57 Should be *jolie* here.

58 Littré and Larousse both give *ré-zon-psi-on*; Lesaint (p. 107) gives *ré-zonp-cion.*

59 *Juin prochain* certainly lacks the idiomatic ring about it in French that E. "next June" has. I doubt whether any educated Frenchman will tolerate it.

60 The semi-consonantal diacritic under the *u* is missing.

61 Should be *mûrs* here.

62 The semi-consonantal mark under the *i* is missing. On p. 28, d. i̯e:r is written.

63 According to H.-D. the length of the vowel is *moyen*.

64 No accent over the *u* in the French word.

65 Should be *renne; rene* and *tète* appears in the second edition of *Les Sons*, p. 60; in the third edition, it is corrected, p. 80, while in the fourth edition, curiously enough, it reappears, p. 84.

66 More commonly *tette*.

67 See the list (p. 157) in the fourth edition of *Les Sons;* it appears by the note that the quantity of this word may be either long or short.

68 Should have a circumflex accent over the *i*.

69 Should have a circumflex accent over the *a*: M.-P. writes: Neu(f)châtel.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 21. | " *kọ:k*[70] | coke | *kɔk.* |
| 22. | P. 39: *gzẹnọfọn*[71] | Xénophon | *gzenɔfɔ̃.* |
| 23. | " *šɣa:r* | cheoir[72] | *ʃwa·r.* |
| 24. | " *kri* | Christ | *krist.* |
| 25. | " *aršiẹpiskọpal* | archiépiscopal | *arkiepiskɔpal.* |
| 26. | P. 40: *gita:r* | guitarre[73] | *gita:r.* |
| 27. | " *ābigüitẹ*[74] | ambiguïté | *ā·bigɣite.* |
| 28. | P. 41: *ọtẹl*[56] | hôtel | *ɔtel.* |
| 29. | " *laaž* | la hache | *la haʃ.* |
| 30. | " *ọtsü* | haut-dessus[75] | *o·tsy.* |
| 31. | " *ẹrọ* | héro[76] | *he·ro.* |
| 32. | P. 44: *fiziọgnọmi* | physiognomie[77] | |
| 33. | " *rẹkuiẹm*[78] | requiem | *rekɣi(j)em.* |
| 34. | " *übikuitẹ*[79] | ubiquité | *ybikɣite.* |
| 35. | P. 46: *fiẹ*[80] | fier (the verb) | *fje.* |
| 36. | " *ir:ẹgülẹ* | irregulier[81] | *i(r)regylje.* |
| 37. | P. 48, last phrase: *ẹparnẹ*[82] | épargner | *eparne.* |
| 38. | P. 52, phrase 11: Le temps fait beau,[83] etc. | | |
| 39. | P. 57: *nu-dọ-na:m*[84] | nous donnâmes[84] | |
| 40. | " *vu-dọ-na:t*[84] | vous donnâtes[84] | |
| 41. | P. 58: *kil-dọ-na*[84] | qu'il donnât[84] | |
| 42. | P. 63: *ọzurdüi*[85] | aujourd'hui | *ɔzurdɣi ou ɔzɔrdɣi.* |
| 43. | P. 63, l. 16: *d mil ptit*[86] | de mille petites | |
| 44. | P. 65, l. 6: *ün*[87] *mẽ:s lizẹrẹ* | un mince liséré | |
| 45. | P. 67, l. 20: *bɑtọ dẹ*[88] *blāšisœ:z* | bateau de blanchisseuses | |
| 46. | P. 73, l. 3: *dẹ fọ*[89] *ẽtẹrẹ* | de faux intérêt | |
| 47. | P. 73, l. 8: *ẹ dẹ*[90] *grā:d pɑt* | et de grandes pattes | |
| 48. | P. 73, l. 11: *alfọ:s*[91] | Alphonse | |

70 H.-D. [kɔ̃k'].

71 According to Lesaint and Larousse the last vowel in *Xénophon* is nasal.

72 The modern spelling is *choir*.

73 Should be *guitare*.

74 The diacritic under the *ü* is missing: [*en vers* -gu-i-tẽ] H.-D.

75 Should be *au-dessus*.

76 Should be *héros*.

77 This form is not to be found even in the largest dictionaries, hence its place in the *Primer* may properly be questioned.

78, 79 Should have diæresis over the *u*.

80 Should have diacritic under the *i* [*en vers* fi-e], H.-D.

81 The acute accent over the first *e* is missing.

82 The diacritic over the *n* is missing.

83 Only heard, I believe, in our school rooms.

84 These verbal terminations are pronounced with front *a*, as most of the grammars state: Grandgent, *l. c.*, p. 11, note 1; Bevier, p. 24, § 39, 1; Passy, *Les Sons*, fourth edition, p. 151, 3°. Beyer and Passy, considering that in the north of France there are no such tenses as the above forms belong to, omit a *passé défini* throughout their verb system, and consequently the imperfect of the subjunctive.

85 The diacritic over the *z* is missing.

86 Hardly to be imitated, if according to the authorities, standard pronunciation recommends *mon p'tit*, but *une petite* [mɔ̃ pti, yn pətit]. On the next transcribed page (65), seven lines from the bottom, occurs ün ptit afẹ:r—*une petite affaire*. Cf. Chardenal's *First French Course* xviii (2).

87 Should be œ̃.

88 Should be dẹ.

89 Evidently də foz ẽtere also; cf. Lesaint, p. 398. This question of "linking" often brought out in the class profitable discussion on mooted points.

90 Should be dẹ.

91 Should be alfɔ̃:s.

Besides these inaccuracies which I have numbered, there are among the Illustrative Sentences throughout the manual a number of phrases which certainly can be improved and made the better to typify French usage. From those criticised by the class, I select a few by way of illustration:

P. 22. Le nouveau maître est beaucoup aimé par ses élèves.

P. 27. Les Européens n'ont pas connu l'Amérique avant la découverte de Colomb.

P. 30. Avant d'entrer en France on doit passer en douane.

P. 31. La pluie a tombé presque toute la journée.

P. 48. Il coucha le fusil en joue et tira sur l'ours.

P. 49. Vous avez là un bel exemplaire de l'histoire de Guizot.

P. 53. Ils resteraient ici, s'ils avaient encore du temps.

Anyone who will use the system of phonetic transcription employed by Prof. Matzke and that of the *Association Internationale* will, I believe, find the latter the simpler. Where many diacritic marks are used, as in the *Primer*, the chances of making mistakes are increased proportionately. Evidence of this, to a certain extent, is the number of diacritics omitted in the above list. Take the form given for Fr. juin=*züę̃*, (three letters and five diacritics) and compare it with the corresponding forms in the M.-P. dictionary *ʒɥœ̃*, *ʒɥɛ̃*, *ʒwɛ̃*; compare also Fr. chuinter=*šüę̃te* with the M.-P. forms *ʃɥɛ̃·te* and *ʃɥœ̃·te*; also Fr. essuyer=*esüile* with the M.-P. *esɥije*. I believe that more time and more care must be expended in writing any of these words according to Prof. Matzke's system than according to that adopted by M.-P.; but the two systems stand side by side, and one has only to compare them. To summarize, I believe it to be of the highest importance to the cause of education in general for scholars to unite on one system. To aid in doing this nothing more important to one phase of linguistic science has appeared than the *Dictionnaire Phonétique*. Is it not fitting here to ask scholars to give it a trial?

In his preface to this work, M. Gaston Paris says:

"Votre dictionnaire sera encore utile à la science par les doutes mêmes ou les contradictions qu'il ne manquera pas de provoquer; car tous vos lecteurs ne seront pas de votre avis dans tous les cas, et il sera très interessant de noter les points sur lesquels leur opinion diffère de la vôtre, et de rechercher les causes de ce dissentiment."

The comparisons made in our class-room this fall, specimens of which I shall be glad to show to any who may feel interested to see them, and of which this article, long as it is, is only a very brief *résumé*, have been called forth by the interest awakened by the new phonetical dictionary. The *Primer of French Pronunciation* has had just the effect which, according to M. Paris, the dictionary is destined to have, and therefore Professor Matzke's work, both in stimulating interest and inviting comparison, has proven directly and indirectly doubly effective.

J. Geddes, Jr.

*Boston University.*

## *A NEGLECTED EIGHTEENTH CENTURY ORTHOEPIST.*

Several English worthies might answer to the above description. In the first decades of the century, for instance, lived the dictionary-maker, Nathaniel Bailey, whose *Introduction to the English Tongue*, though occasionally mentioned, has been little utilized. Some fifty years later we find *A New Grammar of the English Language*, London, 1771, by D. Fenning, the author of the *Royal English Dictionary*. R. Nares, whose *Elements of Orthoepy* appeared in London in 1784, is somewhat better known. A little book that I have never seen cited is James Gough's *Practical Grammar of the English Tongue*, Dublin, 1760, which is interesting because of the seemingly Irish character of its pronunciation: the list of "words sounding alike but differently written" is full of such pairs as *bait* and *beet*, *mate* and *meet*, *same* and *seem*, which had long since ceased to be homophones in England; couples like *file* and *foil*, *kind* and *coin'd* are commoner here than in other eighteenth century manuals; moreover, *boat=bought*, *coat=cot*, and *could =cud*, *soon=sun*, *stood=stud*, as late as 1760, not to speak of *tulip = julep* ('a Cordial'), certainly look Hibernian.

The subject of my paper is, however, none of these, but Thomas Tuite, author of *The Oxford Spelling-Book*, London, 1726. I find no mention of him in Ellis and Sweet, and he is not cited by Vietor, Bohnhardt, Löwisch, nor Holthausen. He is careful to inform us that his name is pronounced *toot*. His terminology is not always so clear as one could wish; for instance, he mixes up, under "short *oo*," the real short *oo* of *foot* and a sound that must at least have been on its way to our "short *u*" in *hut*, and he sometimes confounds long and short vowels. Between *ee* and *i*, *ō* and a short open *o*, *au* and the *o* of *hot*, long *oo* and short *oo*, he recognizes no distinction of quality, and possibly there was none in his day. He was doubtless right in identifying the vowel of *part* and *past* with that of *pat*, and the "long *a*" of *mate* with the *e* of *met*. Our "Italian *a*" was apparently unknown to him, and the vowel which we use in *first* and *hurt* probably did not exist in his speech.

Tuite seems to have had no long vowels but the following[1]: 'î' (corresponding to our *ee* in *feet*), a monophthong in his day, perhaps a long, open 'i,' our *i* in *pit* prolonged; 'ê' (corresponding to our *a* in *fate*), also a monophthong, probably a long, open 'e,' our *e* in *pet* lengthened; long 'æ' (the Western sound of *a* in *fast*), used regularly by Tuite in the words which at present have "Italian *a*"; 'ɔ' (corresponding to our *o* in *for*), with him doubtless always rounded, as it still is in England; 'ô' (corresponding to our *oa* in *boat*), then a monophthong, perhaps a long, open wowel, as in the Irish pronunciation of *coat*; 'û' (corresponding to our *oo* in *boot*), likewise a monophthong, possibly a long, open 'u,' our *oo* in *foot* prolonged. Corresponding respectively to the long 'î,' 'ê,' 'ǣ,' 'ɔ,' 'ô,' 'û,' are the short, stressed vowels: 'i' (*i* in *bit*); 'e' (*e* in *bet*); 'æ' (*a* in *bat*); 'o,' the English *o* in *hot*, always rounded; 'ò,' the New England *o* in *whole*, but doubtless pronounced by him a little further back in the mouth than is the place of formation of the present Yankee sound; 'u' (*oo* in *foot*). To the list of short vowels should probably be added, although our author does not distinctly recognize it, a sound approaching our *u* in *hut*—perhaps an unrounded "high-back" vowel, which still strongly resembled 'u'; I shall call it 'ɐ.'

The sound which we give to the *a* in *father* is not recognized by Bailey, who, like Tuite, ascribes to the letter *a* only the three values 'æ' (as in *cart*, *mat*), 'ê' (as in *mare*, *mate*), and 'ɔ' (as in *bald*, *balk*, *ball*, *call*, *halt*, *malt*, *swallow*, *swan*, *walk*, *war*, *was*). Benjamin Franklin, in 1768, has no "Italian *a*." Fenning, in 1771, tells us that *a* has three sounds: the "slender" (ê), as in *brace*, *nation*, *race*; the "open" (æ), as in *blast*, *father*, *mast*, *rather*; the "broad" (ɔ), as in *all*, *fall*, *wall*. Sheridan's dictionary, 1780, shows no sign of "Italian *a*." Nares, however, in 1784, pronounces our vowel, or something similar, before *f*, *s*, *th*, *n*, and *l* (as in *aft*, *pass*, *path*, *dance*, *calm*), but apparently not before *r* (as in *part*). In Walker, 1791, we find our present sound in use before *r*, *lm*, *n*, and the spirants. Our "Italian *a*" seems, then, to have come into vogue between 1780 and 1790.

A sound resembling our 'ë' (*i* in *bird*, *u* in *hurt*) occurred, sporadically at least, long before Tuite; but the real 'ë' does not seem to have firmly established itself until the beginning of our own century. According to Tuite, *er* is generally pronounced 'er,' as in *fervour*, *term*, *terrible*, *verse*; but in *her*, *mercy*, *person* the *er* is sounded 'ɐr,' and in *clerk*, *merchant*, *sergeant* it is 'ær;' *ea* is 'e' in *dearth*, *earth*, *pearl*, 'æ' in *early*; *ir* is 'ɐr,' as in *birch*, *bird*, *dirt*, *fir*, *shirt*, *stir*, *third*, *thirst*), except in *birth*, *chirp*, *circle*, *circuit*, *firkin*, *firm*, *gird*, *girdle*, *girl*, *girt*, *irksome*, *kirk*, *mirth*, *shirk*, *skirmish*, *skirt*, *smirk*, *Virgil*, *virgin*, *virtue*, in which the *i* presumably is sounded 'e.' *Or* in *Jordan*,[2] *word*, *work*, *world*, *worm*, *worship*, *worst*, *worsted*, *worth*, *worthy* is pronounced 'ɔr.' *Ur* in *burst*, etc., is 'ɐr.' Apparently *or* and *ur* had not yet coïncided, as they did soon after this time. In the *er* and *ir* words con-

[1] Whenever phonetic symbols are used in this article, they will be printed in Roman type and, unless they are in parentheses, they will be enclosed in single quotation marks. Their significance will be explained in the text, the first time they occur. The characters are those of the American Dialect Society.

[2] Tuite expressly condemns the use of 'ɔ' in *Jordan*. The natives of Mt. Desert, Maine, still pronounce *Jurdan* in the local name *Jordan's Pond*, and this pronunciation lingers in some other regions. *Jurdan* is, of course, the regular form from French *Jourdain*.

fusion reigned, in elegant speech, until 'ë' was fully developed; the vulgar usage early levelled them all under 'ʁr.' With Bailey and Fenning, *ir* regularly is sounded like *ur*. With Nares, *er* and *ir* are generally so pronounced, but in *girl* the *i* is equivalent to 'e.'

The unstressed, indistinct vowels are, as was to be expected, rather vaguely treated. Tuite must have had an unaccented 'ə' (the *a* of *sofa*), but he nowhere says so. He does, however, mention an atonic (probably somewhat "mixed") 'u' and 'ò,' and he refers clearly to an unaccented 'i.' The prefixes *em- en-*, he says, are sounded 'im,' 'in,' and the endings *-ble*, *-cle*, *dle* somewhat like 'bil,' 'kil,' 'dil'; the *i* is silent, however, in final *-il* (*devil*, *evil*). *E* and *r* are transposed in *children*, *hundred*, and also in *acre*, "*tygre*," etc., as are the *o* and the *r* in *apron*, "*caldron*," *citron*, "*inviron*," *iron*, *saffron*, *squadron*, the *u* and the *r* in *construe*, the *a* and the *r* in *Israel*. *A* is pronounced 'æ' in the last syllable of *baggage*, *climate*, *female*, "*humane*," *nightingale*, *palace*, etc.; *ia* is 'i' in *carriage* and *marriage;* *a* is silent in *diamond* and *extraordinary* (="extrordnary"). *E* is not sounded in the verb ending *-est*, except after sibilants. *I* is silent in *medicine* and *ordinary*, *o* in *Nicholas*. Final *-on* usually has "an obscure sound," as in *bacon*, *button*, *lesson;* but the endings *-mon*, *-non* have a clear vowel (*sermon*, *cannon*), while the *-on* of *flaggon*, *waggon* and the *-ion* of *carrion*, *cushion*, *fashion* are pronounced 'in'; the *-iot* of *chariot* is 'it.' In *anchor*, *faggot*, *maggot* the *o* is sounded like *e*. Final *-ow* has "*o* short" (ò), as in *window*. The vowel is "short" also in *-dure*, *-sure*, *-ture*, and in such words as *tenure*, *volume*; *manure*, *ordure*, *pasture*, *tenure* were pronounced respectively like *manner*, *order*, *pastor*, *tenor*.

We shall now consider the different values of the letters, beginning with the simple vowels, treating next the vowel digraphs, and finally the consonants. *A* had, according to Tuite, three sounds, "*a*, *ay*, *au*" (æ, ê, ɔ), as in *man*, *made*, *fall:* it was pronounced 'æ' in such words as *father*, *part*, *past;* *a* between 'w' and a consonant in the same syllable was sounded 'ɔ,' as in *quarrel*, *quart*, *quarter*, *squander*, *war*, *was*, *watch*, *what*, etc., likewise, in *wrath;* in *hale* also it was 'ɔ,' and in *any*, *catch*, *many*, *than*, it was 'e';[3] *Walsh* was pronounced *Welch*. *E* had two values, "*é* and *ee*" (ê, e and î, i), as in *bed*, *be:* in *devil*, *Jenkin*, *jennet*, *Jenny*, *yes*, *yesterday*, *yet*, the *e* was sounded 'i': in *yellow* it was 'æ';[4] in oxytones in which *e* is now pronounced 'î,' it was then generally 'ê,' as in *adhere*, *austere*, *blaspheme*, *cohere*, *complete*, *concrete*, *convene*, *extreme*, *impede*, *interfere*, *obscene*, *precede*, *recede*, *replete*, *revere*, *severe*, *sincere*, *supersede*,[5] so also in *alledge*. *I* had two sounds, "*i* and *ee*" (ai[6] and î, i), as in *bribe*, *bit:* in *oblige* the *i* was 'î.'[7] *O* had three values, "*o*" and "*oo*" and "*au*" (ô, ò and û, ʉ and ɔ, o), as in *robe*, *Rome* (rûm), *storm:* before *r* final or followed by a consonant, 'ô' occurred in *borne* (not in *born*), *divorce*, *effort*, *force*, *ford*, *forge*, *fort*, *forth*, *porch*, *pork*, *port*, *portion*, *report*, *shorn*, *sport*, *support*, *sword*, *sworn*, *torn*, *transport*, *worn*, 'ò' was used in the examples previously cited (*Jordan*, *word*, *work*, etc.), but in most cases the vowel was 'ɔ,' as in *for*, *storm;* 'ò' was the sound in *borough*, *brother*, *colonel*, *color*, *columbine*, *come*, *coney*, *cover*,[8] *cozen*, *dozen*, *gone*, *honey*, *hover*, *money*, *mother*, *nothing*, *other*, *poverty*,[8] *smother*, *woman*, in *dost* and *doth* the vowel seems to have been already 'ʉ,' while in *attorney*, *conduit*, *conger*, *conjure*, *constable*, *London*, *Monday*, *Monmouth*, *month*, *sponge*, *wonder* Tuite calls it "oo"; 'û' was used in *Rome*, *tomb*, *womb*, and probably in *gold;* *chorister* was "*quevister*." *U* had two pronunciations, "*u* long and *oo* short" (yû, yu[9] and u, ʉ), as in *cure*, *cut;* in *guard* the *u* was heard. *Y* in *syrop* had the sound 'ʉ.'

3 Nares has 'e' in *catch*, *gather*, *January*, *many*, *radish*, *thank*.

4 In Nares, *celery*, *mesh*, and *terrier* also have 'æ.'

5 This pronunciation reappears at the very end of the century, in the *Essai Raisonné sur la Grammaire et la Prononciation Angloise*, by Duncan Mackintosh, Boston, 1797.

6 Or 'ʉi.' Franklin's pronunciation, 1768, was 'ʉi'; that of Nares, 1784, and Webster, 1789, was 'ai.'

7 This pronunciation lasted into our century. Nares has 'e' in *rinse*, and tells us it was formerly used also in *cistern*, *miracle*, and *spirit*.

8 'Kivər' and 'povərti' are expressly condemned. In Bailey, 'ò' is used in *come*, *done*, *gone*, *one*, *some*, but the pronunciation of *done* is given also as "dun."

9 Perhaps rather a "high-mixed" vowel: Tuite says it is "somewhat like French *u*." Webster, in 1789, declares that "long *u*," in the best pronunciation, is a simple vowel.

The vowel digraphs that call for special comment are *æ*, *ai*, *au* (*aw*), *ea*, *eu* (*ew*), *oa*, *æ*, *oi* (*oy*), *oo*, *ou* (*ow*), *ue*. In Latin names *æ* was sounded 'æ,' as in *Æsop*, *Cæsar;* *œ*, as in *Phœuix*, had the same value. *Ai* in *agaiu* was 'e'; this was, as far as I know, the only pronunciation in the eighteenth century. *Au* was generally 'ɔ,' as in *fraud*, *Paul*, *sauce*[10]; but in *aunt*, *daunt*, *draught*, *gauge*, *jauudice*, *laugh*, *Lawreuce*,[11] *sausage*, the *au* was 'æ.' The pronunciation of *ea* was in a state of transition: nearly all the words which now have 'æ,' 'e,' or 'ê' (as *bear*, *head*, *break*) were pronounced by Tuite in the corresponding way; those which now have "Italian *a*" (as *heart*) then had 'æ;' the words which now have 'ī' mostly varied, in Tuite's time, between 'ī' (the London fashion) and 'ê' or 'æ' (the older practice), as *bean*,[12] *beard*, *beat*, *breathe*, *creature*, *fear*, *flea*, *leaf*, *meat*, *pea*, *plea*, *sea*, *spear*, *tea*, *teach*, *veal*, but *appear*, *arrear*, "*chear*," *cleau*, *clear*, *dear*, *hear*, *near*, *read*, *weasel*, *year* always had 'ī,' *leap* had 'e,' and *weary* had 'æ;' *early* was 'ærli,' and in *dearth*, *earth*, *pearl*, the *ea* was 'e.' The sound of *eu* or *ew* is unfortunately not described; we are told, however, that *chew*, *curfew*, *ewe*, *nephew*, are pronounced respectively "chaw," "curfer," "yo," "nevvy." *Oa* in *oatmeal* was a short 'ô.' *Oi* and "long *i*" were more or less confused, as they were throughout the eighteenth century: *boil*, *broil*, *spoil*, *voyage*, we are informed, had nearly or quite the sound of "long *i*," and in the list of homophones we find several such pairs as *bile* and *boil*, *file* and *foil*. *Oo* usually had the sound 'û,'[13] but the short vowel was heard in *blood*, *foot*, *good*, *look*, *soot*, *stood*, *took;* it is likely that in *blood*, and perhaps in *soot*, the vowel was unrounded; in *soothsayer* and *swooning*[14] the *oo* was pronounced like *ou*. *Ou* probably had, in most cases, the value 'ðu,' which is the sound ascribed to it by Franklin; it was 'û,' according to Tuite, in *acoutre*, *could*, *course*, *should*, *soup*, *source*, *would*, *you*, *your*, *youth;* in *chough*, *couple*, *courage*, *cousiu*, *enough*, *flourish*, *journey*, *nourish*, *rough*, *touch*, *tough*, and in unaccented final syllables (as in *favour*, *pious*, *Portsmouth*) it was 'ɐ;' in *country*, *courtesy*, *double*, "*jealousie*," *scourge*, *trouble* it was 'ð;' in *Gloucester* it was 'ô.' "*Ue*," says Tuite, "in the end of a word not following *g* or *q* sounds *u*, *e* being only added, to cover the nakedness of *u*."

*C* was silent in *perfect* and *verdict*. *D* was not sounded in "*ribband*," which was pronounced "*ribbin*." *F* was silent in *bailiff*, and was sounded *r* in *haudkerchief*. *G* was heard in *beuigu*, *coudigu*, *impugu*, *maligu*, the preceding vowel being short; but *phlegu* was pronounced 'flîm.' Final *gh* was equivalent to *o* in "*Edinburgh*, *Gotteuburgh*, *Hamburgh*"; in *drought* and *sigh* the *gh* was sounded like *th;* generally final *gh* was silent. *Gu*, as in *guat*, had just become 'n.' *H* was not spoken in *hospital*, *humble*, *Humphrey*.[15] The name *jay* for *j* was new. *K* was still pronounced in *knack*, *knell*, *knife*, *know*, *knuckle*. *L* was silent in *almost*, *Bristol*, "*chaldron*," "*faulcon*," *fault*, *soldier;* the first *l* of *colouel* was sounded 'r.'[16] *Li*, as in *William*, had become a palatal 'l'; similarly *ui*, as in *uuion*, was palatal 'n.' *Ng* was pronounced 'n' in *Fleuing*, *shilling*, *stocking*.[17] *P* was silent between *u* and *t*, as in *assumptiou*, *empty*, *exempt*, *symptom*, *tempt*. *S* was sounded *sh* in *consume*, *issue*,[18] *sugar*, *sure;* it was "like French *j*" in *hosier*, *pleasure*,[18] *usual*,[18] *visiou*, etc.; in *obscure* the *b* was voiceless. With regard to *sh* Tuite says:

"'Tis too common a Fault of some, who affect an over and above nicety (forsooth) in speaking, to pronounce *sh*, in the beginning of a word before *r*, like *s*, and accordingly pronounce *shred*, *sred;* *shrill*, *srill*." "*T* between *s* and final *le* or *les*," says Tuite, "is either lost or very little heard, as *castle*," etc.[19]

*Th* was equivalent to *t* in *Arthur* and *Cath-*

10 Tuite condemns "sace" for *sauce*.

11 Compare the nickname *Larry*.

12 *Bean* and *been* were pronounced alike by Tuite.

13 According to Bailey and others, 'û' was the vowel of *door*.

14 Bailey tells us that the *w* was silent in this word.

15 Fenning says that *h* is "almost silent" in *heir*, *here*, *honest*, *honour*, *hostler*, *hour*, *humble*, *humour*.

16 'Kɐrnəl.' So Bailey and Fenning.

17 Throughout the eighteenth century final unaccented *-ing* was very commonly pronounced 'in.'

18 So Nares.

19 Tuite does not discuss the palatalization of *t*, and neither does Bailey. Nares says that the pronunciation of *t* as *ch* is correct in *bestial*, *courtier*, *frontier*, etc., recent in *fortune*, *nature*, etc., common in *beauteous*, *covetous*, *virtuous*, and vulgar in *tumult*, *tune*, etc.

*erine* (ærtər, kætərn); in *booth* it was voiced; *clothes* was pronounced *close*.

"*W* is often not sounded in the beginning of a syllable, if the foregoing syllable ends in *r*, as *Ber-wick*, *War-wick*, *for-ward*, etc., . . . . and sometimes when the foregoing syllable does not end in *r*, as *Ed-ward*, *Green-wich*, *back-ward*, *penny-worth*, which is pronounc'd, *pen-north*. Some omit *w* in *midwife*, which they pronounce *midif*."

Tuite does not mention the confusion of initial *w* and *wh;* there are several instances of it in Bailey, and it was extremely common later in the century.

"*Zi* sounds like the French *j*, in *brazier*, *glazier*, *grazier*, *Frazier*." "*Piazzas* is pronounc'd *piaches*, in the common *English* way of speaking."

Tuite has nothing important to say of *r*,[20] which was regarded in his time as the simplest and most regular of the letters. It was probably always trilled. Franklin, in 1768, defines it thus: "The tip of the tongue a little loose or separate from the roof of the mouth, and vibrating." Fenning says: "*R* has always the same rough snarling sound, and hence is called the canine or dog letter, as *road*, *rural*, *roar*." Final *-re* he bescribes as "a weak *er*," as in *acre*, etc. Sheridan admits only one type of *r*. But Walker, in 1791, distinguishes *r* before a vowel from *r* otherwise placed. The glide, or indistinct vowel sound, before an *r* that is not followed by a vowel, was doubtless audible in Tuite's day: he says that *hire* sounds like *higher*, *mare* like *mayor*; Bailey writes the pronunciation of *fire* as "fiur." Nares remarks:

"*R* does not perfectly unite with long vowels and diphthongs preceding it, but retains something of the sound of *er* or *ar:* hence it is that the monosyllables *bare*, *bear*, and *hair*, sound very like the dissyllable *prayer;* *hour* like *power* . . . . ; *cure* like *brewer;* and hence it has been usual to write *fiery* and *wiery* for *firy* and *wiry*."

The pronunciation of certain peculiar words in Tuite's time can be learned from the following list, which is taken from Bailey's *Introduction to the English Tongue*, second edition, London, 1733:—

achievement=hatchment
alchymy=occamy
almond=amun
anemone=emmony
apothecary=potticary
apprentice=prentice
artichoke=hartichoke
asthma=asma
atheist=athist
athwart=athart
awkward=aukard
awry=ary
balcony=belcony
ballad=ballet
ballast=ballas
ballaster=bannister
boatswain=bosen
calf=cafe
coin=quine
conscientious=conshenshus.
construe=constur.[21]
coroner=crowner.[21]
courtesy=curchee.
cucumber=cowcumber[21]
diamond=dimun[22]
dictionary=dixnery
enough=anuff
ensign=insine
errand=arraud
exchange=change
farthing=fardin
folk=fokes
housewife=huzzif
jaundice=janders
jointure=jintur
joist=jice
jonquil=junkil
island=ilan
lieutenant=leftenant[23]
mastiff=mastee
medicine=meds'n[24]
melancholy=mallancollee
monsieur=mounseer
myrrh=mur
onion=innian
perfect=parfit[24]
protonotary=prothonneter
psalm=saam
quotient=coshint
sallad=sallet

20 He does tells us that *Margaret* was pronounced "Marget."

21 So Tuite, 22 Cf. Tuite. 23 Tuite: "*Iivtenant.*"

sarsenett=sasnet
sentinel=centry
schedule=sedule[25]
sheriff=shreeve
sigh=sithe[24]
swoon=sound[24]
toilet=twilight
vault=vaut
verdict=vardit[24]
voutchsafe=voutsafe[26]
wrath=rauth[26]
yeoman=yemun[27]

C. H. GRANDGENT.

*Cambridge, Mass.*

## *PUNDELAN.*

UNSUPPORTED conjectures are but meagre diet; yet for lack of better I will offer one on this strange word, which occurs in Barbour's *Bruce*, iii, 159, and apparently nowhere else. Bruce has just done a great exploit of arms, and his foe, Macnauchtan, says to the Lord of Lorne,—

"Sekyrly now may ȝe se
Betane the starkest pundelan
That ewyr ȝour lyff-tyme ȝe saw tane."

The meaning is clearly 'champion,' or 'hero.' Skeat says, with reason, that Jamieson's conjecture of *pantaloon*, is not to be approved, and gives as "a mere guess" an imaginary O. Fr. *puin-de-leine*, 'fist of wood.' As guessing is free, I offer the guess that it is a corruption of "paladin."*

WM. HAND BROWNE.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

## *MIDDLE-HIGH-GERMAN READER.*

*Mittelhochdeutsches Lesebuch* mit Grammatik und Wörterbuch von DR. A. BACHMANN, Professor an der Universität zu Zürich. Zweite Auflage. Zürich: Fäsi & Beer, 1898. 8vo, pp. xxxii, 274.

BACHMANN'S Middle-High-German Reader, first issued in 1892, is still little known in this country, and a notice of it may not be out of place on the occasion of the appearance of a second edition now lying before us. It seems to us the most satisfactory aid to the study of Middle High German that has been produced since the publication of Paul's Grammar. In the selection of extracts it follows in general the plan of Weinhold's Reader, but it provides considerable more reading material, and many of the extracts seem to us particularly well chosen and likely to interest the student.

The first selection in the Reader consists of four hundred and eighty-four stanzas of the *Nibelungenlied*, comprising a number of Lachmann's *Lays* complete. Only the so-called "genuine" stanzas are given, all "interpolations" are omitted. Although Weinhold follows the same plan, it nevertheless seems to us a mistake. Entirely aside from the question whether anybody has yet succeeded in restoring the original lays, in regard to which doubts do not subside as the years roll on, this way of presenting the text makes it impossible for the teacher to give to his students an adequate conception of Lachmann's method of procedure; without at least the text of *A* before him, the student can get no fairly satisfactory idea of the meaning of the Nibelungen controversy. Furthermore, it is an undeniable fact that in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the *Nibelungenlied* (as distinguished from the lays) was an immensely popular book, as appears from the large number of manuscripts extant: the very "interpolations," therefore, must be regarded as in a sense characteristic of the time and the public for which they were intended. Any conception of the epic poetry of that period based upon the *Lays* to the exclusion of the *Nibelungenlied* must be inadequate. We might as well study Hartmann by reading Chrestien.

If space does not permit the editor in a future edition to give a considerable portion of the *Nibelungenlied* without omissions, we should prefer to see this work altogether omitted from the Reader and the space thus gained devoted to additional extracts from *Iwein*, *Parzival* and *Tristan*, which are now represented to an extent hardly adequate to their importance and to that of their writers. The *Nibelungenlied* is now accessible in so many inexpensive and otherwise suitable editions that it might well be omitted from a Middle-High-German

24 Cf. Tuite. 25 Tuite: "*shedule*." 26 So Tuite.
27 Tuite: 'yɛmən.'

* It is pertinent to compare *Alcanor* from *Amilcar* (MOD. LANG. NOTES ix, p. 241); and *Archipiada* from *Alcibiades* (*The Athenæum*, Dec. 24, 1898).—J. W. B.

Reader, just as the Modern-German Readers for the higher schools no longer contain selections from *Wallenstein* or *Iphignie*. All that has been said about the *Nibelungenlied* applies to a somewhat lesser extent also to *Kudrun*.

The selections from the *Nibelungenlied* and *Kudrun* are followed by such from *Der grosse Rosengarten*, *Reinhart Fuchs*, Lamprecht's *Alexander* (the interesting episode of the Marvelous Forest), *Iwein* (Kalogroant's adventure in the forest of Breziljan), *Parzival*, *Tristan*, Konrad von Würzburg's *Trojanischer Krieg*, also his *Otte mit dem Barte* complete, *Meier Helmbrecht*, the *Passional* (the story of Theophilus and the devil), Stricker's *Amis* and Heinrich von Freiberg's *Kobold und Eisbär*. Then follow extracts from some ten or twelve lyric poets, among them Walther with forty-two *lieder* and *sprüche*, a few of the songs of the Mystics, and some *Carmina Clericorum*; further, some specimens of the didactic poetry, including from Rudolf von Ems' *Barlaam und Josaphat*, the parable of the man and the unicorn (cf. Rückert's *Parabel*), finally some specimens of prose, including part of a sermon by Berthold, from the Zürich Chronicle the episode on which Schiller's *Graf von Habsburg* is based, and from the *Schwabenspiegel* the sections dealing with the election of the king and with the judicial duel. It will be seen that these selections are well suited to give the student along with a working knowledge of the language also a good idea of the variety of Middle-High-German literature, as well as of thirteenth century thought, manners, customs and institutions.

The text of the selections is better than it was in the first edition of the Reader. In some cases a different text has been followed; for instance, in the case of the extract from *Iwein*, where Lachmann's text has been substituted for Bech's, and elsewhere many errors have been corrected. Objectionable seem to us the readings *siropel* p. 111, l. 637, *suonestac* p. 167, l. 36, *denete* p. 86, l. 49 (*PK senete*; Schoenbach, Reissenberg *smucte*).

The Notes refer only to the details of the text; there are no general introductory, or even merely bibliographical, notes for each selection as has been the custom in such books. This will seem to many a serious defect. The Notes, as far as they go, are very satisfactory, especially in the new edition, where many slight errors have been corrected and previous omissions supplied. P. 106, l. 341, *der werlde riuwe* is wrongly interpreted as "das grösste Leid von der Welt;" *der werlde* is, of course, dative. (Cf. *PBB.* 24. 190.) It would have been well to take note of Hildebrand's explanation (cf. *ZfddU.* viii, 686) of *betrogen*, p. 162, l. 35, as used here actively in the sense of *Betrüger;* cf. *verlogen*. Dialect forms also ought to have received more attention, for instance, p. 91: *dusint*, *hube wir*, *wundiris*; p. 93: *frô* for *fruo*, etc.

The brief Middle-High-German Grammar at the beginning of the book has been carefully revised for this second edition and it is improved in many respects. Of errors we have noticed only the forms **hanhen* and **fanhen*, p. xiv. We wish, however, that all attempt at historical explanation had been omitted. It is impossible to treat Middle-High-German phonology historically in a satisfactory manner for students that are not supposed to know Old High German or any other Old-Germanic dialect, especially within the compass of a few pages. These explanations do not explain, they only confuse. It is perfectly possible for a student to learn Modern German without being told why *binden* has an *i* and *sprechen* an *e*, or why the former has in the past participle an *u* and the latter an *o;* and the beginner in Middle High German should be taught in the same way.

In the Vocabulary we have noticed that nearly all the words that had erroneously been omitted in the first edition have now been inserted, and a number of more or less inaccurate or incomplete definitions have been revised. Some definitions can still be improved, for instance those of *hel* (cf. *PBB.* ii, 75), *kûchen* ("hauchen," not "keuchen"), *lâzstein*, *valde;* and the following words are still omitted: *erkunnen*, p. 113, l. 93; *gevellic*, p. 121, l. 28; *hirs* p. 85, l. 17 (MHG. st. w. m. "Hirse"); *merzisch*, p. 63, str. 92, 3; *viuhte*, p. 122, l. 159; *vâl*, p. 122, l. 157; *zûn*, p. 86, l. 47.

H. C. G. von Jagemann.
*Harvard University.*

## *FRENCH LITERATURE.*

*Etudes sur la Littérature Française*, par René Doumic. Troisième série. Paris: Perrin et Cie., 1899. 8vo, 311 pp.

Probably no more interesting subject has presented itself in the history of nineteenth century literature than the struggle between the impressionist and dogmatic schools of criticism in France, represented by Jules Lemaître, Anatole France, etc., and Ferdinand Brunetière, the founder of pure literary criticism in its broadest sense. The principal questions under discussion were the following: Can a critic be impersonal? Is it the duty of the critic to criticise defects or beauties?

An impressionist critic certainly supposes the same nature and same æsthetic aptitudes of his reader, for he reflects the work read and lives in its emotional life. If he condemns a work, all those who have enjoyed it have enjoyed a false pleasure. The dogmatic or objective critic insists on the right of individual taste, but this must be based on certain laws, among which education is of prime importance. These laws of objective criticism have been most admirably stated by M. Ricardou in his *Critique Littéraire*, 1896. The first obligation is to produce an æsthetic emotion with a truly humane value, revealing an enlarged taste, humanized by tradition and expressing what essential, what truth and what morality humanity possesses. Truth in literature does not mean to copy appearances nor to reveal the laws of being; but, while conforming itself to these appearances and rules, to disengage and express the essentially humane in man and the depth there is in him. As life is so much more truly humane the more it is moral, to be true in literature is, therefore, not to moralize, not to instruct, but to disengage and express what in man distinguishes him from nature and makes him man, what ennobles and inspires the reader by communicating itself to him and gives him the æsthetic emotion required; it means to describe immorality also, but not in a way to harm, shock, or dishearten, but in a way that our moral qualities and virtues will be so much more striking by the contrast with our miseries. And the expressive force must choose, coördinate, and put in relief what in reality is humane, true and moral. Thus is the art of expression put at the service of truth and morality. Based on this method, impersonal, dogmatic criticism is possible. This criticism has had a natural and logical growth. Sainte-Beuve and Taine developed historical criticism; M. Brunetière, by applying the theory of evolution and that of humanity, has brought French literary criticism to its culmination. The reviewer sincerely believes that there is no more important writer and no more profitable study in nineteenth century French literature than M. Brunetière. In criticism itself his influence is especially felt. The finest critics of this generation are his admirers and willingly call themselves his disciples. Foremost among these are René Doumic, Faguet, Texte and Ricardou. The works of these men are by far the best of this decade in literary criticism. Such an array of brilliant disciples is certainly a great credit to such a young man as M. Brunetière. These men are all critics, too, and desire to be nothing but critics, which probably accounts for the depth and soundness of their works.

When M. Doumic has a question to discuss he usually waits for the appearance of a book bearing on it; he rarely reviews the book, simply stating in a few words its value. He never writes unless he has a reason for doing so, so different from the Impressionists.

The present book under review is the third of a series of essays on literary questions and questions of the day. He has already written three volumes on modern writers, mostly novelists; two on the modern drama: *De Scribe à Ibsen*, *Essais sur le théâtre contemporain*, and one entitled, *La Vie et les Mœurs au jour le jour*. All of these essays are sound, forceful, logical, full of difficult but important questions, showing a broad, accurate, and vigorous scholarship. The following is a short analysis of some of the essays of his last work.

The first subject he treats is, *La Manie de la Modernité*, apropos of Houdar de Lamotte and *La Querelle des anciens et des modernes*. The fad among writers of to-day is to be modern, to be so purposely, to be in touch with the present fads, etc. This craze is of recent date, Lamotte being one of the first to be affected, and

today the interest is somewhat revived by the study of P. Dupont, *Un poète philosophe au commencement du xviii^e siècle*. M. Doumic points out the characteristics of Lamotte, his versatility, his fads, defects, etc. Lamotte knew his defects and, therefore, wrote according to his talents, and indeed he wrote well on things he understood very badly. He was always ready to confess his faults, at the same time those of others, comparing himself to Homer and other great writers. After showing the shallowness and platitude of Lamotte's reasoning and judgment, he points him out as a true precursor of the modern dilettants and impressionists, as opposed to the sound and severe school of objective criticism. How much the following sounds like Brunetière:

Mais si le jugement de goût est pure affaire de sentiment, et si tout se ramène à une impression de plaisir immédiat, combien cela est commode, et que voilà une théorie qui vient au secours de l'ignorance mondaine! Les gens de qualité, qui savent tout sans avoir rien appris, seront reconnaissants à l'écrivain qui s'en remet si généreusement à la sûreté de leur instinct. Toutes les femmes seront pour lui.

The remainder of the study is devoted to the question so much discussed to-day in France—The ancient languages in our modern educational systems. The second essay deals with *Voyages de Montesquieu*. Inasmuch as M.'s works were prepared by the means of his confidences, and inasmuch as we have these works, there is very little information gained from such publications. Nothing new is drawn from these notes and letters concerning the man, his life, or his ideas. He then speaks of M's travels, the traveler himself, an acute, close observer, a fine careful student; the effects of these travels upon him, his study of art. He concludes that M. was neither a tourist nor an artist; he was a historian and moralist, a collector of facts. After these voyages M. retires to his study and there, after long reflection and meditation, he writes his work. Doumic shows what impression these travels made upon M., and then how these impressions, in note form, were changed by reflection and quiet meditation, and how they built up his great works.

The third study is on *La Préface de Cromwell à l'usage des classes*. In this he shows the progress the University is making in its choice of subjects for instruction, turning its attention now to the modern writers. The objection to the *Préface* is that by bringing Victor Hugo, the æsthete, historian, and thinker before children of fifteen, they lose sight of the poet and bring out the character that they (Doumic, etc.) refuse to salute as an educator. The *Préface* is full of confused ideas, false theories, and written in a tone of haughty assurance. It is a work of circumstance, written for the immediate needs of polemic. A book in which one idea contradicts another only encourages in youth a very philosophical dilettantism. M. Doumic objects especially to the two main assertions in the *Préface*.—Everything in nature is in art; absolute liberty of the artist.—There are no rules, no models. The book is well annotated and of use to scholars. He concludes in denouncing the books in general imposed upon the *lycéens* and the *Préface* caps the climax of them all. This is undoubtedly one of the finest of these essays. In it the doctrines of dogmatic criticism are most excellently applied.

French correspondence has certainly no equal or rival in any other literature; it really forms a part of French literary history. The great epoch for this was that of Mme de Sévigné and Voltaire. The letters of the nineteenth century writers are really not letters; Mérimée's correspondence, however, forms a striking exception. "Why do our contemporaries no longer write letters?" Newspapers, telegraphy, the organization of society, the place the man of letters occupies and the manner in which he exercises his profession are the reasons. Mérimée wrote many letters and these have left us a portrait quite different from the one already existing. They show in him a complexity of character truly wonderful, but they also show a weakness, especially in his love affair. To hide this weakness of which he was only too conscious he veils himself in the garb *de mystificateur*. M. had leisure to write, took pleasure in doing so; he traveled extensively, lived in all kinds of society, saw nearly all varieties of social life. These very reasons close the doors of the art of letter-writing to our nineteenth century writers, who have not the time and only write when they have to.

In *Une Apothéose du Naturalisme* M. Doumic gives vent to his feelings on Zola and the later naturalists of 1875. The occasion for this is *Le Bilan littéraire du xixe siècle* by G. Meunier, which is no more than a great eulogy on Zola. After ridiculing the work and Zola, he takes up a very serious and profound discussion of what naturalism really is, the difference between the naturalists of 1850 and those of 1875.

In the next essay he pays a well-deserved tribute to Alphonse Daudet. The principal points in which he differs from his school lie in his sympathy, good healthy characters, lack of brutality, of tiresome minutiæ; a friend of the Goncourts and Zola, but not of their methods. More artist than thinker; *gaité* and congeniality, a fine story teller, full of harmless irony and humor. Daudet never goes to extremes; he is always charming in his pictures of *la vie mondaine* and *la vie intime*, whose characters belong to the highest and lowest classes of society. His work is like an elegant piece of architecture, finely joined, brightened and made cheerful by arabesques which, looked upon as a whole, appears frail. He lacks a certain power of creative force due to his strong sensibility which he fails to control and from which he cannot free himself. An analysis of the principal characters and of his sensibility make this study exceedingly interesting. Doumic concludes by stating that Daudet was the most amiable writer of his generation and the one who, at the same time, has given of the society in which he lived the largest, the most varied, and the most faithful image. His *contes* are already classic. Without a very penetrating knowledge of souls, a wide experience of the world, or a very personal interpretation of things; without any kind of conception of life he has given us what is best and wholesome with a finely colored imagination and the true nature of an artist.

In his study of Loti he shows that he has never attained again to the height of his *Pêcheur d'Islande* and *Frère d'Ives*. An analysis of the nature and organization of Loti follows; his utter lack of ideas, of abstract thought and analysis of sentiment; but a marvelous painter and dreamer. He has the art of perfectly describing and noting traits, colors and shades, as well as rendering what is without precise form, definite color, immaterial and unreal. With *Ramuntcho*, however, another Loti is before us. The affected melancholy and weak languor found in his first works, sickly and unwholesome, is now one of reflection, grave, virile, and nearly religious. Now we face the great human *tristesse* inherent in our nature, coming from the consciousness of our *fragilité d'éphémères en face de la Nature éternelle et impassible*.

In René Bazin, one of the younger novelists, we find a very welcome exception to the ordinary brutal and tiresome naturalists; his writings are wholesome, ennobling and pure. *Noellet*, *Sarcelle bleue* and *Donatienne* are among his best works.

In his essay on *Les idées du Comte Tolstoï sur l'art*, he first analyzes the work, points out the defects, discusses beauty in art and what art really is. It is beyond the limits of this review to enter into a discussion of them.

In the essay *Les Méfaits de la Vigne* by Demolins, the evident weakness of modern France, its organization, physical, social and political are discussed. Demolins endeavors to trace this, by the influence of race, and especially place, upon writers and statesmen, to the vineyard; in this book he applies this theory to the South of France; Touraine and her vineyard have fostered the *esprit gaulois*, and with it what may be called the nude; that is, grossness and immorality as seen in Rabelais, Balzac and Courier. But the theory of place alone does not hold. Man is dependent on his social and physical *milieu*, but is not a prisoner in it and even has the power to change the *milieu* himself, which is so often overlooked and especially so by M. Demolins.

*Un Roman de Mœurs Napolitaines* is quite a detailed analysis of Mme de Serao's novel *Au Pays de Cocagne*, describing the passion of gambling in Italy and its results.

M. Barrès in *Les Déracinés* comes before the public again after a long silence in a new form; he takes up a social stand now. *Trop de chimères et trop de sophismes ont faussé la conscience publique: il n'est que temps de la redresser.* This he attempts in a trilogy of which this novel is the first under the form of a political story. M. Barrès is well fitted for this difficult task; but when he takes upon

himself to discuss the educational system of France and condemns it he loses his force. His discussions are tiresome, nothing but a heap of documents, gathered by reading and observation, of all sorts of political questions and events. But in spite of these defects there is great talent in the book and M. Doumic proceeds to give him and other promising novelists good advice.

*A propos du "Désastre"* is a study on the war of 1870; it is a strong book. Two important points are pointed out; 1. The book does not leave a depressing impression, but a powerfully strong patriotic feeling; 2. the duty of the soldier and his rôle in society to-day. The book came at the right time, for the French people have repaired their faults and can now acknowledge them without blushing. It is now time to draw the lesson. Above the faults of individuals and the errors of a régime, above the souvenirs of defeat, tableaux of humiliation and desolation, the authors have drawn up a great image of the army, impersonal, silent, impassible, disciplined, faithful to its traditions, resolute in its attachment to an undisputed duty. The book is useful because it is an act of faith in the army. As long as Europe has not proclaimed a universal disarmament, he who fastens the bonds between the army and nation has produced a work of a good Frenchman. MM. Paul and Victor Margueritte have done this.

HUGO P. THIEME.

*University of Michigan.*

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### *SOME OLD FRENCH PLACE-NAMES IN THE STATE OF ARKANSAS.*

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—I have read with interest, in your February number, Mr. John C. Branner's paper on the origin of some old French place-names in the state of Arkansas.

Although some of the origins here given of the queer names now prevalent are quite doubtful, the article surely makes a good step towards the etymology of the early place-nomenclature of Arkansas.

I may, later on, examine closely the origins set forth in the paper referred to; but I will now present the few remarks that a rapid perusal of the paper has suggested to me.

DARDANELLE.—The origin given as being derived directly from the French *dort d'un œil* (not *œille*) is not probable, as *dort d'un œil* means 'a disturbed or uneasy sleep.' It might possibly have originated from *darde un œil*, 'cast an eye,' that is, 'be on the look-out,' "a rocky point projecting into the river at this place and making the navigation a little dangerous."

ELEVEN POINTS.—Mr. Rose's explanation *Levé pont*, has no value whatever. *Levé pont* means nothing in French. If it were *Pont levé*, it would have a little more probability; the words have likely been interverted. The origin of this place-name is rather American than French.

GULPHO.—*Calfat*, calker, is not a proper name, and the name *Gulpha* does not likely derive its origin from the word *calfat*, as the calkers, in those early days, could not have been very numerous in the Arkansas territory.

LA FAVE.—This name may possibly have been originated from a Lefebvre or Lefaivre family, not likely from *la fève*.

LOW FREIGHT.—The origin given may be right, as the old French traders used to pronounce *l'eau froide*, "*l'eau fret.*" This pronunciation of *froide* is current to-day among the French-Canadian peasantry.

I would recommend to Mr. Branner two papers on place-nomenclature, one by Mr. George Johnson, of the Canadian Federal Statistic Bureau, and the other by Mr. W. F. Ganong. Both of them are to be found in the recent volumes of the *Transactions* of the Royal Society of Canada.

RAOUL RENAULT.

*Quebec.*

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

**Baltimore, April, 1899.**

## *THE SIXTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA.*

THE acceptance of the invitation extended by the authorities of the University of Virginia, to hold the sixteenth annual convention of the Modern Language Association of America in Charlottesville, was most fortunate. The growth of interest in linguistic and literary studies on the field of Modern Languages has nowhere been more active than in the Southern States, and in the development of scholarship and the creation of literary taste in that part of the Union the University of Virginia has been the chief factor.

It was, therefore, peculiarly appropriate that the members of the Association should have an opportunity, in the yearly wandering from one part of the country to the other, to visit the great southern University.

The comparative remoteness of location and the fact that there were few of the facilities of a great city did not interfere materially with the success of the meeting, nor with the excellent entertainment, which was afforded the delegates. In round numbers a hundred members were present, representing all the great Eastern universities and colleges. As was to be expected, there was a considerable representation from the southern colleges, especially from those located in Virginia. Harvard, Yale, and Columbia sent large delegations, while the University of Pennsylvania and Johns Hopkins were well represented.

Dr. Paul B. Barringer, the eminent Physiologist, and Chairman of the faculty of the University of Virginia, presided at the opening meeting, which was held Tuesday evening, Dec. twenty-seventh, in Public Hall. Mr. George W. Miles, Head Master of St. Alban's School, and a member of the Board of Visitors, made an eloquent address, in which he welcomed the Association, on the part of the Board, to the University. Professor James W. Bright, responded very happily to the oration of Mr. Miles and, on behalf of the Association, returned thanks for the cordial welcome.

After these preliminary exercises the President of the Association, Professor Alcée Fortier of Tulane University, delivered the President's address, on the subject of "Social and Historical Forces in French Literature." President Fortier spoke in part as follows:

Philology, in its broadest sense, is understood to signify the study of literature as well as of language; it means, in reality, the study of civilization. The civilization of each country of Western Europe is somewhat different from that of the others, and the literature, which is in great part the product of a peculiar civilization, has peculiar and distinct traits. As civilization means development, new historical and social forces are constantly being brought to bear upon the individual, and the three great causes which mold the mind of the individual are: 1, the fact of being a man, which gives him ideas and sentiments common to all men; 2, his birth-place, which impresses upon him the civilization of his country; 3, the historical and social forces produced in his own life-time.

It is very difficult to trace all the forces which have exerted an influence on French literature, but it is interesting to note some of the most important, from the earliest times to our own epoch. The theories of M. Brunetière and M. Lanson are interesting and important, but they should not be adopted blindly.

The pessimism in contemporary French literature is to be regretted. If French society be taken as a whole we find a happy and prosperous people and no cause for pessimism in literature. Let us hope that pessimism is about to disappear, and that M. Rostand's "Cyrano de Bergerac" is the beginning of a new era and has brought back absolute faith in pure and chivalric sentiments.

At the conclusion of this paper the regular programme of the meeting was begun. Two essays were on the programme for Tuesday evening, one by Dr. P. B. Marcou, entitled "Are French Poets Poetical?" and the other by Prof. Thomas Fitz-Hugh, "A Neglected Field in American Philology."

In answering the query, "Are French poets poetical?" Dr. Marcou said:

Byron, Emerson and Heine have expressed the opinion that there is no real French poetry. Tennyson's favorite French poet is Béranger.

The reasons for this state of things are:—

First:—The rhythm of French poetry, like

the French stress-accent, is so slightly marked that it fails to stir the English or German reader, except where the lines are short and the false foreign rhythm can be easily read into the French lines.

Second:—The slight emotional value of most of the English words that are derived from French and Latin makes French verse seem light and flimsy to the English reader.

Third:—The artificiality of French verse during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries has prejudiced foreign readers against French poetry as a whole.

The best modern French verse is free from the defects that can be urged against the classic French poets, and if a French poet of genius should be born, he would find a perfect instrument awaiting him.

Prof. Fitz-Hugh dwelt pointedly upon the vastly enhanced culture-historical and linguistic significance attaching to the study of the so-called Vulgar Latin in the light of the modern investigations of Gröber, Meyer-Lübke, Wölfflin and their co-adjutors. To the Roman commonfolk *per se*, and not to its aristocratic brother of the Græcizing Classic hierarchy, belongs all the characteristic significance of the Roman spirit in the economy of world-history. The very genius of the Classic Roman world has its living roots in that shrewd practicality and deft eclecticism which are indigenous traits in Roman folk-psychology. On the other hand, if we would search aright for the genius that could take on the new spirit of Christ as promptly as it could put off the old Adam of Hellas, and so as if by world-regeneration reconstitute the foundations of history 'And be the fair beginning of a time,' we must search for it in the living, not the dead Rome, in the mighty race who have spoken since the dawn of history and still speak the *lingua Romana*, and not in the secluded hierarchy, which created and maintained during its political existence the more conservative and stereotyped speech of literature, the *lingua Latina* of scholastic tradition. The study of the spiritual and linguistic life of the Roman commonfolk has, until recently, fallen between the Scylla of Ciceronianism and the Charybdis of Romanic dialecticism. The Classicist scorns it, and the Romanicist neglects it. University catalogues offer courses in the folk-speech, but the scientific work of our Professors is confined to the Classic Latin on the one hand, and the Romanic dialects on the other. The bibliography of the Vulgar Latin is a reproach to American and English scholarship. The author urged a radical change of front in American philology, insisting upon what he called the forward view-point as against the traditional backward view. Instead of eyes directed stolidly back against the increasingly narrow prison-walls of the over and gone, philology must soon, under the victorious promptings of culture-historical life, enter upon the far vaster, richer and more hopeful regions of the forward view. The increasingly narrow field of Latin Classicism will be widened into the promised land of Latin Romanicism. The borders of Latin philology will be boldly enlarged to enclose the rich virgin soil of the Late Latin, fascinatingly interspersed as it is with the fount-tain-heads of the Romanic vernaculars. The author urged a readjustment of the time-honored Doctor-trilogy, declaring that the Greek-Latin major is not a logical unit but a duality, having historical, not scientific validity. Not so the Latin-Romanic *Hauptfach:* Latin-Romanic philology is a culture-historical unit. The truly scientific adjustment of the academic trilogy would accordingly be, Latin-Romanic as *Hauptfach*; Greek as *Nebenfach*, and Philosophy as rounder-up; or again, Greek-Romanic as *Hauptfach*, Latin as *Nebenfach*, and the time-honored Philosophy, if you please, as in Germany.

The *lingua Romana* and its most fundamental laws of evolution were characterized in the light of modern investigation, and the field of inquiry was organized by the author in accordance with the trend of the materials collected and proposed as the basis for subsequent papers before the Association.

At the close of Prof. Fitz-Hugh's paper, the meeting adjourned and the delegates attended in a body a reception tendered the Association in the library of the University.

On reassembling, Wednesday morning, the order of business included the further reading and discussion of papers and the reports of the Secretary and Treasurer, which showed the Association to be in a highly flourishing condition.

Prof. Todd's paper, which was the first of the session, entitled "*La Vie de Sainte Catherine d'Alexandrie*, as contained in the Paris MS. *La Clayette*," began with a reference to what has already been published concerning the legend of St. Catherine in general, and an account of the *Clayette* manuscript, which offers a poetical version of the legend, not yet edited, nor even analyzed. The bulk of the paper, as read, presented a popular discussion of the contents of the poem, but as published will consist chiefly of a critically edited reproduction of the original text.

Luis de León, the Spanish poet, humanist and mystic was treated in an article read by Dr. J. D. M. Ford.

The chief purpose of this paper was to call attention to the need felt by students of Spanish

letters of a new and critical edition of the works, and especially the poetical works, of the sixteenth century poet and scholar, Luis de León. The importance of León was indicated: 1. by the citation of eulogistic judgments passed upon him by Cervantes and Lope de Vega; 2. by mention of the fact that Quevedo was the first to publish an edition of his lyrics, and did so to counteract the evil results of the Gongoristic movement, and that Diego González, Cabanyes and Juán Valera have all undergone his influence; 3. and by a rapid account of his life and work. Particular stress was laid upon the humanistic side of the man and his advocacy of the doctrine of *measure*, derived from his study of the Greek and Latin classics. This devotion to *measure* greatly tempered his mysticism which is, therefore, free from the exaggeration by which that quality is so often accompanied in Spanish character, and which has been aptly described by Pérez Galdós in his novel *Halma*.

Prof. M. D. Learned's subject was "German-American Ballads."

The early German settlers in America, though exchanging oppression and poverty for freedom and plenty, in coming to the New World lost, nevertheless, their cultural birthright, and with it among other things the folksong. Among the "Phamer sects" nothing remains of the beautiful choral, for example, but the rough harsh hymn, and the ballad is extinct. Among the Lutherans, on the contrary, there are still fugitive survivals of the German Volkslied.

The following ballads have been found with complete texts in most cases, and in some cases with the music: 1. *Des bucklich Männli;* 2. *Schpinn, Schpinn mei liewe Dochter;* 3. *In Polen schteht ein Haus;* 4. *Ulalei;* 5. *In Uniontown;* 6. *Ich war ein kleiner Dit-dittel-am;* 7. *Froh will ich sein;* 8. *Bis die Mühlstein tragen Reben;* 9. *Nau Bill, Ich will dir ebbes froge;* 10. *Ich hab geträumt die anner Nacht.*

The first two songs were compared with the European versions, and it was found that the American versions show a fusion and expansion of the German originals, but of those German versions coming from Alsatian. This accords with the ethnographic traditions of the Germans of Pennsylvania, who came largely from the Rhenish Palatinate and Alsatia. The music of the American ballads has in some cases a different melody from that of the German versions.

Prof. James M. Garnett's paper on "The Latin and the Anglo-Saxon *Juliana*" discussed the two Latin 'Lives' in the *Acta Sanctorum*, and the Greek "Life" in the works of Symeon Metaphrastes (Migne's *Patr. Græca.*); the gradual growth of the Martyrologies, as the Martyr. Rom., that attributed to St. Jerome, those of Bede, Ado, and Usuard (Migne's *Patr. Lat.*); the rise of false "lives" of saints in the seventh century (*Les Vies des Saintes*), such as the first "Life" of St. Juliana in the *Acta Sanctorum*, from which the second "Life" by a certain Peter is derived. Bede, and later Cynewulf, must have had access to such a "Life"; Cynewulf's *Juliana* is directly based on it. An appendix to the paper gives a close comparison of the two. The *Legenda Aurea*, in which the particulars are much condensed, is the source of most of the M. E. "Lives," of all except the earliest ones.

The next paper was by Prof. O. F. Emerson, who treated "Transverse Alliteration in Teutonic Poetry."

Transverse alliteration has been discussed since Lachmann's time, early critics recognizing the phenomenon as an art form of Teutonic poetry. More recently, Frucht (*Metrisches und Sprachliches zu Cynewulf's Elene, Juliana, und Crist*), followed by Sievers (*Altgermanische Metrik*), tried to prove the accidental character of this alliterative form by applying the doctrine of mathematical probability. Frucht's reasoning, however, is faulty on its mathematical basis, since: 1. he did not calculate the chances for vowel and consonant recurrence separately; 2. he did not take account of the much greater frequency of certain initials than of others. Far worse, the doctrine of probabilities is proved wholly inapplicable to the problem, since it utterly fails when tested outside of the special problem to which Frucht applied it.

Prof. George B. Raymond, in his paper on "Modern Poetry and the Revival of Interest in Byron," after referring to the new editions of Byron, called attention to the fact that the novel has largely taken the place in public interest formerly occupied by poetry. The writer noted further the lack of appreciation for the poetry of Tennyson, and of writers influenced by him, on the part of many English-speaking people, and of virtually all foreign critics of distinction.

Prof. Raymond said that the feature that separated verse of this school from that preceding it, was the greater attention given to the musical flow of the syllables—a feature imparting to modern English poetry almost as distinctive a character as the rhythmical balance of lines imparted to the poetry of the age of Pope.

Byron's poetry with its abrupt, if not ungrammatical transitions of tense, its inaccuracies of diction, and its inharmonious succession of syllables, the German critics prefer to the poetry of Tennyson. If we, ourselves, do not prefer it, would it not be wise for us to try to perceive why others should do so, and to ask

ourselves whether this style does not meet a legitimate imaginative demand, which the poetry of our time is neglecting?

After the paper by Prof. Raymond, the meeting adjourned and the Association was for the second time the guest of the University, on this occasion at a luncheon which was served in the library.

Upon reassembling, in the afternoon, the regular order of business was resumed, which included principally the reading of papers. Dr. John R. Effinger was the first on the programme, and read a part of a study of "Lemercier and the Three Unities."

The subject of this paper was to show the views held by Lemercier regarding the application of the famous rules for the three dramatic unities. In his day, during the keen discussion between the Classic and Romantic schools, it was the custom to accept these rules or reject them, unconditionally. This Lemercier did not do, as he consistently held the middle-ground position, now generally accepted, which admits the essential truth of the unities, while approving all deviations which may be required by the nature of the subject in hand. Lemercier was then an early precursor of the modern idea, and not a timid innovator in secret sympathy with the Romantic movement, as has been so often said.

Dr. R. H. Wilson's paper on "Adversative-Conjunctive," relations will be published in a later number of MOD. LANG. NOTES.

Dr. Thomas S. Baker, in treating the sources of Opitz's *Buch von der deutschen Poeterei*, showed to what extent the study of Opitz's models had been carried. There can be no doubt that many authors have been held responsible for Opitz's utterances with whom the German writer was entirely unfamiliar. Several instances were noted where it was manifestly impossible that Opitz could have had access to the works from which it is claimed he borrowed *in extenso*.

Prof. A. Gudeman, then, in an extremely interesting essay, offered a new explanation of "The Origin and Meaning of the Word 'Germani' (Tac. *Germ.* 2)." Prof. Gudeman's results have already been published in *Philologos*, and are exciting attention.

Prof. Magill's article on "The International Correspondence" has already been presented to the readers of MOD. LANG. NOTES. Its reading before the Association called forth some discussion, and the President was requested to appoint a Committee to report on the subject at the next meeting of the Association. This Committee consists of Prof. Magill, Miss Clara Wenckebach, Mrs. Thérèse Colin, and Dr. Adolph Rambeau.

Resuming the regular order of business, Mr. Frederick M. Padelford presented an paper on "Old-English Music."

This paper considered certain stringed instruments of Celtic origin which were used by the Old-English people. These instruments were the *timpan*, the *crwth*, and the *rotla*. They were oblong, rounded at the ends, with depressions in the sides. In the earlier forms they were played with the fingers or with a plectrum, in the later forms with a bow. These instruments were identical originally: the Irish *timpan* became the Welsh *crwth*, and the German *rotla* was an outgrowth of the *crwth*.

This paper was an extract from an essay on Old-English Music which forms the Introduction to a monograph on Old-English Musical Terms. This monograph is to appear as the fourth number of the *Bonner Beiträge*.

This paper was the final one read on Wednesday. In the evening Dr. and Mrs. Paul B. Barringer received the members of the Association at their home. This was one of the most interesting features of the Convention, as it afforded the visitors an opportunity to observe the charm of genuine Southern hospitality.

Thursday, Dec. 29th, was the last day of the meeting, and as a result, very much was crowded into its two sessions. One was held in the forenoon, the other in the evening, the afternoon being devoted to an excursion to "Monticello," the home of Thomas Jefferson. This drive was undertaken at the invitation of the members of the local committee, who throughout the whole convention, contributed greatly to its success. The committee was composed of Professors Charles W. Kent, James A. Harrison, and Paul B. Barringer.

The first paper of the morning session treated "The Origin of the Runic Alphabet, and the Explanation of the Peculiar Order of the Runes." The paper, written by Prof. George Hempl and read by the Secretary of the Association, contained the announcement of an important discovery.

Prof. Hempl presented a brief report on the finding of the key to the long-debated question

as to the origin of the Runic alphabet. Suspecting that the order of the runes was a modification of the usual order, caused by displacements due to association of letters that were similar in form or sound, Prof. Hempl found that a few such displacements explain the whole matter, and prove that the Runic alphabet is derived from a Western Greek alphabet of about 600 B. C. *Theta*, *san*, and *ψ* were not adopted. The chief displacements are: *a* and *f* (similar in form) exchanged positions; the voiced labial fricative *b* and the labial vowel *u* were similarly confused; original *r* and the *r* that arose out of *z* exchanged places; *l* joined the similar *n*; *e* was associated with the similar *m*; later *n* was placed between *h* and *i*, to which it is intermediate in form; the ligature *ng* thus got the old place of *n*; the velars were grouped with *h*, *q* (through *kq*) becoming *w*. As in the other Western Greek alphabets, confusion arose between *kappa* and the similarly formed *gamma*, the latter driving out the former. *Thorn* is *delta*; *j* is the older Greek form of *i*; *dæg* is the dental fricative out of which ξ grew in the Eastern alphabets (Wimmer is wrong in placing it *after* the *o*). The position of *z* where it stood in Greek, of itself, puts an end to the theory of the Latin origin of the runes. Taylor and Gundermann came much nearer the truth than Wimmer. Contrary to their theories, however, the Germanic shift of consonants was completed when the alphabet was adopted, but the voiced fricatives had not yet become voiced stops. The paper will appear in full as one of the chapters of a volume of Runic Studies that Prof. Hempl expects to issue during the year.

Probably the most important event of the Convention, was the presentation of the report of the Committee of Twelve, which had been appointed in 1896 to consider the position of the Modern Languages (French and German) in Secondary Education.

A brief summary of results arrived at by the Committee, was given by Prof. Thomas, the chairman. The document will soon be published and distributed.

The report of the chairman leads to the supposition that many of the disputed points in Modern Language teaching have been settled, and to the conclusion that the paper will prove to be a most valuable contribution to this much debated question.

Although a number of the delegates had left Charlottesville before the session of Tuesday night, this meeting proved to be one of great interest.

Prof. W. Stuart Symington, Jr., in his paper on "The Influence of the Return of Spring on the Earliest French Lyric Poetry," remarked that the influence of spring on the early French lyric was patent to the most casual reader, that Jeanroy had noted this influence on the "Chansons dramatiques" and the refrains, but that it remained for G. Paris to see that most of the lyric poetry of the Middle Ages had its origin in songs of spring. The reader then showed the extent of this influence: how many and what proportion of the romances, chansons dramatiques (or à personnages), pastourelles, aubes, débats and refrains had: a. an introductory allusion to spring: b. a spring setting; c. allusions to known May ceremonies.

The title of the next paper was "From Franklin to Lowell, a century of New England pronunciation."

Prof. Grandgent gave only a brief sketch of certain portions of his paper, which, in its complete form, deals with New England pronunciation—and incidentally with English phonology in general—from the middle of the eighteenth century to the middle of the nineteenth. The first subject treated was the development of untrilled *r*, in the second half of the eighteenth century, and the loss or vocalization of this *r* (unless it precede a vowel) at a somewhat later date. The next topic was the revival of "Italian *a*," in such words as *father*, *hard*, *ask*, which in Franklin's time were pronounced with the vowel of *cat*; the modern sound came into use in the latter part of the eighteenth century. The evolution of the modern value of *u* in *hurt* and *i* in *first* was then discussed. The breaking of "long *a*" and "long *o*," in words like *fate* and *rote*, was shown to be a very recent phenomenon. Finally the diphthongs, "long *i*," *ou*, and *oi*, were taken up, and their different shades of sound were noted. To illustrate the practice of the beginning and the middle of the period treated, and the rustic usage of the first half of our century, Prof. Grandgent read a selection from Addison in accordance with a phonetic transcription by Benjamin Franklin, a little poem from *The Young Ladies' and Gentlemen's Spelling-Book*, with the pronunciation of the last years of the eighteenth century, and the opening speech of *Richard III*, in the dialect of the *Biglow Papers*.

"Some Tendencies in Contemporary English Poetry" were discussed by Mr. Cornelius Weygandt.

A study of the output of English verse since 1888 shows its dominant note to be virility. Five writers have attained a certain distinction during this decade—Mr. W. E. Henley, Mr. Kipling, Mr. John Davidson, Mr. Francis Thompson and Mr. W. B. Yeats. Of these, Mr. Henley,

Mr. Kipling and Mr. Davidson are essentially poets of virility. They are in a sense realists, but they see romance in reality. They believe that the basic passions of men, forming as they do so much of life, call for expression as full, are capable of expression as exalting, as intellectuality, spirituality, dream. Anti-ascetic and optimistic, these three poets have taken to heart Mr. Meredith's declaration that "blood and brain and spirit" joined, fused in the man, are necessary for his true felicity. In the words of their masters—Browning, Whitman, and Mr. Meredith—these three younger men are singing "the wild joys of living," "the procreant rage of the world," "iron hymns." They, as well as their masters, have exerted a very evident influence upon contemporary verse-writers, most of whom show comparitively little influence of Tennyson and the pre-Raphaelites.

Prof. Edwin W. Bowen read the next paper, his subject being "The Development of Long *u* in Modern English."

The subject of this study was to show the historical development in Modern English of long *u*. Beginning with ME. the author showed that the original AS. *u* did not persist, but passed into the ME. diphthong *ou*. The Modern-English long *u* came into ME. from three sources; namely, 1. certain original AS. diphthongs *ȩu* and *ēu;* 2. certain French *u's*, which were introduced into English from the Anglo-Norman dialect chiefly; 3. Late ME. close *ō*, which in the seventeenth century developed into long *u*. The early Modern-English long *u*, which was pronounced almost like the Modern-French *ü*, persisted to the eighteenth century, when it passed into the diphthong *iu* with the stress shifted to the second element. This has continued to the present, but with considerable modifications, giving the variety of the long *u*-sounds of the present day.

The last paper that was read was by Prof. J. L. Hall on "Experiments in Translating Anglo-Saxon Poetry." Two more papers, "The Influence of German Literature in America from 1800 to 1825," by Dr. Frederick H. Wilkens, and "Archaisms in Modern French," by Mrs. Thérèse F. Colin, were read merely by title.

At this session the officers for the ensuing year were elected. The changes consisted in the election of Prof. H. C. G. von Jagemann as President, and of Professors L. E. Menger, H. S. White and W. D. Toy to the Executive Council, to take the places of Professors C. T. Winchester, Bliss Perry, and A. R. Hohlfeld.

The programme of the meeting was excellent throughout, although there seems to be an increasing demand for a larger number of papers of general interest, and for more discussion of the papers dealing with special topics.

Columbia University, New York, was selected as the place of meeting for the next year. The Secretary of the Association, Prof. Bright, is at present engaged in making arrangements with representatives of other philological societies in the United States, for holding a Philological Congress in the year 1900.

THOMAS STOCKHAM BAKER.
*Johns Hopkins University.*

## *THE HOMUNCULUS-HELENA THEORY, AND THE EVOLUTION OF THE HELENA DRAMA AND ITS ANTECEDENTS.*

IN the November and December issues of MOD. LANG. NOTES, Vol. xiii, 1898, Veit Valentin, Professor in Frankfort on the Main, and member of the Executive Council of the Goethe-Gesellschaft, editor of a number of 'Deutsche Schul-Ausgaben,' and author of a series of Æsthetische Schriften, has an article on 'Goethes Homunkulus,' the object of which is to uphold his Homunculus-Helena Theory against an attack which had been made upon it in MOD. LANG. NOTES, Vol. xii, 1897, No. 2 (Feb.), and to refute the explanation of Homunculus which was advanced in the same place. Every line of the twenty columns of the article shows how completely Veit Valentin is convinced of the correctness of his theory, and how far superior he considers his method to that of his opponent. Nevertheless, it would have been more fair on his part if he had really examined his opponent's method instead of condemning it without a hearing,[1] and a great deal more

1 Valentin asserts again and again that in the article in the February issue of MOD. LANG. NOTES for 1897, no attention was paid to the dramatical connection in which Homunculus appears. He might have convinced himself that the greater part of col. 77 and parts of cols. 78 and 79 deal with the relation of Homunculus and the Galatea scene to the second and third acts. The evolution of Homunculus has since been presented in a similar way by Dietze in the *Ztschr. f. d. Phil.* xxx, 2, p. 244 f. and by Thomas: *Goethes Faust*, Vol. ii; Second Part, Boston, 1897. It shall not be maintained that the division of the Classical Walpurgis-Night as given in col. 77 is correct. The Classical Walpurgis-Night is dominated by the contrast of the worlds of the land and of the sea. Its dramatical aspect will be treated more fully in a special article entitled: *The Evolution of the Classical Walpurgis-Night* and the Scene in Hades, which is about to appear in *Americana Germanica*.

wise, if he had carefully investigated the poet's evidence regarding the Helena drama and its antecedents, instead of forcing both the Helena and the Classical Walpurgis-Night into a dramatic structure evolved from his own mind. In the following, first the theory for which Valentin is contending and which he has now published four times[2] will be restated; then a résumé of the preceding criticism and counter-criticism will be given; and finally a decision will be sought by means of a historical examination of Goethe's own evidence in the case.

The Homunculus-Helena theory is, in short, as follows: Helena and her maids and Menelaus and his followers consist of three component parts: the shade which gives them form and personality; life which animates them; and matter which makes them material beings of flesh and blood. The entire second act has the purpose of preparing for the union of those three parts. Homunculus stays in his bottle until the shades of Helena and the others are at hand. Then inspired by the beauty of Galatea he shatters his bottle and unites with the elements. The union of life and matter is at once built into the shades, which until then were empty,[3] and transforms them into material bodies of flesh and blood.[4] These bodies have full reality, but Helena and her maids are at the same time conscious of their artificiality. What formerly was Homunculus is now the life of all those bodies and manifests itself also in Euphorion. When the maid whom Euphorion has caught dissolves, what was Homunculus goes up into the air; when Helena returns to Hades, what was Homunculus remains in her garments which carry Faust aloft; when the maids consider their future, what was Homunculus remaining connected with the matter of the elements is to continue life in "den Verkörperungen der vier Elemente,"[5] in ever new forms. Only with this assumption, it is claimed, Homunculus has a dramatic purpose, only so the appearance of Helena can be understood dramatically, only so the "grosse Lücke" between the second and third acts is filled out.[6]

The manner in which Helena receives her corporeal being, says Valentin, undergoes the following changes. According to the oldest designs it was through a magic ring, according to the *Ankündigung*, of Dec. 17, 1826, it was by means of the sojourn in a certain place (that is, Sparta), according to the final execution of the drama, whatever Valentin may mean by that, it was through a spiritual force (that is, Homunculus).[7]

In the article in the issue of February, 1897, the attempt was made to show the untenability of this theory mainly by trying to prove, on the one hand, that Helena and her maids have no material bodies of flesh and blood and hence have no need of Homunculus, and on the other hand, that Homunculus is obliged to take the road of evolution and, thereby, is debarred from uniting with the shades of Helena and her maids. Besides, the fact was emphasized that no one before Valentin had ever thought of such a combination of Homunculus and Helena, and that Goethe himself had nowhere given the slightest hint that he intended so strange a device.

Of these points, only the first has been combatted by Valentin with evidence from Goethe which, however, as the reader may see in the note below,[8] is not conclusive. The second is simply denied on the strength of the theory which ought first to be proved,[9] and the third is headed off by a wail over the preoccupation of the public with regard to the Second Part of Faust,[10] an argument which may be justified where an allegorical or symbolical interpretation of certain persons or passages is con-

2 In the two books mentioned above, in the *Goethe-Jahrbuch*, vol. xvi, and in the issues of Mod. Lang. Notes cited above.

3 See especially *Erläuterung*, etc., p. 87: 'dann entsteht beim Zerschellen der Flasche die Vereinigung der Lebenskraft mit den Elementen und baut sie in die bis dahin leere Gestalt des Schattenbildes als lebendigen Stoff hinein.'

4 Mod. Lang. Notes. Vol. xiii, col. 466: 'Hier handelt es sich aber . . . um eine materielle, körperliche Wiederbelebung, um eine Erscheinung in Fleisch und Blut, etc.'

5 *L. c.*, col. 442.

6 *L. c.*, col. 464. Valentin seems to have misunderstood a passage in Eckermann's letter to Goethe, Sept. 14, 1830.

7 *L. c.*, col. 440, and in the books cited above.

8 *L. c.*, col. 438: 'durch einen magischen Ring ist ihr die Körperlichkeit wiedergegeben,' sage nicht ich, sondern sagt Goethe,' etc., and col. 438 f.: 'Als wahrhaft lebendig' sagt Goethe—Gerber weiss es besser.' As for the first point Helena is called in the same place a 'Halbwirklichkeit,' a semi-reality. A semi-reality is not a material reality of flesh and blood. For the second point see cols. 210–221 of this article.

9 *L. c.*, col. 467. 10 *L. c.*, cols. 464 and 467.

cerned, but which surely ought to have no weight with regard to the recognition of an important dramatic motif. That would be presuming too much on the prepossession and lack of insight of all readers and critics before himself.

Though it should, therefore, seem that Valentin's theory still stands as much disproved as it appeared to Prof. Poll of Harvard, when he reported in that sense to the *Euphorion*;[11] though it might be urged that it is incompatible with Goethe's regard for the eternal laws of nature or with his art as a dramatic poet, though, finally, it might be shown that it does not even explain what it purposes to do, namely, the arrival of Helena in Sparta with the idea that she is coming from Troy, etc., it shall this time be attacked with the aid of evidence from Goethe himself only.

This evidence is found in volume xv, 2, of the Weimar Goethe edition, in the extracts from Goethe's diaries in Erich Schmidt's *Goethes Faust in ursprünglicher Gestalt*3 and in Eckermann's *Gespräche mit Goethe*, all of which books must undoubtedly have been accessible to Valentin all this time.

In the *Ankündigung* of his *Helena* of Dec. 17, 1826,[12] Goethe tells us that it was the part which Helena plays in the old legend and in the puppet play that induced him not to neglect so important a motif in his own work. In accordance with this statement we see him take from the legend, in his plan of 1775,[13] not only those traits which are still preserved in the final version, namely, the twofold entrance of Helena, her having a son with Faust and her disappearing simultaneously with that son,[14] but also that it is Mephistopheles who brings her from Orcus, that he takes her to Germany[15] instead of Greece, and that Faust is yet called a new Paris. In other respects the plan of 1775 already differs from the legend, and foreshadows quite a number of new traits which reappear on a higher plane, and more poetically developed, in the finished drama. Faust has an 'unendliche Sehnsucht nach der einmal erkannten höchsten Schönheit.' Helena is limited to a certain territory. She meets Faust in a castle. He has become a mediæval knight. She is no longer a source of evil to him. Their son dances and sings as soon as he is born. His lack of restraint is his ruin. He dies in connection with a fight. His death severs the union of his parents, and when on parting, Helena throws herself into her husband's arms, he clasps only her empty garments in his embrace.

In one point, however, the plan of 1775 differs both from the legend and the final version, and that is in connecting Helena's and her son's corporeal existence with a magic ring, a device which the legend did not need because in it Helena simply appears and disappears according to mediæval beliefs, and with which the drama could dispense, because in it the revivification of Helena is founded on ancient tradition. But, although in the drama Helena's return to life is no longer connected with the ring, yet obtained through the intercession of Manto, the ring itself does not immediately disappear from Goethe's plans. In a partial scheme,[16] for example, it is still attached to the beginning of Mephistopheles' activity: 'Übergang ins magische Unheimliches Ring' and only gradually it is entirely renounced. Quite a similar gradual renunciation of a motif for which a better and more organic one had been substituted may be observed in the case of the interlocutory[17] in which Phorkyas was to apologize for the rapid growth of Euphorion by a reference to the British stage, where a little child in the course of the action develops into a hero. For after Goethe had hit upon the comparison with Hermes, the interlocutory and the chorus 'Nennst du ein Wunder das?' once appear in the same scheme.[18] In the final version, however, both the ring and the interlocutory are given up.

11 Band v, Heft 2, p. 358 (*l. c.*, col. 468).

12 Weimar Edition (=W.E.) xv, 2, p. 199 f. Repeated in *Kunst und Alterthum*, Band vi, Heft 1 (1827), p. 202 f.

13 W.E. xv, 2, p. 173 ff., more especially 175 f.

14 In the Helena drama, to be sure, there is a slight apparent interval, yet mother and son are still inseparable, Helena exclaiming: 'Persephoneia, nimm den Knaben auf und mich.'

15 That the castle must be sought in Germany may be inferred from the general situation and the *Paralipomenon*, no. 84, l. 14 (*l. c.*, p. 184).

16 *Paralip.*, No. 162, l. 7 f.: 'Übergang ins magische Unheimliches Ring.' Cf. also No. 165, l. 17 and No. 166, l. 2.

17 *Paralip.*, No. 176.

18 *Paralip.*, No. 166, l. 14: 'Phorkyas interloquirt'—l. 15: 'Nennst du ein Wunder das?'

The new manner of Helena's revivification which could dispense with the magic ring was considered by the poet a matter of great importance. This is proved by the introduction to *Helena* of June 10, 1826.[19] In the first place this introduction was written immediately upon the preliminary completion[20] of the drama, and in the second place it explains nothing but the one single thing—how and upon what conditions Helena returns to life. All the other events which now form the first and second acts of the completed Second Part are still left to the imagination. Only in the following half-year, or rather towards the close of it, in the months of November and December, Goethe elaborated a more detailed introduction. The schemes of Nov. 9, and 10(?),[21] cover the entire second act and give at least a few more hints as to how the events of that act were being planned, while the sketch of four folio pages of Dec. 15,[22] and the *Ankündigung* of seven pages of Dec. 17, contain a rather full outline of both the first and second acts as they were then intended.

In the *Ankündigung*, of Dec. 17, where Homunculus still appears with a body and hence even according to Valentin's admission[23] can have nothing whatever to do with Helena, the revivification is still conceived as it was in the introduction of June 10, only the details which were given for the first time in the scheme of Nov. 9, are still further increased so that the whole scene in Hades now occupies forty lines. Manto descends with Faust to Hades and makes a plea for the release of Helena. This plea is based on the strength of precedents. Protesilaus, Alceste, Eurydice had been released; even Helena herself had once before received permission to return to life in order to be wedded to Achilles. The argument is successful. Helena is to return to the upper world upon the condition that she be limited to Sparta, as in the case of Achilles she had been limited to the island of Leuke. She is to appear alive, or 'truly alive' at Sparta, and it is to be left to the new wooer to see how he can win her favor. Her release, therefore, is granted in accordance with the precedents in Greek tradition, and more especially in analogy to her own former return to life in the case of Achilles. Corporeal being is *implied in the release* and not, as Valentin surmises, obtained by the 'Zaubermittel (!)' of a sojourn in a certain place.

Since this conception of the revivification of Helena, as was shown above, was written *after* the drama had been completed, it follows that the limitation to Sparta should be interpreted from the drama as we have it. In Goethe's mind a stay in Arcadia must, therefore, not have seemed to conflict with this limitation to Sparta, whether he thought of the fact that parts of Arcadia had belonged to Sparta in history, or whether Helena's sovereignty extended Sparta over Arcadia as well as over the other states of the Peloponnesus, or whether, which would seem most likely, Sparta is to be conceived as a contrast to Germany where Helena, as we saw, was taken in the legend and in the plan of 1775.

Also the much debated question of the nature of Helena's corporeal being can only be considered from the standpoint of the *Ankündigung* in connection with the drama. Helena is to be released from Hades, and is to appear in Sparta 'truly alive.' For a while she distinguishes herself in no manner from a being that is truly alive in the ordinary material sense of the word, but soon the aspect changes both with herself and with her maids. She feels drawn towards Orcus; she is vanishing away and becoming a phantom to herself; her soul is ready to leave the form of all forms upon which the sun has ever shone;[24] and when she does depart her corporeal being actually

19 *Paralip.*, No. 123, 2, p. 213 f.

20 Erich Schmidt, *l. c.*, p. 99: '8 Juni. Völliger Abschluss der Helena. Vorbereitung des Mundums.' Besides: '13 Juni. Überlegung noch einiger wirksamer Chöre zur Helena. 24 Juni. Völliger Abschluss der Helena, durch Umschreiben einiger Bogen.' Between this day and January 25, 1827, when the manuscript was packed in order to be sent to Cotta, there is no indication of any consequential change whatsoever, only some filing seems to have been done. The only entry in the diary which indicates such filing is: '21 November. Revidirte an der Helena.' The date of the final completion of the Helena drama is, therefore, June 24, 1826.

21 *Paralip.*, No. 99. The scheme of Nov. 9 is in the notes. The date of Nov. 10 appears probable from the diary, *l. c.*, p. 100 '10 November. Das Schema zu Fausts zweytem Theil fortgesetzt.'

22 *Paralip.*, No. 123, 1 in the notes.

23 *L. c.*, col. 439: 'Auch in diesem Entwurfe Goethes hat Homunkulus mit Helena nichts zu thun.'

24 Ll. 8836 f., 8881; 8904 ff.

vanishes, without leaving any material trace, in exactly the same manner as in the plan of 1775, where she is called a 'semi-reality.' Her son's rapid birth and development are contrary to all laws of the material world; his death seems to take place in consonance with them, but his corporeal being vanishes at once without leaving a trace. The maids are called phantoms by Mephistopheles; at another time they are doubtful as to whether they are not shades following Hermes' golden staff to Hades; one of their number changes into a flame to tease Euphorion, as the Lamiæ transform themselves to make sport of Mephistopheles; all the others, except Panthalis, finally join nature or the elements in their capacity of spirits,[25] and the Phantasmagory is ended.

With this wonderful world Faust associates without difficulty. Just as in the *Ankündigung* Chiron, who also according to Valentin's opinion is a phantom, carries him through Thessaly, Helena bears him a son. At the same time he is perfectly conscious that this world is transient, for he says to Helena 'Dasein ist Pflicht und wär's ein Augenblick' and, accordingly, he does not shed a tear nor feel a pang when all is over. Only the uplifting influence of the whole experience remains with him. But can this revivified world have more than a poetic reality? Must not any attempt to attribute to it a material reality involve us in the greatest intellectual difficulties, or even lead to such lamentable failures as Valentin's Homunculus-Helena theory?

That this theory is a failure can now easily be seen. Goethe tells us five times, June 10, Nov. 9, and 10(?), Dec. 15 and 17, 1826, the last time in forty lines with all due detail, that he has conceived the revivification of Helena as taking place in strict analogy to her former return to life in the case of Achilles, and carries this analogy so far as to give her son by the second Achilles, the very name of the one she had by the first and even, in imagination at least, his wings;[26] Goethe writes these accounts of her revivification, not before he had composed his drama and when he might still have changed both the drama and its presuppositions, but *after* he had finished the *Helena* and when, therefore, all fundamental alterations in the presuppositions were out of question; Goethe moreover enjoins upon the reader that the revivification and what precedes it should be 'als vorausgehend genau gekannt und gründlich überdacht.' In spite of all this, Valentin has the boldness to replace Goethe's own organic introduction by his fantastic and artificial Homunculus-Helena theory.

And how is his analytic proof in the *Goethe-Jahrbuch*?[27] He starts out with the abstract, though not incorrect assumption, that the manner in which Helena and her maids dissolve must contain a clue as to how the poet conceived their coming into life. Then he interprets this dissolution to suit his theory, and thus by sheer force of necessity arrives at that which he set out to prove. One glance at the chronology of the introduction, or the schemes, or the *Ankündigung*, might have shown him that his æsthetic deductions are all in the air and that, Homunculus not being available for Helena and her maids, on the contrary his interpretation of their dissolution must be wrong.

Finally, the so-called historical investigation which Valentin claims to have made,[28] and by which he discovered that Helena receives cor-

25 Ll. 8930; 9116 ff.: 9806 f.: the stage directions read in H. 68: 'Sie *verwandelt sich* und flammt und lodert;' 9989 ff. Also *Eckermann*, 29 Jan. 1827: 'Auf den Gedanken, dass der Chor .... *sich den Elementen zuwirft*, thue ich mir wirklich etwas zugute.' Notice that the terms: *Idol* (8881), *Seele* (8904), *Gespenster* (8930) and *Geister* (9990) are all used synonymously. In the sketch of Dec. 15 the Pompejans and Caesareans are called *Geister* and *Gespenster* in the same clause (*l. c.*, p. 206). The phantasmagorical character of the third act appears also from l. 22 in the interlocutory of Phorkyas (*l. c.*, p. 234): '*Gespenstisch* spinnt der Dichtung Faden sich immer fort.' Ll. 9992–9995 show that the spirits of the maids will 'preside' over the life of the branches. Compare also H. 57 (*l. c.*, p. 129): 'Lass uns dort der Trauben pflegen.' The Phantasmagory now begins at Pharsalus.

26 Hederich (Goethe's Mythological Handbook) bearbeitet von J. J. Schwabe, 1770: sub Euphorion: 'ein Sohn des Achilles und der Helena, welcher in den glücklichen Inseln von ihnen erzeuget, u. mit Flügeln geboren wurde.' Mr. A. Sträubing of Weimar has had the kindness to look up this reference for me.

27 Band xvi, p. 132:

'Wenn wir einen Organismus in seinem Bestande verstehen lernen wollen, so bleibt nichts Anders übrig als ihn zu zerlegen. ... Da m ssen wir es um so dankbarer begrüssen, wenn uns der Dichter selbst in der Zerlegung unterstützt .... denn so können wir wenigstens mit Sicherheit erkennen, wie er sich das Ganze gedacht hat. Glücklicherweise ist dies aber auch gerade das, was wir hier suchen.'

Also *l. c.*, col. 440 and *Erläuterung*, p. 104.

28 *L. c.*, col. 434; larger book, p. 153 f.; *Erläuterung*, p. 84.

poreal being first through the magic ring, then by means of the sojourn in Sparta, and in the last place through Homunculus. The first item is actually correct; the second is wrong because, as we have seen above, she was revivified in analogy with her return to life for the sake of Achilles; the third is impossible because the time for further changes had expired with the completion of the drama. Hence the revivification through Homunculus which Valentin palms off as a 'geniale Umgestaltung' of Goethe is nothing but a fantastic lucubration of his own brains, the 'Genialität' of which may be left to the judgment of the reader.

That Goethe still adhered to his idea of the revivification of Helena—as of course he was obliged to do because it was the basis of the Helena drama—when the Classical Walpurgis-Night was finished, is proved by the existence of a scheme of June 18, 1830, entitled 'Prolog des dritten Acts'[29] which sets a double seal on the final overthrow of Valentin's hypothesis. In the first place, the conditions of Helena's return to life are still the same as they were in 1826; in the second place, the union of Homunculus with the sea is now separated from Helena's release from Hades, not only by the close of a scene, but by the close of an act. Instead of seeing, as Valentin[30] wishes him to, the threads that connect Homunculus with Helena, the spectator sees the curtain of the act fall after Homunculus has become wedded to the sea, and when he sees it rise again Manto has not yet even made the request for Helena's release.

That the execution of this prologue was finally abandoned does not alter the case. Two facts remain established by Goethe's own authority. First, that in 1826 he finished the Helena drama without planning that Homunculus should have a share in Helena's revivification, since at that time Homunculus was conceived as having a body from the start, and second, that in 1830 he completed the Classical Walpurgis-Night without intending that the shades of Helena and her maids, and Menelaus and his men, should unite with Homunculus, since, apart from other reasons, Helena was conceived as being still in Hades for a good while after Homunculus had been wedded to the sea.

How easily could Valentin have seen all this himself and kept from expending a vast amount of labor and ingenuity on a useless hypothesis, had he not had as profound a disregard for place, in the case of the projected scene in Hades, as he had for time, in the case of the chronology of the *Ankündigung* of the *Helena* and the sketch and schemes preceding it. He might have found in the Weimar edition, which was always at his elbow, and of which he is himself a co-editor, that Goethe states or intimates there in no less than eight different places—in the introduction of June 10, in the schemes of Nov. 9, and 10(?), in the sketch of the *Ankündigung* of Dec. 15, and in the *Ankündigung* itself of Dec. 17 of the year 1826, and in the schemes of Jan.(?), Feb. 6,[31] and June 18 of 1830,—that Faust's arrival in Hades and the scene in Hades were immediately to precede the Helena drama. But as place is overlooked in his æsthetical deductions just as much as time, he blandly assumes in both of his books, in the *Goethe-Jahrbuch* and in MOD. LANG. NOTES, that Helena's shade is present when Homunculus shatters his glass, and calmly maintains that the scene in Hades remained unwritten, because

> 'die strenge Folgerichtigkeit seiner Entwickelung der Handlung verbot es ihm (Goethe), in die durch Zauber für eine Nacht lebendig gewordene Geisterwelt eine Handlung *einzuschalten*, die in der mit bleibendem Dasein ausgestatteten natürlichen Wirklichkeit der antiken Götterwelt (Hades) vor sich gehen müsste.'[32]

though Goethe never dreamed of *inserting* it, but always intended to put it at the close.

If a writer is so infatuated with a pet theory that he no longer pays attention to the conditions of time and place, as laid down by the poet for whom he professes the greatest admiration, he can hardly be expected to examine without bias the remarks of a critic whom he ranks with the interpreters of a by-gone age. For this reason no attempt will be made to show in detail that the supposed inaccuracies in the article of February, 1897, are all due to misun-

29 *Paralip.*, no. 157.

30 *L. c.*, col. 467 and *Goethe-Jahrbuch*, xvi, p. 143.

31 *Paralip.*, no. 124 and no. 125.

32 *Erläuterung*, p. 97. Compare also the larger book, p. 175 f. The italics are not Valentin's.

derstanding on his part.[33] Nor will it be necessary to re-enter upon a discussion of the question of method, after it has been seen whither the method for which Valentin claims so much has led him. It may, however, be remarked that the fall of the Homunculus-Helena theory does not only discomfit Valentin's dramatic interpretation of the second and third acts, but that it also gives a severe shock to the dramatic fabric which he has constructed for the whole of Faust. Had it not been for the reverent preservation of the documents which show the gradual progress and development of Goethe's work, the Homunculus-Helena theory might have continued for many more years to hold a large proportion of the readers and students of Faust under the magic spell with which the brilliant style and the assurance of its originator have invested it.

ADOLF GERBER.

*Earlham College.*

---

## *A PREPOSITIONAL HITCH.*

"Is *on* or *of* right in this place?"

"Well?"

"'. . . the pleasant store of learning that they got when they read to each other *on* winter nights . . . '—Do you want to say *on* or *of*?"

"I want to conform to usage."

"That's why I asked," she said.

"In such a place I usually say *on*, if I use a preposition at all."

"*Of* seems more natural to me."

"Perhaps I have something," and I went to a box of mems.—"Here is something, but not much."—Then I marked five quotations, (*a*), (*b*), etc., and laid them on the table one after another, with little pauses between, waiting for comments.

(*a*) ". . . its quaint, gray, castled city where the bells clash of a Sunday . . . "—Robert Louis Stevenson, *The Silverado Squatters*, p. 63.

"I thought so."

(*b*) ". . . when old Mr. Crewe, the curate . . . delivered inaudible sermons on a Sunday . . . "—George Eliot, *Scenes of Clerical Life* (Edinburgh, cabinet ed.), vol. ii, p. 51.

"Oh!"

(*c*) ". . . it was a correct thing to be seen at church of a Sunday . . . "—Thackeray, *Pendennis* (London, 1869), vol. ii, ch. ii, p. 18.

"Two to one."

(*d*) "My brother had arrived from Persia only a few hours before. This was on the Tuesday."—J. H. Newnan, *Apologia*, ch. i.

"Oh, that doesn't count. That's different."

(*e*) "When they hear that up at the hall they play tennis on Sunday afternoons."—Augustus Jessopp, *The Trials of a Country Parson* (London, 1890), p. 39.

"One way is just as good as the other," and her eyes turned to the MS. again.

"It's a pity that people who write about good English havn't reached that conclusion in a lot of cases. But, my dear, you got there on too slight support. — In fact, you jumped. When there are only two conclusions to choose from, you are just as likely to be right as not—if you don't care which is which."

"But there were *four* here."

"Prove it."

"(1), (*a*) might be right and (*b*) wrong; (2), (*b*) might be right and (*a*) wrong; (3), (*a*) and (*b*) might both be right; (4), (*a*) and (*b*) might both be wrong,—yes, and (5), (*a*) and (*b*) might be right or wrong according to the way you used them, — and half-a-dozen more, for aught I know."

"Let's go on with the work. Publishers don't care about such things."

"Men's minds are different from women's minds."

"That doesn't fret them."

"Women are right a great deal oftener than men are, and it doesn't take them half so long either."

"There isn't any place for that opinion in this book."—(Men must never doubt the superiority of men.)

Naturally, after that, one got together more examples that would throw light on the prepositional question at issue. Such success as has been reached in stringing them on a discriminative theory is shown below.

When an act or occurrence is *not* thought of as customary, *on* is used (or understood) before

33 As Valentin might have inferred from the absence of quotation marks, it was not intended to give his views literally, but only in substance and much condensed. See also the misunderstandings in the interpretations of the luminosity of the phosphorescent atoms (*l. c.*, col. 439) and of the passage referring to the completion of the Classical Walpurgis-Night (cols. 442 and 443). In the latter place, Valentin adds a learned discourse on Goethe's use of 'ins Unendliche,' without noticing that the passage in question does not contain that expression at all.

the day, afternoon, evening, etc., on which the act or occurrence is said to have taken place; as, *they were married on a Wednesday; we arrived at Richmond on a rainy Saturday afternoon.*

"It was between three and four o'clock, on a fine morning in August, that, after a ten hours' journey from Frankfort, I awoke at the Weimar station." — George Eliot, *Essays and Leaves from a Note-Book*, 2d. ed. (Edinburgh, 1884), p. 290.

"Some say that he [St. Martin] died on a Sunday, at midnight." J. H. Newman, *Historical Sketches*, 5th ed. (London, 1885), vol. ii, p. 205.

"Ascend with me on this dazzling Whitsunday the Brocken of North Germany."—De Quincey, *Suspiria de Profundis* (Boston, 1858), p. 247.

"There had been a grand entertainment at Gaunt House on one beautiful evening in June . . . "—Thackeray, *Pendennis* (London, 1869), vol. ii, ch. vii, p. 78.

"On Sunday afternoon I accompanied her to Rydal Mount."—Emerson, *English Traits* (Boston, 1887), ch. xvii, p. 279.

"It was a wood-fire in the parlor of an old farm-house, on an April afternoon, but with the fitful gusts of a wintry snow-storm roaring in the chimney." — Nathaniel Hawthorn, *The Blithedale Romance* (Boston, 1852), ch. ii, p. 14.—"On one of those ugly nights, which we have faintly hinted at . . . "—*Id.*, *The Scarlet Letter* (Boston, 1885), ch. xi, p. 178.

"It was on a Sunday, during the time of public worship, that he was conveyed under a guard to his place of confinement."—Macaulay *History of England* (London, 1869), vol. iii, ch. x, p. 352.

". . . he arriv'd at Rome on a Thursday night . . . "—James Howell, *The Signorie of Venice* (London, 1651), p. 138.

To connect *of* with a single act, as in the passage quoted below, is not in accord with the prevailing literary usage of either England or America.

"I remember that in going to England a year ago, and disembarking of a dismal, sleety Sunday evening at Folkstone, the first thing that struck me was the good looks of the railway porters . . . In like manner, landing lately at Boulogne of a brilliant Sunday morning . . . " —Henry James, *Portraits of Places* (Occasional Paris).

But a *customary* act or occurence is followed sometimes by *on* and sometimes by *of*,—much oftener by *on* than *of* when the day, afternoon, evening, etc., is named or qualified by a defining word or phase.

"He gets together the working men in his parish on a Monday evening, and gives them a sort of conversational lecture on useful practical matters . . . "—George Eliot, *Amos Barton*, ch. vi,—"The book Adam most often read on a Sunday morning was his large pictorial Bible . . . " *Id.*, *Adam Bede*, ch. 21.—"It was Godfrey's custom on a Sunday afternoon to do a little contemplative farming in a leisurely walk."—*Id.*, *Silas Marner*, p. 230.

"On a summer evening he delighted to stroll down his fields as far as the allotment-grounds . . . "—T. E. Kebbel, *English Country Life* (London, 1891), p. 12.

". . . but another pleasure I had, which, as it could be had only on a Saturday night, occasionally struggled with my love of the opera . . . "—De Quincey, *Confessions of an English Opium-Eater* (Boston, 1858), p. 77.—"This pleasure, I have said, was to be had only on a Saturday night."—*Ib.*, p. 77.—". . . to which the poor resort on a Saturday night . . . "—*Ib.*, p. 78.

". . . and it was rumoured that one of the Fellows rejoiced in seeing his parishioners play at cricket on Sunday."—F. W. Newman, *Phases of Faith*, ch. i, p. 4.

"To read the 'Voices of the Night,' in particular—those early pieces—is to be back at school again, on a Sunday, reading all alone on a summer's day, high in some tree, with a wide prospect of gardens and fields." — Andrew Lang, *Letters on Literature* (London, 1889), p. 45.

"Plaswater Weir-Mill Lock looked tranquil and pretty on an evening in the summer time." —Dickens, *Our Mutual Friend*, book iv, ch. i.

So, too, in the plural;

"On Sunday mornings I was always taken to church."—De Quincey, *Suspiria de Profundis*, p. 184.

". . . the old wooden meeting-house in Salem, which used, on wintry Sabbaths, to be the frozen purgatory of my childhood . . . "—Nathaniel Hawthorne, *Our Old Home* (Boston, 1886), p. 83.

"The ramparts had been suffered to fall into decay, or were repaired only that the townsfolk might have a pleasant walk on summer evenings."—Macaulay, *History*, vol. i, ch. iii, p. 301.—"*The London Gazette* came out only on Mondays and Thursdays."—*Ib.*, p. 404.—". . . on fine evenings, the fiddles were in attendance, and there were morris dances on the elastic turf of the bowling green."—*Ib.*, p. 360.

"They met once a week, on Monday evenings, at the Turk's Head, in Gerrard Street . . . "—Leslie and Taylor's *Life and Times of Sir Joshua Reynolds* (London, 1865), vol. i, p. 228.

"He went without dinner on Fridays . . . "—Thackeray, *Pendennis*, vol. ii, ch. xxv, p. 304. —"Except on market days there is nobody in the streets."—*Ib.*, vol. i, ch. xv, p. 154.

"He [the English labourer] wears broadcloth on Sundays, and sometimes at his work too."—E. T. Kebbel, *English Country Life*, p. 170.

But *of* is also found in such relations,—though not so often as *on:*

"Pen had been standing with his back to the window, and to such a dubious light as Bury Street enjoys of a foggy January morning."—*Pendennis*, vol. i, ch. xx, p. 222.—"So Mr. Pen and Miss Laura found the society at Clavering Park an uncommonly agreeable resort of summer evenings."—*Pendennis*, vol. i, ch. xxii, p. 252.

"It was his custom of a Sunday, when this meal was over, to sit close by the fire, a volume of some dry divinity on his reading desk. . . . "—Robert Louis Stevenson, *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, ch. ii.

When the day, afternoon, evenings, etc., is *not* named or qualified by a defining word or phrase, a customary act or occurrence is regularly followed by *of:*

". . . he was rarely to be found anywhere of an evening beyond the bounds of his own parish . . ."—George Eliot, *Mr. Gilfil's Love-Story*, ch. i.—"Mr. Bates is habitually a guest in the the housekeeper's room of an evening . . . "—*Ib.*, ch. iv.—". . . seated by his fireside of an evening . . . "—*Id.*, *Essays* (*Worldliness and other-Worldliness*).

". . . cutting down branches of a night to secure himself from the wild beasts . . . "—J. H. Newman, *Historical Sketches*, vol. ii, p. 401.

". . . the staircase and passageway were often thronged of a morning with a set of beggarly and piratical-looking scoundrels . . . "—Nathaniel Hawthorne, *Our Old Home*, p. 19.

". . . his father was quietly reading, according to his custom when he sat at home of an evening."—Henry James, *The Reverberator*, ch. viii.

". . . after reading pretty hard of a morning, and, I fear, not law merely, but politics and general history and literature . . . "–*Pendennis*, vol. i, ch. xxx.

". . . he used to have two candles on his table of an evening."—William Hazlitt, *Sketches and Essays* (London, 1884), p. 373.

"His waistcoat of a morning was pale buff—of an evening, embroidered velvet."—Lytton, *The Caxtons*, vol. i, part ii, ch. ii.

And in the plural:

". . . and here Pen was introduced to a number of gallant young fellows with spurs and mustachios, with whom he drank pale-ale of mornings, and beat the town of a night."—*Pendennis*, ch. xix.

The observance by writers of the foregoing distinctions in the use of *on* and *of* is probably seldom premeditated, and no doubt is often neglected; but an examination of a large number of cases in a considerable variety of writing seems to show that customary usage recognizes the differences indicated. Linguistic distinctions are often blurred and confused by impressions of phrases similar in sound. Perhaps the distinctions we have been considering have been blurred, more or less, by the influence of such partitive phrases as those below.

". . . when he and she and John, at towards nine o'clock of a winter evening, went to London . . . "—Dickens, *Our Mutual Friend*, Bk. iv, ch. xii.

"It was near nine o'clock of a moonlight evening . . ."–Nathaniel Hawthorne, *The Snow Image and other Twice-told Tales* (My Kinsman, Major Molineux).—"One afternoon of a cold winter's day, when the sun shone forth with chilly brightness . . . "—*Ib.*, *The Snow-Image.*

But there is a tendency to confuse *of* and *on* apart from such an influence. It should be added that Thackeray, although cited several times above, seems to have had no discriminative rule as to *on* and *of* in cases of customary action.

R. O. Williams.

*New York.*

---

## *NOTES ON LYRIC POETRY.*

Popular poems have, in all ages, suggested replies and begot the inspiration of rival work. The tournament sonnet of the later days of Queen Elizabeth is well known, and has been frequently discussed though, one may suspect, not yet exhaustively. To anyone who is desirous of learning how widely diffused such parallels are, and in how great a depth of antiquity their originals are rooted, Prof. Albert S.

Cook's notes on the series, "Care Charmer Sleep" are to be recommended. (MOD. LANG. NOTES, iv, 8, 229, and v, 1, 11.) It is not with the sonnet that we are for the moment concerned, but with the direct answer to a previous poem, or a second poem written in imitation or emulation of an earlier one. As early as the second edition of Tottel's *Miscellany*—and I am not concerned here to look earlier than Tottel—we find verses answering the sentiments expressed in certain poems of the first impression; and subsequent anthologies show the same thing.

As might be supposed, the most popular poems were those most frequently answered, imitated, or parodied. Thus Marlowe's famous *Come live with me and be my love*, which first appeared in *The Passionate Pilgrim*, was reprinted the next year in *England's Helicon*, with two poems which its popularity had inspired. One of them is anonymous, the other is ascribed to Sir Walter Raleigh under the title, *The Nymph's Reply to the Shepherd*. This latter poem, which is almost as fine as Marlowe's original, takes the tone of a serious doubt of the duration and reality of "these pretty pleasures." Next comes Donne, who, while successfully imitating "the smooth lines of Kit Marlowe," characteristically fills his verses with conceits and makes his fair mistress "the bait."[1] Lastly and years after, Herrick transmutes pastoral, moralizing, and conceit into a pure little idyl of English country life, in which the maiden is promised:

> Thy feasting-tables shall be hills
> With daisies spread and daffodils;
> Where thou shalt sit, and redbreast by
> For meat shall give thee melody.[2]

In this series of lyrics, all on the same general theme, the nature of each poet is plainly discernible, and may be studied as to contrast better than where each has chosen his own subject. In another series of parallels, the poetical employment of a single figure—that in which the suit of a lover is likened to the attack or siege of a defended town—furnishes us with illustrations of several of the fashions in the lyric which succeeded each other between the reign of Henry VIII and that of James II. In the earliest version, that of Lord Vaux, entitled *The Assault of Cupid*, and printed in Tottel we have, after the manner of the time, a well sustained little allegory in which figure Fancy, "Desire shrouded in his targe," "Beauty walking up and down on the ramparts, bow in hand,' and "Good-Will, the Master of shot." The citadel is the lover's heart which yields expeditiously to the assaults of Beauty. In a second version, that of *The Phoenix' Nest*, 1578, we are still in the land of allegory, but the opening line,

> Pass forth in dolefull dumps, my verse,

the "grizzled grief," and "heavy hap," proclaim our proximity to the chilling atmosphere of that iceberg of these early poetical seas, *The Mirror for Magistrates*. Here the allegory is transferred to an attack by sea, and the pirate is Detraction, his ship manned by Ignorance, Suspicion and Envy. The unfortunate victim is captnred and, bound by Carking Care and Fell Annoy, is brought before my Lady Disdain, thrown in prison, and denied even the access of his friend, Troth. These verses are a didactic observation on the ingratitude of the world, and as far from poetry as didactic verses usually are.

Passing by a poem in *The Gorgeous Gallery of Gallant Inventions*, 1578, (Park, *Heliconia*, p. 103) in which the figure is more than once employed, though not extensively, and omitting the cases of its use in prose in Painter's *Palace of Pleasure*, and elsewhere, we reach the anonymous *Beauty's Fort* (printed in Arber's *English Garner*, 1, 128), which dates later in the same century. Here we have the allegory of Lord Vaux inverted, and it is Beauty that is besieged by raging Love. Although the fair besieged has allies in Chastity and Prudence, "she hath traitors in her camp," and yields at last to the combined attacks of her outward and inner foes. Here the poet touches the moral note, but cleverly evades the question, remarking in conclusion:

> She needs must yield her castle strong,
> And Love triumphs once more:
> 'Tis only what the boy hath done
> A thousand times before.

In 1580, Humphrey Gifford employed the same figure by way of simile in the following stanza of a very pretty poem (*A Posie of Gil-*

1 See Donne, ed. 1650, p. 57.

2 Hale, *Selections from Herrick*, p. 88.

*loflowers*, Miscellanies of the Fuller Worthies Library, p. 84):

Like as a fort or fenced town,
By foes assault that lies in field,
When bulwarks all are beaten down,
Is by perforce constrayned to yield:
So I that could no while withstand
The battery of your pleasant love,
The flag of truce took in my hand,
And meant your mercy for to prove.

With Sidney's *Stella! whence doth this new assault arise?* (*Astrophel and Stella*, Son. 36) the figure of siege and assault enters the voluminous sonnet literature of the age. It is found everywhere; in Linche's *Diella*, 1590;

When Love had first besieged my heart's strong wall,
Rampiered and countermured with Chastity,
And had with ordnance made his tops to fall,
Stooping their glory to his surquedry:
I called a parley, etc.,

and in the anonymous *Zepheria*, Canzon twenty-five; and in Percey's *Coelia*, of the same date, where the subject is elaborated into a whole sonnet.

In that curious and enigmatic book of verses, *Willobie his Avisa*, 1594, this figure is recurred to again and again, and forms practically the theme of a whole part of the work. See especially: "To plant a siege and yet depart, etc." (Canto xix, Spenser Society's ed. of *Avisa*); "The wise men seek the strongest fort, And paper castles most detest" (ib. p. 39); and Canto xlix, where the figure is extended once more into the familiar allegory:

You are the chieftain that have laid
This heavy siege to strengthless fort,
And Fancy that my will betraid
Hath lent Despair his strongest port, etc.
(Ib. p. 84).

Even Spenser did not disdain a variation on the familiar theme in his *Amoretti*, Son. xiv:

Retourne agayne, my forces late dismayd,
Unto the siege by you abandon'd quite.
Great shame it is to leave, like one afrayd,
So fayre a peece for one repulse so light.
'Gaynst such strong castles needeth greater might
Then those small forts which ye were wont belay:
Such haughty mynds, enur'd to hardy fight,
Disdayn to yield unto the first assay.

Years later when Carew wrote his *A Deposition from Love*, the old figure was flitting in his mind in the words, "Could we the fortress win," and again in the last stanza:

Hard fate I to have been once possess'd
As victor of a heart,
Achieved with labor and unrest,
And then forced to depart.
If the stout foe will not resign,
When I besiege a town,
I lose but what was never mine;
But he that is cast down
From enjoyed beauty, feels a woe
Only deposed kings can know.

At length the cynical coxcombry of Sir John Suckling casts this obvious old similitude into an imperishable artistic form in his poem, *The Siege*, which is too well known to need more than a mention here; and Sir Charles Sedley, original in nothing yet clever in all, echoed Sir John in the song of the third Act of *Bellamira*. (*Works of Sedley*, ed. 1778, ii, 141.) With this we may dismiss the subject.

One of the neatest pieces of actual parody amongst the lyrics of the age of Elizabeth is one pointed out by Mr. Bullen, in the Introduction to his *Lyrics from Elizabethan Romances*. Thomas Lodge, who is frequently imitative of the matter and manner of French poets, his contemporaries and predecessors, imitates one of the meters of Ronsard in a particularly daring manner, in the well-known "novel," *Rosalynde*. The verses run thus:

Phoebe sate,
Sweet she sate,
Sweete sate Phoebe when I saw her,
. . . . . .
Phoebe sat
By a fount;
Sitting by a fount I spied her.

Nash parodied (*Tarlton's Newes out of Purgatory*, ed. Huth Library):

Down I sat,
I sat down
Where Flora had bestowed her graces,
Green it was,
It was green
Far passing other places.
. . . . . .
There I sat,
I sat there,
Viewing of this pride of places:
Straight I saw,
I saw straight
The sweetest fair of all fair faces.

Less delicate, though certainly more direct, is Jonson's parody, stanza for stanza, of an immortal Song of George Wither. Wither had written:

Shall I, wasting in despair,
Die, because a woman's fair?

Or my cheeks make pale with care,
'Cause another's rosy are?
Be she fairer than the day,
Or the flowery meads in May?
If she be not so to me,
What care I, how fair she be?

Jonson replied:

Shall I, mine affections slack,
'Cause I see a woman's black?
Or myself with care cast down,
'Cause I see a woman's brown?
Be she blacker than the night,
Or the blackest jet in sight?
If she be not so to me,
What care I how black she be?

Can it be that Jonson had in mind, in this stanza, Shakespeare's well-known sonnet, beginning: "My Mistress' eyes are nothing like the sun?" Another poem, graver and finer than Jonson's, though also written under the suggestion of Wither's, will be found in Hannah's *Poems of Raleigh*, etc., p. 82, in which occurs this stanza:

Shall I like an hermit dwell
On a rock or in a cell,
Calling home the smallest part
That is missing of my heart,
To bestow it, where I may
Meet a rival every day?
If she undervalue me,
What care I how fair she be?

In a volume entitled *Poems by Francis Beaumont*, printed in 1640, there is a poem *On the Life of Man*. It has also been included amongst the works of Bishop Henry King. (See *The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher*, ed. Dyce, ii, 952; and *Poems of King*, ed. Hannah, pp. lxii, cxviii.)

Like to the falling of a star,
Or as the flight of eagles are,
Or like the fresh spring's gaudy hue
Or silver drops of morning dew
. . . . . .
Even such is man, whose borrowed light
Is straight called in and paid to night:
. . . . . .
The dew's dried up, the star is shot,
The flight is past, the man forgot.

Ellis in his *Specimens of Early English Poets* (ii, 339), quotes from a series of similitudes on the same theme, which he refers to the authorship of one Simon Wastell in a book entitled *Microbiblion*, 1629. If the poem from which I have just quoted is Beaumont's, the question of priority is easily settled. In any case the inferiority of Wastell's work would point to it as the imitation.

Like the damask rose you see,
Or like the blossoms of the tree,
Or like the dainty flower of May,
Or like the morning of the day, etc.
. . . . . .
E'en such is man;—whose thread is spun,
Drawn out, and cut, and so is done.—
The rose withers, the blossom blasteth,
The flower fades, the morning hasteth, etc.

Once more we meet with a string of similitudes, this time evidently intentionally absurd, applied to the same subject. These verses, which I find in *Wit's Recreation*, a species of degenerate anthology or miscellany, published in several editions between 1640 and 1680, are the work of Bishop Corbet, and are appropriately entitled, *A Messe of Non-sense*. A few lines will suffice:

Like to the tone of unspoke speeches,
Or like a lobster clad in logic breeches,
Or like the gray frieze of a crimson cat,
Or like a mooncalf in a slipshoe-hat,
Or like a shadow when the sun is gone,
Or like a thought that ne'er was thought upon:
. . . . . .
E'en such is man, who brethless, without doubt,
Spake to small purpose when his tongue was out.

The poetry of Donne from its originality, and the cynical mood in which he frequently indulges, led to many replies and imitations. The Song beginning: *Go and catch a falling star*, especially calls into question woman's faith and fidelity, and affirms that one who has ridden "ten thousand days and nights," upon his return must swear,

Nowhere
Lives a woman true and fair.

In Habington's *Castara*, the theme of which is the praise of chastity and womanly virtue, there is a direct answer to this poem, entitled, *Against them that lay unchastity to women*. This poem begins:

They meet with but unwholesome springs
And summers which infectious are,
They hear but when the mermaid sings,
And only see the falling star,
Who ever dare
Affirm no woman chaste and fair.

Another very popular poem of Donne is entitled *The Indifferent*. In it the poet affirms his affluent ability to "love both fair and brown,"

Her whom abundance melts, and her whom want betrays,
Her who loves lonenesss best, her who masks and plays.

The earliest imitation of this poem with which I am acquainted is that of Alexander Brome. (See Calmer's *English Poets*, vi, 645.) The second stanza runs:

I vow, I am so far from loving none,
That I love everyone:
If fair, I must; if brown she be,
She's lovely, and for sympathy,
'Cause we're alike, I love her;
If tall, she's proper; and if short,
She's humble, and I love her for't.

Cowley's *Inconstant* is modelled on the same poem, and from certain similarities of expression may have been another source or an imitation of Brome's verses; it might be difficult to determine which. Brome was about Cowley's age, and his works, though doubtless written long before, were not published until the year of the Restoration. This stanza from Cowley's *Inconstant* will sufficiently indicate the parallel to which I refer:

If tall, the name of "proper" slays,
If fair, she's pleasant in the light,
If low, her prettiness does please,
If black, what lover loves not night?
If yellow-haired, I love lest it should be
Th' excuse to others for not loving me.

A fourth poem on the same theme is Suckling's *Guiltless Inconstant.*

Without going into the particulars, other borrowings from Donne will be found in these cases: Donne's *Love's Growth* and his *Woman's Constancy* are respectively the sources of Suckling's *True Love* and *Constancy;* and Donne's *Absence hear thou my protestation* (for which see Davison's *Poetical Rhapsody*), which repeats as a central idea the thought of his song: *Soul's joy, now I am gone*, offers Carew the suggestion of one of the most effective passages of his poem, *To his Mistress Confined.*

Waller's well-known song, *Go lovely rose*, appears in *Wit's Recreations*, with two other poems all nearly on the same theme. One of these is Waller's own, beginning: *Lately on yonder fragrant bush*, the other is a poem of Herrick, in subject and manner sufficiently close to raise the question, who was the borrower? Herrick's lines run:

Go happy rose, and interwove
With other flowers bind my love;
Tell her too, she must not be
Longer peevish, longer free,
That so long hath fettered me. etc.

This parallel I find noted by Mr. G. Thorne Drury, in his excellent edition of Waller, together with a number of others bearing upon this poem. The mention of this most popular of the lyrics of Waller naturally suggests the poem that shares that popularity, the lines *On a Girdle*, and a couple of parallels not given by Mr. Drury. In his charming little poem, *Upon Julia's Ribband*, Herrick says in simple affirmation as to that article of Julia's attire:

Nay 'tis the zonulet of love
Wherein all pleasures of the world are wove.

The language is direct, the idea fancifully but tastefully treated; Herrick employs an unusual and musical word, "zonulet," and his versification is free and artistic.

Give me but what this ribband bound,
Take all the rest the world goes round!

cries Waller in rhetorical exclamation, reducing fancy to sense, avoiding unusual words, but practicing an end-stopped verse of unexceptional regularity. Lastly, though perhaps prior in time, Cleveland contorts the same thought into a "conceit," far-fetched and unpoetical, and asks:

Is not the universe straight-laced,
When I can clasp it in a waist?

FELIX E. SCHELLING.
*University of Pennsylvania.*

---

## *THE PASTORAL ELEMENT IN THE ENGLISH DRAMA BEFORE 1605.*

MOST accounts of the English pastoral drama have begun with Fletcher's *Faithful Shepherdess* or Daniel's *Queen's Arcadia.* There have been references, of course, to some of Lyly's plays, Peele's *Arraignment of Paris* and Sidney's *May Lady*, but there has been no recognition of a continuous and considerable development of the pastoral drama before Daniel and Fletcher introduced the genre already highly developed by Tasso and Guarini.

It is the purpose of this paper to present evidence of such a development before 1605, the date of Daniel's *Arcadia;* and this evidence will fall naturally into two divisions. First, we shall consider evidence of a pastoral element in entertainments and shows presented to the

queen; and secondly, we shall consider plays and allusions to plays which show that pastorals were not uncommon on the London stage. The evidence under the first head has for the most part not been presented before, and that under the second has not all been previously utilized.

Taken altogether, this evidence will be enough to throw some light on many questions concerning the origin and development of English pastoral drama. The important and direct influence of the Italian drama on Fletcher and Daniel is well known, but the existence of an English pastoral drama prior to their plays at once suggests that they may have been influenced by it, as well as by the Italian forms. The extent and character of Italian influence on this early English development offers another subject for investigation. While the existence of such Italian influence is undoubted, the existence of a characteristic English development apart from foreign influence is equally to be expected. In the main, we shall leave to one side the question of Italian influence, and point only to such conclusions in regard to the characteristics of the drama as the evidence seems prima facie to warrant. In fact we shall try to do little more than to present the evidence.

## I. The Pastoral Element in Royal Entertainments before 1605.

The theory of Rossi[1] that the Italian pastoral drama was developed from the eclogue through the medium of public pageants in honor of noble families, at once suggests the possibility of a similar development in England. The pastoral idea, in general, was a fashionable cult of the court: and the pastoral plays of Lyly, Peele, and Daniel, were all court entertainments. In the royal shows, then, if anywhere, we might expect to find germs of the finished form. I have, therefore, examined the accounts of the entertainments presented to Queen Elizabeth on her various progresses in order to discover whether or not they contain any elements such as afterwards appear more highly developed in the pastoral plays of Fletcher and Jonson. Such elements do appear, and will be briefly enumerated.

1 Battista Guarini, ed Il Pastor Fido, 1886. Part ii, Chap. 1.

A word may first be prefaced in regard to the character of these royal entertainments. Wherever the queen made a journey she was greeted with an oration or show, and often with an elaborate entertainment, highly spectacular, and more or less dramatic. Sometimes the village schoolmaster, or some local functionary prepared the show; sometimes a court favorite like Gascoigne, or a great gentleman like Sidney, devised the entertainments. Hence their artistic quality varies widely. Some of them, doubtless, suggested Shakspere's burlesque in the pageants of Holofernes and Bottom, the weaver; and, on the other hand, some of them with their songs and fairies may possibly have suggested the beautiful conception of *Midsummer Night's Dream*. They also vary widely in their subject matter. Some with their allegorical characters are like the old moralities, some have deities and scenes from classical mythology, some fairies and bits of folk lore, some are satirical, some deal with romance and chivalry, and some have pastoral elements such as shepherds and satyrs. Often the performance contained a mixture of several of these varieties, and the only invariable point of similarity was the fulsome panegyric to the virgin queen.

In considering the pastoral elements I shall give a broad meaning to the phrase and take account of everything which can have had any relation to the pure pastoral drama. It must be remembered, too, that the accounts which we have of these entertainments before the queen are few compared with the number actually presented, and that we have no records at all of the many given before private persons. A single representation which has been preserved may, therefore, be taken as typical of a considerable number; and the existence of any pastoral elements may fairly be considered proof that such elements were not uncommon.

The first indication of anything at all pastoral is a reference to "a mask of wild men" performed at Greenwich in 1873.[2] The mask is lost. The connection between wild men and satyrs will appear later.

In 1575, at Kenilworth,[3] George Gascoigne

2 F. G. Fleay, *A Chronicle of the English Drama*, 1559–1142, ii, 341.

3 Nichols, *Progresses of Elizabeth*. Vol. i. p. 436.

prepared several devices to add to the interest of Leicester's entertainment. One evening as the queen was returning from the chase, she was greeted by a "Humbre Salvagio," "with an oaken plant pluct up by the roots in his hands, himself foregrone all in moss and ivy." At the end of his speech he called on "his familiars and companions, fawns, satyrs, nymphs, dryads, and hamadryads." None answered but echo; and then ensued a long dialogue between the wild man and echo. Here, then, we have a representative of the satyr type and the device of the echo dialogue, both elements of the pastoral drama.

This show seems to have been favorably received, for a similar exhibition[4] was at once prepared, but for some reason not presented. In the midst of an entertainment presenting Diana and her nymphs, a man clad all in moss comes in and announces that he is the son of the "humbre salvagio" and has a similar dialogue with echo.

On another day,[5] as the queen was going hunting, she was meet by Gascoigue, "dressed as Sylvanus, god of the woods." He made a long speech, running along by her horse, and led her to a bush, whence "deep desire" was heard speaking. This business of a voice from a bush or tree is repeated in other entertainments, and also in *Pastor Fido* (i, 4), where we have "a shrill voice from riv'd beech." In Gascoigne's device, Pan, Diana, and her nymphs also appear.

These three Kenilworth devices show that the introduction into English drama of Diana and her nymphs, and wilder denizens of the woods, such as Pan, Silvanus, and the satyr tribe, goes back at least to 1575. As in later representations, it is the hunting horns which disturb these wood-dwellers. It seems certain that Gascoigne borrowed most of this pastoral material directly from similar Italian performances.

In 1578, at Wanstead, the Contention of a Forester and a Shepherd for a May Lady, by Sir Philip Sidney, was presented before the queen. Here for the first time we find shepherds and a distinct pastoral setting. The old shepherd, afterwards a favorite character, makes his first English appearance; the chorus of foresters and shepherds reminds us of the chorus of huntsmen and shepherds in *Pastor Fido* (iv, 6); and Therion, the hunter, who is rude and sometimes strikes the lady, and his rival Espiles, who is mild and gentle, are rudimentary types not unlike the contrasted Silvio and Mirtillo. The singing match is also a bit of dramatized eclogue; but, on the other hand, the burlesque schoolmaster, and the lady, dressed like "an honest man's wife of the country," are English elements quite foreign to the conventional pastoral genre.

I have found no other traces of a pastoral element in the accounts of the queen's progresses until 1591. At Cowdray in that year, a wild man awaited the queen by a tree and made a speech.

In 1592 at Bissam,[6] on the queen's arrival at the top of the hill, she was again met by a wild man who made a speech full of references to Pan, Sylvanus, and Echo.[7] At the middle of the hill, "sate Pan and two virgins keeping sheep and sewing in their samplers." Pan made love to the shepherdesses, and a long dialogue ensued, the subject of which may be well enough described in two phrases of the virgins—"the follies of the gods who became beasts for their affections; the honour of virgins who became goddesses for their chastity." At the bottom of the hill, Ceres and her nymphs completed the show. Here, then, we have again the satyr element both in the wild man and Pan, who woos the virgins with presents of chestnuts; and the chastity motive, so highly developed in later drama.

In the same year at Sudely,[8] an old shepherd greeted her majesty in a pastoral strain, praising the country as a very Arcadia where "we carry our hearts at our tongues' ends, being as far from dissembling as our sheep from fierceness;" and presenting her with a lock of wool "in which nothing is to be esteemed but the whiteness, virginity's color; nor to be expected but duty, the shepherd's religion.

On a Sunday, at the same place, there was a performance in which Apollo appeared running after Daphne, while a shepherd followed lamenting the loss of his nymph. Apollo turned Daphne into a tree, "and on one side of the tree appeared one who sung; and on the other,

4 Nichols i, 503. 5 Nichols i, 575. 6 Nichols iii, 135. 7 Nichols iii, 137. 8 Nichols iii, 137.

one who played." After the song the tree rived; Daphne appeared; and upon being pursued by Apollo, fled to her majesty," uttering this—"for whither should chastity fly for succour but to the queen of chastity?"—and so on, in a long panegyric on chastity and the virgin queen.

On another day at the same place,[9] there was a speech by one "cloked in a sheep's skin, face and all." Then her majesty was brought among shepherds, among whom was a queen and king to be chosen. Melibaeus and Nisa appeared as shepherds, also the Cutter of Cootsholde, a comic and not a pastoral personage.

In these entertainments we find again the pastoral setting, the exploitation of chastity, and the mixture of mythological and English country characters. These entertainments also warrant us in concluding that the representation of shepherds and nymphs and wild men, was not uncommon in such pageants. Pastoralism was certainly popular in the literature of the day, and played a considerable part in these theatrical shows, even when the pieces were not pastoral in theme or character. This prevalence of the pastoral may be illustrated by a few lines from a masque of knights and ladies,[10] in which the queen of fairies had a part. The lines are, I think, fairly typical of many similar songs and pastoral allusions.

> "Of our new destiny
> Echo, echo, certify,
> Farewell all in woods that dwell,
> Farewell Satyrs, nymphs farewell,
> Adieu desires, fancies die,
> Farewell all inconstancy."

From 1592 on, the queen's progresses were very infrequent, and only one other pastoral entertainment appears. In 1600–1 a "Dialogue between two shepherds, Thenot and Piers, in praise of Astrea," was recited at the home of the author, the Countess of Pembroke. It is simply an eclogue.

One of the first entertainments offered to Queen Anne must be added to complete our list. In her progress to her coronation (1603), she was entertained at Althorpe with a kind of masque written by Ben Jonson, and entitled "The Complaint of the Satyrs against the Nymphs." A satyr was lodged in a spinet (little wood), by which her majesty and the prince were to come, and advancing his head above the top of the wood, he began:

> "Here! there! and everywhere!
> Some solemnities are near
> That these changes strike my ear,
> My pipe and I a part shall bear," etc.

After piping a strain he ran out and welcomed the queen. Then a bevy of fairies, headed by Queen Mab, tripped out and began to dance and sing. Thereupon the satyr

"came hopping forth, and mixing himself with the fairies, skipped in, out, and about their circle, while they made offers to catch him."

He mocked them in a long song, of which a few lines will indicate the tenor:

> "This is she that empties cradles
> Takes out children, puts in ladles,
> Trains forth mldwives in their slumber
> With a sieve the holes to number
> And then leads them from her burrows
> Home through ponds and water furrows."

The fairies declared to Queen Mab,

> "This is only spite
> For you would not yester night
> Kiss him in the cock shut light."

Then they caught him and pinched him black and blue. The satyr ran away, but later reappeared, and in a long speech to Queen Anne, closed the ceremony.

So far as I know, the foregoing are the only bits of pastoral pageants before 1605 which have been preserved. Meagre as they are, they may be fairly taken, I think, to indicate that Daniel and Fletcher did not work in an altogether untried field. Even apart from the plays of Lyly and Peele, and the masques of Sidney and Jonson, the entertainments of the queen's progresses show a considerable amount of the pastoral element. Before 1600 the chastity motive, the setting of shepherds and hunters, the story of unrequited love, the singing contest, the hunting party with sounding horns—all these had become material of the pastoral drama. Some characters, too, such as the satyr type, the rude forester, and the venerable shepherd, were pretty familiar. That, after all, this is a small contribution, that Daniel and Fletcher are to be credited with

9 Nichols iii, 142.

10 Nichols iii, 202.

creative work, goes without saying; but in the light of these earlier pastoral dramatic attempts, it hardly seems possible that their work could have seemed absolutely new either to themselves or the Elizabethan public.

How far Italian influence can be traced in these early pastoral exhibitions cannot probably be definitely determined. I find no sure indications of the influence of either *Aminta* or *Pastor Fido*. These plays may have had an effect in increasing the prevalence of pastoral exhibitions after 1580; but, on the other hand, this prevalence must in a considerable measure have resulted from the popularity of pastoral poetry in general. Most of the pastoral entertainments might have well enough been suggested by the pastoral eclogues and romances. At the same time, there can be no doubt that the use of the pastoral in royal entertainments was at least suggested in the cases of Gascoigne and Sidney by similar pastoral entertainments in Italy.

The mixture of pastoral with mythological elements is only natural, both being taken from classical sources; and is, in fact, to be found in nearly all pastoral drama. The mixture of pastoral with native comic characters is, perhaps, more distinctively an English development. It may, indeed, possibly be taken as an evidence of the influence of contemporary public plays, though to some extent this mixture was anticipated in Spenser's and Barclay's eclogues. Pastoral poetry, at any rate, anticipated the pastoral drama in the introduction of contemporary satire. However, the honest country woman and the pedant Rombus of Sidney's *May Lady*, and the Cutter of Cootsholde at Sudeley, are worth noting, since they precede Daniel's use of contemporary satire, and Shakspere's introduction of English rustics, in the Arcadia of *As You Like It*.

More notable as an English variation is the development of the satyr type. Just what connection or difference existed between the wild man of the woods and the satyr, would probably have puzzled both spectators and authors to explain. How dim their ideas may have been, can be surmised from a contemporary description of a stone figure at Hamstead. Nichols[11] points out its resemblance to Gascoigne's "Humbre Salvagio"—"all his limbs being covered with thick hair and his loins surrounded with a girdle of foliage;" and from the illustration, it certainly appears to have been intended for a wild man. The contemporary account, however, calls it a "figure of Hercules with his club."

The wild man of the earliest entertainments is covered with moss, dwells in the woods, and is the companion of satyrs and nymphs. This wild man is differentiated from Silvanus, the god of the woods; but the two look much alike. Later the wild man appears with Pan who woos a shepherdess. Wild man, Humbre Salvagio, Silvanus, or Pan; the personage is the same from a theatrical point of view. So far as we can determine the characteristics with which he is endowed, he is a simple, wild animal, who lives like a squirrel, who ordinarily frolics with the nymphs, and plays his pipe in peace, but who comes forth in wonderment to see the queen.

There is nothing of the classical satyr's lasciviousness in this,[12] nothing of the rude lust of the satyr of the Italian pastoral drama. The satyr kind of the pageants certainly owed nothing to the elaborate development of the satyr in the Italian drama. In Ben Jonson's masque the difference is even greater. The satyr, there so-named, is introduced as the companion of Queen Mab and her fairies. He is a creature not of Arcadia but of fairy-land. He is a singer, a piper, a merry fellow, and in addition serves as a messenger and a sort of chorus. This satyr, however, in his appearance from a bush, his wonderment at the queen's appearance, his long address, his introduction of the host, serves in the same situations and performs the same duties as the wild man. Here, then, we possibly have a direct contribution to the pastoral drama. From the wild man to Jonson's satyr is only a short step, and from Jonson's satyr to Fletcher's is an equally short step. The satyr in the *Faithful Shepherdess* is far removed from the lustful satyrs of *Sacrificio*, *Aminta*, or *Pastor Fido*; he again is an artless creature near related to the fairies, and serves as messenger and chorus. He gains of

11 Nichols ii, p. 121.

12 So far as the wild man is classical, he is clearly a faun rather than a satyr; and so indeed are Fletcher and Jonson's satyrs. The Elizabethans seem to have confused the two.

course in refinement from the delicacy of the verse, and the moral element elaborated in his adoration of chastity. This spontaneous reverence for chastity, however, also appeared in the wild men and Pan, when they encountered Elizabeth. From the wild men to Fletcher's satyr, then, we have what looks like a development peculiar to English soil; and, in this connection, it is worth noting that as theatrical parts, these are points of similarity between Fletcher's satyr and Shakspere's Ariel.

## II. The Pastoral Element in the Public Theatre before 1605.

In tracing the pastoral element in the public drama, we shall first examine the extant plays, and then note the references to pastoral plays, that are not extant. None of the extant plays are pure pastorals like *Pastor Fido* or the *Faithful Shepherdess*. In the extent of their use of mythological characters and stories, they rather resemble such an early pastoral drama as Politian's *Orfeo*. Some of their mythological material, however, as for example, Lyly's use of a miraculous transformation, of an oracle, of a festival to some God, or of the tracing of divine descent, may fairly be called the common property of all pastoral plays. More distinctly pastoral elements, such as shepherds, song contests, and the story of unrequited love also appear.

*The Arraignment of Paris*, by Geoge Peele. First quarto 1584. Probably acted about 1508.

9
1580

The main part of the play deals with classical mythology; but here, as in some of the entertainments, Diana and her nymphs are brought in close connection with shepherds. The chorus of shepherds also appears, and in the first act a shepherd is contrasted with a hunter. The story of Colin's unrequited love and the talk of his fellow shepherds Hobbinol, Thenot, and Diggon, follow the *Shepherd's Calendar*. The probability of Italian influence is also apparent from an Italian song of twelve lines[13] which is incorporated in the text. Oenone appears as a nymph among the shepherds, and Paris is alluded to as "Amyntas' lovely boy," probably a reference to Watson's *Amyntas*.[14]

*Gallathea*, by John Lyly. Entered S. R. 1585. First quarto 1587, Written about 1580.[15]

The sacrifice of a virgin to Neptune forms the basis of the plot as in *Pastor Fido*. Melibeus and Tyterus are shepherds; Gallathea and Phyllida are their daughters, who assume boys clothing to avoid the sacrifice. Diana's nymphs again appear in connection with the shepherds; each of the nymphs, in fact, falls in love with a shepherd. With their loves, and the love which springs up between Gallathea and Phyllida, there is a complication of love affairs something like that of the later pastoral drama. Besides this pastoral story, the play has a large mythological element, a ship-wreck, and a good deal of contemporary satire. The pastoral element, however, is quite distinct and brings us nearer than any previous play to the later forms of Daniel and Fletcher.

*Love's Metamorphosis* by John Lyly. First quarto 1601. Acted, probably, about 1580. Revived (see title page) 1597–1600.

The title page of the first quarto describes the play as "a wittie and wurthy pastorall," and the scene is given Arcadia. Nisa, Celia, Niobe, and Tirtena appear as nymphs of Ceres, and the first three have importunate lovers in Ramis, Montanus, and Silvestris. These last are spoken of as amorous foresters and huntsmen;[16] neither shepherds nor sheep are mentioned. In content, however, the play is, perhaps, nearer to the developed pastoral form than any other of Lyly's. Each of the foresters woos a nymph, and each nymph refuses very persistently, so there is an opportunity for a good many love dialogues,[17] and much bemoaning of unrequited love. There is also a good deal of praise of chastity and talk of "gods amorous and virgins immortal, goddesses full of crueltie, and men of unhappinesse." [V. 1.)

There are a few other distinct pastoral elements; for example, the writing of verses on the trees (i. 1), the nymphs celebrating the festival (i. 2), and Fidelias who "chased with a Satyre, by prayer to the gods became turned to a tree" (i. 2).

The title page shows that the play was intended for a pastoral, hence we may assume that a story of unrequited love was definitely

13 Act ii, p. 350, Routledge Edition.

14 Act iii, p. 360; also cf. p. 584, note.

15 Cf. *Endymion*, Ed. by G. P. Baker, 1894. Introduction.

16 Act i, sc. 2. 17 Cf. act i, sc. 1 act iii, sc. 1; act v, sc. 2.

recognized as the proper content of a pastoral.

*Midas* by John Lyly. Entered S. R. 1591. First quarto 1592. Acted 1590(?).

The pastoral element is very slight, but Apollo, Pan, and nymphs appear in conjunction with five shepherds, Menaleus, Coryn, Celthus, Draipon, and Amyntas. There occurs, too, a long dispute between a huntsman and other servants, on the merits of hunting (iv, 3). Furthermore, in the prologue, spoken in Pauls, there is an allusion which seems to show that plays called pastorals were common on the stage.

"At our exercises, souldiers call for tragedies, their object is blood: courtiers for comedies, their subject is love; countrimen for pastorals, sheepheards are their saints."

In this connection, Polonius' words to Hamlet may be recalled.—"The best actors in the world, either for . . . pastoral, pastoral-comical, historical-pastoral—," etc. Lyly's prologue seems to show that even by 1590 the pastoral was recognized to be a distinct kind of drama, just like tragedy, comedy, or history.

*Amphrisa, the Forsaken Shepherdess*, or Pelopoea and Alope by Thomas Heywood. First printed in *Dialogues and Dramas*, 1636. Identified by Mr. Fleay[18] with one of the *Five Plays in One* acted at the Rose, 1597. This identification is plausible, but by no means certain, so this play may have been written after 1605.

This is a pure pastoral but is very brief, occupying only eleven quarto pages. Pelopoea and Alope, two shepherdesses, appear and speak of Amphrisa's false lover who has forsaken her. Amphrisa then enters; and a long conversation ensues, which results in the conclusion that the only remedy for injuries is patience. The queen of the country, with her nymphs, now enters. They have been chasing the stag and after telling of their exploits, listen in hiding, to the talk of the Arcadian girls, and are charmed by it. Amphrisa meanwhile is presented with a willow garland so that:

> "All th' Arcadian swains and nymphs that see
> Your brows ingirt with this forsaken wreath
> Will take note of his falsehood and your faith;
> Your innocence and his inconstancie."

The queen finally discovers herself, compliments the shepherdesses; and several songs and dances close the entertainment.

18 *Chronicle of Drama*, vol. i, p. 286.

*The Woman in the Moon:* by John Lyly. Entered S. R. 1595. First quarto 1597. Probably written between 1590–5.

As often in Lyly's plays, the main action depends on transformation, and there are plenty of mythological personages: the pastoral element, however, is considerable.

Four "Utopian shepherds," "all clad in skins" appear, ask for a female companion, and sing a roundelay. Pandora is given them, and throughout the play they appear as suitors; Stesias in particular, filling the part of the forsaken, scorned, and love-sick swain. To settle their contention, she sends them:

> "to slay the savage boar
> Which roaring up and down with ceaseless rage
> Destroyes the fruit of our Utopian fields
> And he that first presents us with his head
> Shall wear my glove in favour of the deed." (ii, 1.)

Later, the shepherds dispute who had the largest share in slaying the boar. The passage suggests the incident of Silvio's victory over the boar in *Pastor Fido* (iv, 3). There seems, indeed, to be a similarity in phrasing. The *Pastor Fido* is also suggested by another incident, when Pandora's servant tells her: "Mistress, my mayster is in this cave, thinking to meet you, and search us here." (iv, 1.) Still further, we find a trace of the Satyr motive. Pandora, who becomes light and wanton through Venus' agency (iii, 2.), enters in company with Joculo, and the following dialogue ensues.

> P. Prethee be quiet, wherefore should I daunce?
> J. Thus daunce the Satyrs on the even lawnes.
> P. Thus, pretty Satyr, will Pandora daunce.
> Cupid. And thus will Cupid make her melody.
> J. Were I a man I would love thee.
> P. I am a mayden, wilt thou have me?
> J. But Stesias says thou art not.
> P. What then? I care not. (iii, 2.)

Joculs thus appears to be a sort of satyr; he does not come on the stage again. "Utopian" is rather curious for Arcadian, but the two seem to be the same as far as the nature of the scene is concerned. The setting of shepherds and an Arcadian-like country, and the story of unrequited love appear again, and the satyr element appears for the first time, I believe, in the regular drama.

*The Maid's Metamorphosis;* anonymous. First quarto 1600.

Whether this was an old play (as early as 1590)

revived, or was written shortly before publication, are questions which do not especially concern us; nor does the question of authorship, although we may note that it has been attributed to Lyly, and is thought by Mr. Fleay to have been written by Lyly and Daniel.

The play is a medley in which Apollo and the muses, a magician, fairies, court people, clowns, shepherds, and foresters, all appear; and the main action deals with the transformation of the heroine into a boy and back again. If the author be not Lyly, his indebtedness to Lyly is manifest; and his indebtedness to the *Fairy Queen* is also marked. The pastoral element, however, follows dramatic conventions that were earlier instituted.

The heroine, Eurymine, is saved from death, but banished from court. She wanders in a forest, where she meets with Silvio, "a ranger," and Genulo, a shepherd, who at first, take her for a nymph or goddess and immediately become rivals for her love. Then ensues a long poetical contention as to whose house she shall be taken, in which forester and shepherd proclaim the merits of their respective callings in genuine pastoral style. This contention ends in rival songs by a chorus of shepherds and a chorus of woodmen. Eurymine settles the dispute by accepting a cottage from the forester and a flock from the shepherd. The whole scene at once recalls Sidney's *May Lady*, and was very likely suggested by that entertainment. In this scene, in the rivalry of the forester and shepherd throughout the play, and in the choruses of woodmen and shepherds, we are still further reminded of the *Pastor Fido*. If the play was written as late as 1600, I should think there could be little question of the influence of Guarini; this influence, however, seems general, rather than specific; the direct indebtedness seems to be to Sidney.

Eurymine is now established as a shepherdess; her lover Ascanio seeks her in vain; the rivals woo her in another eclogue, and Apollo, whose advances are repulsed, transforms her into a boy.

Among the distinct pastoral elements, we have an elaborate echo dialogue, in form exactly like that of Gascoigne's; and the rival song contest of shepherd and forester when they serenade Eurymine. The comic dialogues of the clowns—Joculo, the court clown, Frisco, the forester's boy, and Mopso, the shepherd's boy—furnish in addition some bits of real English rusticity. Throughout, moreover, there are many pastoral references, and the forest is obviously Arcadian.

In short, we have the pastoral element so well developed that it suggests Guarini, but on the other hand, the mythological and transformation and comic dialogue scenes, show at least a direct imitation of Lyly. The pastoral scenes, too, follow Sidney and Gascoigne, and are not very different from Lyly's. At all events, the play adds definite evidence of the use of pastoral elements in the drama, and takes its place in the development from the early forms of Gascoigne and Sidney. It shows, too, a pretty highly developed pastoral play at least five years before the *Queen's Arcadia*.

*As You Like It:* Shakspere. Entered S.R. 1602. Probably first acted in later half 1599.

Arden is a sort of Arcadia, inhabited by pastoral shepherds and court ladies in pastoral disguise. The disguised shepherdess appears also, it will be remembered, in the *Maid's Metamorphosis*. In the unrequited love of Silvius for Phoebe, in his laments and her rebuffs, we find again a distinct pastoral element. Shakspere took practically the whole of this pastoral element from Lodge's *Rosalynde*. Just as the *Shepherd's Calendar*, and the *Fairy Queen*, and doubtless Sidney's *Arcadia*, influenced the stage pastoral, so here a pastoral novel receives dramatization. Moreover, the dramatized pastoral and, in particular, the presentation of the pastoral story of unrequited love, must have already been familiar on the stage.

We shall now consider some evidences of the existence of other pastoral plays not extant, and then enumerate in chronological order all the entertainments or plays before 1605, containing pastoral elements.

*Phyllida* and *Covin*, presented at court by the Queen's men, Dec. 26, 1584.[19]

*A Pastoral Tragedy;* by George Chapman. He received £2 in earnest of a tragedy by this name from Henslow, July 17, 1599.

*The Arcadian Virgin;* by Chettle and Haughton. From Henslow's diary, we learn

19 F. G. Fleay, *Chronicle of Drama*, vol. ii, p. 297.

that the authors were advanced money on this play, Dec. 13, and 17, 1599.

Still further evidence of the existence of pastoral plays is found in Henslow's inventory of stage properties, 1598, where there is mention of "two white shepherds coats." Apart from this, there is no evidence of any pastoral play, or play with shepherds in it, performed by his company before 1598.

In *Mucedorus* (earliest known quarto 1598, but play certainly older) there is mention of "a mask of shepherds, presented by Lord Jules" (i, 1). Mr. Fleay says this mention is an addition of the 1606 quarto, and identifies it with the shepherds mask of the time of James I, but this latter he elsewhere says is Jonson's *Pan's Anniversary*, of June 16, 1623.[20] At all events the mask alluded to was probably acted before 1605.

List of Entertainments and Plays, Containing Pastoral Elements before 1605.

1573. A Mask of Wild Men at Greenwich. Fleay, *Chr.* ii, 341.
1575. Entertainments to the Queen at Kenilworth, Gascoigne. Nichols i, 436, 503, 575.
1578. May Lady at Wanstead. Sidney.
1581. (Before 84) Arraignment of Paris at court. Peele.
1582. (Before 85) Gallathea, at court. Lyly.
1582. (Before 1600) Love's Metamorphosis. Lyly.
1584. Phyllida and Corin, at court. Anonymous.
1590. (Before 1592) Midas, at court and in public (most of those court plays were probably also acted on public stage by children's companies). Lyly.
1591. Wild Man at Cowdray.
1592. Entertainment to the Queen at Bossans. Nichols iii, 135 seq.
1592. Two Entertainments at Sudeley. Nichols iii, 137 seq.
1590-95. A Woman in the Moon, at court. Lyly.
1597 (?) (Before 1631). Amphrisa, the forsaken shepherdess. Heywood.
Before 1598. Some play by Henslow's company with two shepherds in it.
1599. A Pastoral Tragedy, public. Chapman.
1599. The Arcadian virgin, public. Chettle and Haughton.
1599. As You Like It, public. Shakspere.
1597-99. Revival of Love's Metamorphosis and probably other of Lyly's plays.
In or before 1600. Maid's Metamorphosis, public. Anonymous.
1600-1. A Dialogue between two shepherds. Entertainment to the queen. Countess of Pembroke.
1603. A Complaint of Satyrs against Nymphs. Entertainment to Queen Anne. Ben Jonson.
Before 1605. Mucedorus, with the mask of shepherds.
Before 1606. *Pastor Fido*, performed at Cambridge University. Nichols. Progresses of James I, vol. i, p. 553.

This list is enough to convince one that the pastoral had wide vogue as a dramatic form. From 1573 on, it played a part in pageants; and from 1580 on, it played a part on the London stage. In London it was represented by at least three companies, the Paul's boys and their successors, Henslow's company and Shakspere's. Indeed, we can hardly doubt that if we had the evidence of the other companies which we have of Henslow's, we should have still further proof of the prevalence of the pastoral drama.

One other important fact is brought out by this list, the popularity of the pastoral plays 1597-1600. During this period Lyly's *Love's Metamorphosis*, and probably others of his plays, were revived by the children of the chapel. At Henslow's theatres, there were several pastoral plays, and at the Globe, *As You Like It.*

The pastoral play was, then, certainly common and popular, though not completely developed. Our evidence is, however, sufficient to enable us to define the general type with some exactness.

The scene is in Arcadia, sometimes explicitly stated as in *Gallathea* and *Love's Matamorphosis* and sometimes only implied. In all cases, however, the action takes place in a forest and its environs. Shepherds and sometimes shepherdesses appear as inhabitants of this Arcadia; sometimes these are of Arcadian origin, sometimes as in *Maid's Metamorphosis* and *As You Like It*, people of the court also appear in shepherd's guise. Foresters, usually in rivalry

20 Cf. *Cronicle of Drama*, vol. ii, p. 344; and vol. ii, p. 14.

with the shepherds, nymphs, magicians, and various gods and godesses also appear among the dramatis personae.

The main story of the pastoral portion of the play is always one of unrequited love. The importunate suitor and the cruel or indifferent maid appear over and again. Sometimes the complication of love affairs results, as in *Gallathea* and *As You Like It*, in something like the love-chain of the later pastoral.

The chastity motive is rarely absent. The chastity of maids in resisting the overtures of amorous gods, the rejection of lovers because of a preference for the virgin state, the divine nature of this virginity—these are favorite subjects.

Among the scenes and situations used we have found hunting scenes, echo dialogues, song contests, rival discussions of a hunter's and a shepherd's lives; writing verses on a tree, the celebration of a festival by the nymphs, the proposed sacrifice of a virgin, the transformation of a maiden to a tree, most of which have been used more than once in the plays discussed. In these scenes, then, the pastoral drama of Daniel and Fletcher was surely forestalled in the use of much of its material.

The satyr appears only once in the plays and is then a merry fellow, Joculo, not far removed from the faun-like satyr of the entertainments. The motive of crude, ungoverned lust hardly appears at all except in the pursuer of Fidelias in *Love's Metamorphosis* and in the amours of the gods.

This pastoral drama is interwoven with a sort of mythological spectacle. Many of the mythological scenes as the transformation scenes, the embassy to an oracle, and the presence of Diana, Pan, Apollo, and nymphs, are closely connected with the pastoral scenes. In general, however, anything from classical mythology seems to have been thought a fit companion for the pastoral. On the other hand, contemporary satire and bits of native comedy, were often introduced into the Utopian Arcadia.

So much for the characteristics of the pastoral drama before 1605; that it owed much to the Italian drama cannot be doubted, but the exact nature of its indebtedness is a question I cannot pretend to discuss. It was also directly influenced by the non-dramatic English pastorals. The influence of the *Shepherd's Calender*, the *Faery Queen*, and Lodge's *Rosalynde* have been noted; and Sidney's *Arcadia* doubtless served to increase the vogue of the dramatic pastoral. That the influence of the Italian drama was equally direct is possible enough; but as in the entertainments, so in the plays, there is no sure evidence of a use of *Aminta* or *Pasto Fido*.

The inter-influence of the entertainments and stage-plays can hardly be determined from the meagre evidence we have, but taking the two together, there is certainly evidence of a direct dramatic influence on Daniel and Fletcher. Even before their time, Chettle and Haughton, Henslow's hacks, must have gone to work to compose their *Arcadian Virgin* on lines already definitely laid down by theatrical precedent. In 1599, too, when Shakespeare dramatized Lodge's novel, he must have been conscious of preparing for the stage material, already familiar there in the work of other dramatists. Surely when Daniel prepared his pastoral, he can hardly have seemed wholly an innovator; and when Fletcher brought out his *Faithful Shepherdess* on the London stage, he was only presenting in a more elaborate form a dramatic genre already well naturalized.

ASHLEY H. THORNDIKE.
*Western Reserve University.*

---

## *PHONETICS AND FRENCH LITERATURE.*

I.

A. *A Manual of Elementary Phonetics*, by A. W. BURT. Toronto: The Copp, Clark Co., Limited, 1898. 8vo, pp. v+93.

B. *Le siège de Paris:* impressions et souvenirs par Francisque Sarcey. Edited with introduction and notes, by I. H. B. SPIERS. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1898. 8vo, pp. v+188.

C. *Voltaire's Prose.* Extracts selected and edited with introduction and notes, by ADOLPHE COHN and B. D. WOODWARD. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1897. 8vo, pp. xxv+454.

D. *La question d'argent*, comédie en cinq actes par Alexandre Dumas, fils. Edited with introduction and notes, by GEORGE N. HENNING. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1898. 8vo, pp. xiii+136.

A. THE title of Mr. Burt's work, *Elementary Phonetics*, is misleading. It would imply a

publication somewhat similar to Beyer's *Französische Phonetik*, only more elementary; whereas the best and longest part of the work deals with mistakes in the pronunciation of English, phonetic descriptions of the various vocal organs being used to explain how the correct sound is made, and how mistakes can be avoided. About eight pages are devoted to the description of the human vocal organs, and to the classification of sounds, and these eight pages, which alone deal with phonetics proper, are decidedly the weakest of all. Over forty pages are devoted to the separate sounds in English, and to explanations of mistakes and of the means of correcting these errors. This part of the work is good. Finally, some thirty pages are taken up with phonetic transcriptions.

The present criticism will deal mainly with the first eight pages or so. Mr. Burt prepares the reader for this weakness in the description of the vocal organs: he writes, in his preface, that he

> "felt that his knowledge of the more scientific side of the subject was scarcely definite or accurate enough to ensure its satisfactory accomplishment."

The assistance of a friend, be he ever so efficient, will never wholly make up for any weakness in the author's own knowledge, but, by his frank admission, Mr. Burt has disarmed adverse criticism, though attention must be called to some mistakes of his.

In the plate on page i, the term "œsophagus," instead of "gullet," had better be used, so as to correspond with the description on p. 4; the glottis is not well represented, since it is supposed to be seen sideways, and the front part of the cricoid cartilage is too low to correspond with the posterior part. In the first Fig. 1 of p. ii, the vocal chords are not well represented as bands. In the second Fig. 1 on p. ii, there should be no "rings" round the windpipe, as the posterior part of the windpipe is membranous. In the second Fig. 2 the vocal chords are not very accurately drawn. In Fig. 4 the points of attachment of the vocal chords are placed too low on the thyroid cartilage. And is the epiglottis actually "attached" to the point indicated on this cartilage?

At the top of p. 4 attention is called to the necessity of breathing "so that the action of the lungs may be felt chiefly in the region of the abdomen and lower ribs," but no mention is made of the parts involved in such breathing. It would, therefore, be better to explain here the functions of the diaphram. In the second paragraph of p. 4, it is wrong to state that the glottis is "in the middle" of the vocal chords. A few lines below "sound" is an unfortunate word to use for what is produced when the vocal chords are drawn together and vibrate; "sound" is too general a term. Toward the bottom of this page it would be more accurate to say that "the epiglottis has no direct function in" English "speech," or "in the speech" of most races of men. On p. 5, l. 9, "induces the quality called nasality" had better be "induces nasality or produces nasalization." Nasality and nasalization are both caused by the passage of air through the nose, and these are two terms which should be made to express separate qualities. Is it helpful to state that the soft palate is "somewhat like an upper tongue reversed," and that the uvula "moves up and down and vibrates" in a manner "corresponding to the tongue tip?" The expression "organ of articulation," as applied to the soft palate, would be most confusing to a beginner, might even be misleading.

The chapter on "classification of speech sounds" is unfortunately worded. The author begins by saying that as "speech sounds depend upon the degree and the place of the obstruction of the breath-stream, we have two chief bases of the classification." We thus have two main classes of sounds depending on the degree of obstruction: consonants and vowels. "The classes of consonants depending upon the second basis, that is, the place of obstruction," Mr. Burt continues, "are distinguished by the name of the speech organ, or organs, mainly engaged in their articulation." He then proceeds: "Another classification of consonants depends upon whether there is a complete closure or merely a narrowing of the breath passage,"—stops and continuants. This second classification of the consonants really infringes on the classification of sounds into consonants and vowels. This produces a confusion which is somewhat unfortunate, and which might be avoided by not using

the degree of obstruction as the basis for the division of sounds into consonants and vowels, since there is no actual "obstruction" in the production of vowels. While the present classification would be intelligible to an experienced phonetician, it must tend to bewilder the beginner.

The introduction of the tongue into the classification on p. 6 is also confusing. If the "tongue" is the principal articulating organ for *t*, *d*, etc., why should it not be for *k*, *g*, etc., also? Or if the "soft-palate" is the "principal organ engaged in the articulation" of *k*, *g*, why should not the alveolars be the principal organs for *t*, *d*? The explanation of voice is found on p. 7, when it should have been given on p. 4, in connection with the function of the vocal organs. The following sentence, on p. 8, had better be worded differently: "change in length is almost invariably accompanied by a difference in the degree of tension of the speech organs." This statement is correct enough for English and kindred languages, but is not quite true if applied in a general way. This sentence might read, "change in length may be accompanied," etc. The following statement, on p. 9, is open to objection:

"Absolute pitch seems to depend upon the reverberation of the sound in the resonance chamber formed between the place of articulation and the outer opening of the mouth."

The rear chamber must also be taken into consideration.

From the ninth page on, the author is at his best, and his description of various mistakes of pronunciation is useful; but, as stated above, such discussions do not come under the domain of phonetics, as scientifically understood. Phonetic phraseology is employed in calling attention to these common mispronunciations, but such use of this phraseology scarcely warrants the book's title—*Elementary Phonetics*.

On p. 17 *r* is said to induce the loss of the "front vanishing sounds" of *ij*, *ei*, *ou*, *uw*; on p. 18 the statement is made that *r* changes *i:* into *ij*, *o:* into *ou*, *u:* into *uw*. These statements seem contradictory. In the sixth paragraph of p. 18 "to omit a vowel" might be better than "to omit a syllable." On p. 25 read "the inherent pitch of vowels" instead of "the pitch of vowels," as any musician, without the aid of "acoustical instruments," can tell the musical pitch, what is ordinarily called simply the pitch, of vowels.

In the last chapter, on "laws of expression and phonetic syntax," phonetics and rules for correct expression are somewhat mixed, not however in any disagreeable manner, but sufficiently to make this work one on correct pronunciation and expression rather than one on elementary phonetics. The remarks in this chapter are carefully made, and the comparison between the various English speeches—pure English, Canadian English, American English, etc., will prove useful to the reader. These comparisons are also numerous in the middle part of this work, in the chapters on the articulation of consonants and vowels.

This publication closes with nine selections in phonetic script, which seem to be carefully prepared. There is a "general index of words spelt phonetically in part i."

With the exception then of the first part, which treats of the science of phonetics, this work will prove attractive to its readers, and useful to those who will take the trouble to study it as it deserves. Being so full of phonetic expressions and spellings, it may also be useful in inducing its readers to examine for themselves, and scientifically, that branch of investigation which is commonly called "phonetics." Judged as a work on elementary phonetics, it may not be a complete success, but judged, in spite of its title, from a more just standpoint, it is a publication of decided merit.

B. Francisque Sarcey's description of the siege of Paris, and of the life in that city both before and during the siege, is most interesting and, as the editor says, is "particularly adapted to supply . . . the increasing demand . . . for reading matter in the modern languages that shall not be fiction." This "increasing demand" is not supposed to mean that fiction should be entirely eliminated from Preparatory Schools, but that the texts read should not be altogether confined to fiction. The editor has abridged the original text and has accomplished this rather difficult task with success.

Mr. Spiers' plan of collecting

"all the brief comment's of persons and places in a separate alphabetical list at the end of the volume where they can be readily referred to at any time,"

is excellent and could be followed with advantage by other editors. As a result of this plan the notes contain, beside "helps on points of language," only the "explanations of historical matter not connected with any one person or place."

Another point that might be mentioned here is the publishers' plan, used in all the texts of this firm, of indicating by numbers, in the text itself, the forms which are explained in the notes. If a student *knows* that a word is explained in the notes he will examine this explanation; otherwise unless more painstaking than the average pupil, he may miss some important explanation. This plan evidently could be followed only in those texts where the notes are comparatively few in number.

Two maps are given: one of northern France, the other of Paris and its surroundings. Both should mention the relative size of the plan, so that students may be enabled to judge of the distance between various places. In the map of Paris an explanation might be given of what the shaded portion represents.

P. 12, 11:[1] an explanation of the formation of *morblots* might be given. P. 27, 4: the word *humus* might be explained, and also the expression *il ne sentait de guère* (p. 43, 16), as well as *boréenne* in the compound *hyperboréenne* (p. 118, 6), *gaver* (p. 123, 20), and *astiquage* (p. 127, 29). A note on the *Hôtel de Ville* (p. 152, 17) would not be amiss. It may be better to explain too few than too many forms, but as the editor is preparing this text for comparative beginners, those words might be explained which are not found in the average small dictionary.

As to the notes, have not the English the same expression as the French *brûler ses vaisseaux* (p. 3, 1)? P. 6, 1: is this English rendering the most accurate? P. 14, 5: this note is not necessary. P. 52, 3: has not "fire-eater" a somewhat different, more vehement, meaning than *un brave à trois poils?* P. 62, 1: "Coryza" is an English as well as a French term. P. 73, 1: had the word "weather" better be introduced into this translation? It would not be used in rendering into English, even literally, the expressions *faire du vent*, *faire du soleil*, etc. P. 101, 1: "Green-room" is not the only rendering of *foyer*, and may not perhaps be the best here. P. 110, 1: might not "dog" be better here than "horse?" P. 115, 2: *écoles* means "schoolings," or "lessons," rather than "blunders;" at least, the former translations seem to be nearer the original. P. 134, 2: is "barge" ever used in America to mean *tapissière?* P. 143, 1: does the "saloon-keeper" represent a French institution? Would it be a good rendering of *marchand de vins?*

Mr. Spiers' notes are carefully prepared and his edition of *Le Siège de Paris* deserves a place in the curriculum of the schools and colleges of America.

C. The review of this edition of Voltaire's prose must needs be brief, on account of the very excellence of this work and of its acceptability to instructors in charge of advanced classes. The introduction is an ideal one for students, and the notes, few of which are grammatical or syntactical, give all the information necessary to the full appreciation of the work of such a versatile writer as Voltaire. The only suggestion possible seems to be that Mr. Spiers' plan, carried out in his edition of *Le Siège de Paris*, had better have been followed. In other words, an alphabetical list of persons and places would be more convenient than the scattered remarks contained in the notes. This plan of Mr. Spiers' deserves the consideration of editors of advanced texts, especially when reference to men and places is frequent, and when such reference is of importance to the proper understanding of the subject-matter.

The editors do not consider Voltaire so much a literary man, as a man whose influence is felt in the "facts and relations of life." They have, therefore,

> "endeavored to select extracts that will enable the reader to understand what Voltaire achieved. Their purpose has not been purely, nor even mainly, literary."

Owing to Voltaire's immense correspondence, only a few of his letters have been given in the present edition, but the editors propose issuing an additional volume of *Extracts from Voltaire*, chosen altogether from his *Correspondance*, and the excellence of their work induces Modern Language instructors to hope that their good intentions may soon materialize.

D. One of the best of the recently edited

[1] The printer's errors have been noted by the publishers.

French texts in America is Mr. Henning's *La question d'argent*, by Alexandre Dumas, fils. The introduction, covering some eight pages, is exactly what is needed by the average American student. If introductions can be divided into two classes, the stimulating and the exhaustive (too frequently the exhausting), then Mr. Henning's would be classed among the former. All the minute facts of the author's life, all the dates and particulars so dear to a certain set of annotators, are conspicuous by their absence in this editor's introduction, and instead are found a few pages of matter which touch on the various social and literary influences in Dumas' life in such wise as to prove a veritable stimulant to the student's mind, inducing in it a desire for a further acquaintance with the life and writings of this clever "dramatist and moralist." The play itself is well adapted to class-room work, and will prove interesting to second and third-year students. The notes are as well prepared as is the introduction, and form the close of a publication which must be acknowledged much more satisfactory than are a number of recent texts.

A statement of the mutual relation of the different characters, on p. xvi. would prove helpful. There are very few misprints in the text. Read *avez* for *avec* (p. 8, 10). It might, perhaps be well to explain in a note the *ç*, on p. 18, 28. The rather peculiar use of *beaucoup* on p. 19, 4 might be noted. *Si* (p. 61, 4) had better be explained. The possible criticisms on the notes are not many, and are nearly all unimportant. The wording of the notes on pp. 9, 2 and 74, 2 might be changed, as the average student would hardly understand how *que* could "repeat" *comme* or *si*. There is a hidden meaning in *d'une grande richesse* (p. 13, 1) which could be brought out in the note. The term *écu* (p. 18, 2) is so often used to denote a five-franc piece, that it is hardly correct to say that it "commonly" today equals three francs. *Qui* (p. 22, 3) used for "what" is an old rather than an "unusual" construction; at least, it was used formerly more frequently than it is now. "It's a set price" (p. 71, 1) hardly contains the full meaning of *c'est un prix fait comme pour les petits pâtés;* in such a rendering the sarcastic turn given by *comme pour les petits pâtés* is entirely omitted. If *qu'il* (p. 87, 4) were meant for *qui*, as the note states, Mathilda would have called attention to this misspelled form, as she does with *scélérat* and *salue*, and *qu'il* would have been spelled correctly in the text, as are the above words. *Qu'il* must, therefore, represent *que+il*, used here ungrammatically. This *que* probably depends on *écrivez*, a more correct French construction requiring the subjunctive *donne* instead of the future *donnera;* the meaning would thus be *demandez à M. Jules de vous en donner*, or *écrivez-lui pour qu'il vous en donne*. Another possibility is that *que* is here used instead of *car*. *Feux de Bengale* (p. 90, 1) are not always "blue" lights. A note (p. 95, 1) on the use of *huit jours*, *quinze jours*, *une quinzaine*, might not be superfluous. It should be stated that *qui* (p. 106, 3) is more indefinite than *celui qui*, thus corresponding rather to *quiconque*.

Such are the criticisms of a text which, except for these minor faults, is unusually satisfactory.

EDWIN S. LEWIS.

*Princeton University.*

---

## *ENGLISH LITERATURE.*

*Leaves from the / Golden Legend /* Chosen by H. D. MADGE, LL.M. / With Illustrations by / H. M. WATTS. Westminster: Archibald Constable & Co., 1898. xvii–286 pp.

THIS dainty little volume is confessedly intended only to satisfy the idle and "short-minded" curiosity of the general reader. It is an effort to popularize some of the more interesting stories in the *Legenda Aurea*, and the work, from this point of view, is very well done. The (ten) full-page illustrations are pleasing. The typography of the volume is clear and correct, with here and there a slip. The selections are judicious. Indeed, one can hardly go astray in selecting stories from the *Legenda*, the paths are too well marked out. Hence we are not surprised to find Mr. Madge giving us *Barlaam and Josaphat*, *St. Brandon*, *St. Eustace*, *Sts. George* and *Alban* (being an Englishman), *Seven Sleepers*, *St. Ursula*, *Holy Cross*, etc., including nearly all the better known and more interesting legends. There are forty-four chapters in all; and Mr. Madge has had the good sense to give, in the case of really interesting stories, the complete version. But in some cases he gives only a fragment, in many only a detached miracle. In this connection we may state that it seems to us he makes an error in fusing into one chapter stories from widely separated legends, and without indicating in any way their sources; for example, in chapter forty-two, p. 361 (*Purgatory and the Dead*), the first three tales (only separated as paragraphs in the text) are from *All Souls* (Graesse's Latin ed., pp. 731–733), while the fourth is from *St. Lawrence* (*Ib.* p. 494) and in cap. 44, p. 267 (*Of Some Possessed with Devils*), the first is from *St. Ambrose* (*Ib.* p. 252), the second from *St. Elizabeth* (p. 766), the third from *St. Peter Mart.* (p. 289), and the last from *St. Dominic* (p. 475).

The text of Caxton, or Wynkyn de Worde, is used, but modernized both in spelling and vocabulary. The general character of the changes may be seen in a few lines (p. 263–4):

"And this judge took away by force three houses that were longing to the church of Saint Lawrence, and a garden of Saint Agnes, and possessed them wrongfully"=(Kelmscott ed., p. 715).

"And this judge tooke aweye by force thre howses that were longyng to the chirche of saynt laurence, and a gardyn of saynt Agnes, and posseded them wrongfully."

A goodly portion of the *Introduction*, which contains ten pages, is devoted to the life of Voragine and to a discussion of the scope of his work and its popularity, etc. On p. x we find:

"Caxton's edition [of the *Golden Legend*] with its four hundred and fourty-eight chapters is the largest, but the French version which he followed (Paris, 1480) is not far off with 440."

This is surely a *lapsus;* Caxton has two hundred and fifty chapters, and a corresponding reduction should be made in the number assigned to de Vignay. Mr. Madge is, perhaps, excusable for counting Jean Belet's so-called *Legende des saints dorés* as a "rendering" of the *Legenda;* it is really very different, as he might have learned from the notice of MS. Add. 17, 275, Brit. Mus. He is acquainted with the English prose version in Egert. MS. 876; whether he knows the other MSS. we can only guess; but he certainly was not familiar with MS. Add. 11, 565 and its incorporated English saints, since *St. Alban* and *St. Katherine* (see pp. xiv, 270, and 282) are the only ones which he thinks Caxton got from his "englysshe legende." The *Notes* (pp. 270–286) are useful and amply sufficient for their purpose, with enough learning to justify them, and enough interest to leaven the learning. The most pretentions are those on *Barlaam* (based chiefly on Zotenberg and Jacobs), *Brendon* (Wright, Zimmer, Whitly, Stokes, etc.), and *Patrick*. It is unfortunate that, in the latter, the note is far longer than the text, which is a short portion of Caxton's short legend, when he might have given us the real Purgatory story as found in the English MSS.

The book is reviewed in the *Academy*, Oct. 22, 1898.

PIERCE BUTLER.
*Johns Hopkins University.*

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### *AN INTERPOLATION IN THE TOWNELEY ABRAHAM PLAY.*

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—Among the various English Mysteries on the subject of Abraham's Sacrifice, the Broome, Towneley, and Dublin [Northampton] plays are in one respect peculiar: Deus reveals the divine purpose in the trial of Abraham. The plays, however, do not agree in representing the Godhead as impelled by the same motive.

That the monologue of 'Deus,' original in the other two, was an interpolation in the Towneley, play has been recognized before (Davidson, *English Mystery Plays*, p. 130), but its source has never, I believe, been pointed out.

The Towneley play of Abraham is written in an eight line stanza, with alternate rimes. This metrical structure is broken by the seventh stanza, which is composed of couplets riming *aa bb cc dd*.

*Deus.* "I will help adam and his kynde,
Might I luf and lewte fynd;
Wold thay to me be trew, and blyn
Of thare pride and of thare syn:
My seruand I will found and frast,
Abraham, if he be trast;
On certan wise I will hym proue,
If he to me be trew of louf."

What seems to be the source of this interpolation is found in *Le Mistère du Viel Testament*, ll. 9511–9515:

*Dieu.* "Il sera fait
Pour monstree le vouloir parfait
Que j'ay des humains rapeller
De ce lieu en ten bres faict,
Ou Adam, par son graut forfaict,
Fait tous ses enfans devaller."

Brotanek (*Anglia* xxi, 21 ff.) has recently shown with much probability that the source of the Dublin play was a French version of the Abraham story, more closely resembling the Paris Lyons recension (E.F.) than that of the *Viel Testament*. However true this may be of the Dublin play, and of the original form of the other English mystery plays on the subject, the reviser of the Towneley must have been acquainted with a similar, if not identical, redaction as that given by the *Viel Testament* (A.B.C.), for E.F. omits that portion of the *Procès de Pardis* comprised between ll. 9435–9515. Since Towneley (7) is apparently the only place in the English mysteries, on the subject of Abraham's Sacrifice when the *Procès de Paradis* is evidently a source, it is clear that the French version used by the Towneley reviser must have been different from that used by the original author.

Except in the Broome and Dublin plays no reference to Adam's Fall is found in any of the other Abraham mysteries—and in both these the references are little more than a recapitulation of biblical history sufficient to mark the condition of affairs at the beginning of the action. But the Towneley mentions Adam in two additional places. In Abraham's monologue two entire stanzas are devoted to Adam, and in l. 61 his name recurs. It may have been this dwelling on the theme that prompted the interpolation.

JULIAN HUGIENIN.
*Johns Hopkins University.*

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

**Baltimore, May, 1899.**

## *UNDERSTAND, GUESS, THINK, MEAN, SEMASIOLOGICALLY EXPLAINED.*

1. G. *verstehen* and E. *understand* have never been semasiologically explained. And yet the explanation is not far to seek. A term denoting insight, perception, understanding may primarily mean one of several things, the most common of which are: 'sharpness, keenness, acuteness;' 'grasping, comprehension;' 'separating, distinguishing.'

The last mentioned class is very numerous. Thus: Lat. *cernō* 'separate, sift: distinguish, discern,' *discernō* 'separate: discern,' Gk. *κρίνω* 'separate: judge;' Lat. *distinguō* 'separate: distinguish;' *intelligō* ('choose between'): 'perceive, comprehend,' etc. So also in Germanic. Here the usual prefixes used in expressing separation are Goth. *fair-* 'for-,' OHG. *fir-*, etc.; OE. *tō-*, OS. *ti-*, OHG. *zir-*; OS. *undar-*, OE. *under-*, OHG. *untar-* '*inter-*.'

In the sense 'between, apart,' OHG. *untar*, etc., are to be compared with Lat. *inter*, which is used in the same way, and further with Gk. *ἔντερον*, Skt. *antara-m* 'entrails.' Lat. *inter*, Germ. *under* may both go back to **n̥tér-*, while Germ. *under* 'under' pre-supposes **n̥dhér-*. I do not find that it is generally recognized that we have here two distinct words. Kluge, *Et. Wb.*5, and Brugmann, *Grd.* I², 413, compare Skt. *ádhara-*, etc., while Schade, *Wb.*, refers to Lat. *inter*, etc. Paul, *DWb.* s. v. *unter*, admits the double origin. As a prefix OHG. *untar* is equivalent to 'inter-, between, apart' more often than to 'under;' and in NHG. *unter-* is not uncommon in the sense 'inter-.' In Eng. this *under-* is probably in *undertake*, cf. Fr. *entreprendre*. Finally, the same word is in ON. *undorn* 'mid-afternoon,' OE. *undern* 'forenoon,' OHG. *uutorn* 'midday,' Goth. *undaurni-mats* 'breakfast.' Compare Lat. *inter*, *internus*. (Cf. Uhlenbeck, *Et. Wb.* s. v. *undaurnimats*.) It is also in OE. *under-wrǣdel* 'waist-band'='middle-band.'

I call attention to the following parallels: OHG. *untarbrechan*=Lat. *interrumpo; untardringen*=Lat. *interpello, interpono; untarfāhan, untarneman=intercipio; untarfallan=intercido; untarlāzan=intermitto; untarquedan, untarsagēn=interdico; untarqueman=intervenio; untarweban=intertexo; untarbintan=interjungo; untarboto=interpres*, etc. This prefix in Lat. and in Germ., from the primary meaning 'between, middle,' came to denote separation. Hence in composition it is often equivalent to 'apart, off.'

In words expressing separation the meaning 'understand' may develop in two ways; 1. 'separate:' 'distinguish;' 2. 'separate, take away, take in;' perceive.' To the first class belong Lat. *cernō, distinguō;* to the second *intelligō, percipiō*.

Of Germ. words which show this development may be mentioned (1): OHG. *untar-sceidan* 'divide, separate:' 'distinguish,' *untar-scidon* 'discern;' OE. *tō-dǣlan* 'divide, distribute:' 'discern, distinguish,' *tō-dāl* 'division, dispersion, dissension:' 'discretion;' *tō-scād* 'difference, diversity:' 'discrimination,' *tō-scādan* 'separate, disperse:' 'discern,' OHG. *za-sceidan* 'separate:' 'distinguish,' MHG. *ge-schīde* 'gescheit;' OE. *tō-syndran* 'separate:' 'distinguish;' *tō-twǣman* 'divide, separate, scatter:' 'discern;' OE. *clēofan* 'split, cleave:' E. *clever*, LG., Du. *kluftig* 'wise, clever' (cf. Kluge and Lutz, *Eng. Et.*); ON. *skilja* 'separate:' *skil* 'discernment,' E. *skill*.

To class 2. belong: OE. *under-gietan* ('get apart, take to oneself,' as *forgietan* 'forget'= 'lose'): 'understand, perceive,' *or-giete* ('able to be got out,' pre-Germ. **us-ghed̥o-*): 'clearly perceivable, manifest;' *under-niman* 'take upon oneself, undertake:' 'take in, understand,' OHG. *fir-neman* 'take away, take to oneself:' 'perceive;' *cēosan* 'choose out, find out:' 'perceive, see.'

To these we can add OHG. *fir-stantan*, MHG. *ver-stān, -stēn* 'hinder from, intercept:' ('take to oneself') 'understand, perceive, notice,' OE. *for-standan* 'obstruct, intercept:' 'understand,' MHG. *under-stān* 'undertake, take upon oneself, seize, attain:' OE. *under-standan* 'take for granted, perceive, understand.' That these words came to mean 'perceive, understand' through 'intercept, take to oneself' admits of

but little doubt. This entirely explains their origin and use. Thus OE. *understandan* 'take for granted, assume' points plainly to this origin. Notice also such expressions as *einen Wink verstehen* 'take a hint,' *keinen Spass verstehen* 'not take a joke.' It will be seen that *under-* and *ver-* have the same force in this compound. So also they correspond in OE. *under-niman* 'take in, understand' and OHG. *fir-neman* 'perceive.' As for *stān*, *standan*, that in its transitive use means 'cause to stand, stop,' and consequently gives in this compound the meaning 'intercept, seize, take.' The further development is similar to *fir-neman*. Compare also the similar force of E. *undertake* and G. *sich unterstehen*. A reference to Gk. *ἐπιόταμαι* in explaining *verstehen*, *understand* is futile, since, in any case, the Gk. word developed in meaning differently. That, if from the root *stā-* 'stand,' would give 'stand over, oversee, care for, give attention to,' hence 'perceive, know, understand.'

2. E. *guess*, ME. *gesse* is referred doubtfully by Kluge and Lutz, *Eng. Et.*, to a Germ. base **gōtisōn*. This seems quite probable. For we may derive the word from the root *ghed-* 'obtain, find, get:' Gk. *χανδάνω*, Lat. *pre-hendō* 'hold,' Goth. *bi-gitan* 'find,' etc. The word is frequently used in expressing mental activity, and occurs in fact, in the sense 'guess.' So in Lat. *comprehendō*, *apprehendō*, OE. *under-gietan* 'understand,' *andgiet* 'intellect,' *or-giete* 'manifest,' *forgietan* 'forget,' ON. *geta* 'arrive at, suppose, conjecture,' *geta* 'supposition, guess,' *gāta* 'riddle,' O. Ch. Sl. *gadati* 'guess.'

3. Goth. *þagkjan* 'think,' *þugkjan* 'seem,' *þagks* 'thank' with their congeners in Germ. are compared with OLat. *tongeō* 'think,' Praenestine *tongitiō* 'opinion.' But this brings us no further, for we know no more about the word than before. A word is not explained until we find out the origin of its meaning. Now it is certain that a word expressing mental action cannot be original as such. *Think* must have had some other meaning; it must go back to some concrete term. The primary meaning of a word for 'think' might be 'revolve, reflect; weigh, ponder; measure, meditate; regard, contemplate; reckon, calculate; value, estimate; hold; touch upon;' or a hundred other possibilities.

Therefore, in looking for the etymon of *think* we need only discover a phonetically identical word from whose meaning 'think' might develop. Such a word we have in Lat. *tangō* 'reach, arrive at, come to; touch, take hold of, handle; affect, impress.' (On the ablaut of *tangō* cf. Brugmann, *Grd.* ii, 999.) From this certainly 'think' could develop. Compare ON. *geta* 'arrive at:' 'suppose,' Lat. *apprehendō*, *comprehendō; percipio;* G. *begreifen;* E. *grasp*, etc.

The root *te(n)g-* 'come to, reach' is probably related to *teq-* 'run' and *tenq-* 'ausreichen, thrive:' Lith. *tekù* 'run,' Skt. *takti* 'hasten,' Av. *taxma* 'quick, strong,' Lith. *tánkus* 'compact,' *tenkù* 'reiche aus,' Goth. *þeihan* 'thrive,' etc. (Cf. Brugmann, *Grd.* I², 578–9.) The order of developed meanings would be: 'hasten, run; reach, come to; touch, take hold of, grasp,' etc. Compare also *teq-* 'take, get, beget' in OE. *þicgan* 'take, receive,' ON. *þiggja*, same, OHG. *dickan* 'implore,' primarily 'take hold of' (compare Goth. *ga-þlaihan* 'fondle, caress;' MHG. *vlēhen* 'entreat'), Gk. *τίκτω* 'beget, bear,' *τόκος* 'birth, child,' etc. Cf. Prellwitz, *Et. Wb.;* Schade, *Wb.* s.v. *digjan*.

With OHG. *dickan* compare OE. *þingian* 'intercede, plead, make terms with, speak,' *þingan* 'address,' OHG. *dingōn* 'plead a case, make a bargain, hire,' *ding* 'thing, meeting,' etc. Similarly Lat. *tangō* 'touch upon, treat of, handle, mention, discuss;' *petō* 'rush at:' 'beseech.'

For the development of meaning 'hasten:' 'reach, touch' compare OHG. *zilōn* 'hasten:' OS. *tilian* 'reach, acquire;' Gk. *πέτομαι* 'fly,' Lat. *petō* 'rush at:' 'fetch;' OHG. *funden* 'hasten;' *findan* 'find;' OE. *rǣsan* 'rush, attack,' *ge-rīs* 'fury:' *rīsan* 'seize.'

4. OHG. *meinen* 'meinen, denken, sagen, erklären,' OE. *mǣnan* 'mean, allude to, intend, speak of, relate, complain of,' OCh. Sl. *menja*, *mĕniti* 'meinen' cannot be directly compared with the root *men-* 'think,' if indeed they be related at all. They are rather from the root *mĕ-i̯o-*, *mī-* 'measure,' from which come the bases *moi-to-*, *moi-no-*. From the primitive root *mē-* 'measure' come similarly Lat. *meditor* 'meditate,' Gk. *μεδομαι* 'ponder, devise,' *μήδομαι* 'intend, resolve,' Goth. *mitōn* 'think.'

The root, in its simple form *mē-*, occurs in

Skt. *mā-ti*, *mi-mā-ti* 'measure,' and, in its enlarged form, *mĕ-ɫo-*, *mĭ-*, in *mí-mī-tē*, pass. *mīyá-tē* 'measure, measure off, measure through, traverse, consider, compare; measure out, allot, assign to; prepare, form; show, prove,' *mita-* 'measured out, equivalent to; moderate, scanty, small; estimated.'

The p. p. *mita-* may, to be sure, be for **mətó-*, but the meanings are what we are most concerned with now, and whether this particular form is from *mē-* or *mī-* is of little consequence. In any case a derivative of the root *mī-* would partake of its meanings and might be used in as many different senses as the parent word. It needs no proof to show that the base *moi-no-* in Germ. **mainjan* 'mean, think; tell, declare' may be a derivative of the root *mī-*, which in Skt. means 'measure, consider; show, prove.' The base *moi-no-* occurs also in Lat. *mūnus* <**moinos-* 'gift, office, duty, service, favor,' primarily 'something measured out, allotted, an allotment, portion, share;' *com-mūnis* ('sharing together'), 'common,' Goth. *ga-mains* 'sharing, common,' OHG. *gimeini* 'gemeinsam, gemein,' *mein* 'false, deceitful,' Lith. *maĩnas* 'exchange.' (Cf. Uhlenbeck, *Et. Wb.* s. v. *gamains;* Brugmann, *Grd.* I², 185.)

These words are referred by Uhlenbeck to a root *mei-*, *moi-*, Skt. *máyatē* 'exchange.' This, however, is the same root. Skt. *mī-* 'measure, measure out, compare' shows the original sense of 'exchange.' Similarly 'deceive' comes from 'compare, make like, imitate, counterfeit,' Compare also Skt. *mímītē* 'measure, compare:' Gk. *μῑμέομαι* 'imitate,' *μῖμος* 'actor;' *mimīte* 'measure off,' *mita* 'measured off, scanty, small:' *minā́ti* 'diminish, injure;' *mímītē* 'mete out, arrange, form, build:' *minōti* 'establish, build,' Lat. *moenia* 'walls,' *mūniō* 'fortify.'

The base *mei-to-*, *moi-to-* occurs in Goth. *maidjan* 'change, corrupt,' ON. *meiða* 'injure,' Goth. *ga-maips* 'frail, feeble,' OS. *gi-mēd* OHG. *gi-meit* 'foolish,' OE. *ge-mād* 'foolish, mad,' Lat. *mūtō* 'change,' Gk. Sic. *μοῖτος* 'thanks, favor,' Goth. *maiþms*, OE. *māþum* 'gift,' etc. These words are connected by Uhlenbeck, *Et. Wb.*, and referred to the same root as in Goth. *ga-mains*, etc. To these I should add OHG. *mēta*, *miata*, OS. *mēda*, *mieda*, OFrs. *mēde*, *mīde*, OE. *mēd* 'reward, pay,' pre-Germ. **mēitā-*. With this explanation they are, of course, to be separated from Goth. *mizdō*, OE. *meord*, Gk. *μισθός*, etc. At best the old comparison has never been satisfactorily explained, while this comparison explains itself.

Compare the development in meaning in the bases *mē-t-* and *mē-d-:* Gk. *μῆτις* 'wisdom, skill, craft; advice, plan, Skt. *māti-* 'measure, insight,' Lat. *mētior* 'measure, distribute, traverse, estimate, consider,' *mētor* 'measure, traverse, lay out, erect,' OE. *mǣþ* 'measure, degree, proportion, share, rank, one's due, respect, efficacy, power, capacity;' *metan* 'measure, limit, compare, traverse,' OHG. *mezzan* 'measure, traverse, allot, give, form, compose, consider, estimate,' OE. *mǣte* 'insignificant, small, few, bad,' MHG. *mūze* 'moderate,' *māzen* 'measure off, limit, diminish, make smaller, be moderate, refrain from, compare.' Cf. Prellwitz, *Et. Wb.* s. v. *μῆτις*, *μέδομαι*.

FRANCIS A. WOOD.

*Cornell College.*

## *GOETHE AND WORDSWORTH.*

I WISH to call attention to the parallelism between certain passages in Faust i, and Book iv of 'the Excursion' ('Despondency Corrected').

In 'Wald und Höhle,' which, in a position different from its present place in the poem, formed part of the 'Fragment' of 1790, Goethe's own religious nature inspires the panegyric raised by Faust to the 'Spirit Sublime,'

> Erhabner Geist, du gabst mir, gabst mir alles,
> Warum ich bat . . . . . .
> Gabst mir die herrliche Natur zum Königreich,
> Kraft, sie zu fühlen, zu geniessen. Nicht
> Kalt staunenden Besuch erlaubst du nur,
> Vergönnest mir in ihre tiefe Brust
> Wie in den Busen eines Freunds zu schauen.
> Du führst die Reihe der Lebendigen
> Vor mir vorbei, und lehrst mich meine Brüder
> Im stillen Busch, in Luft und Wasser kennen.

These verses may be said to fore-shadow Goethe's evolutionary theories; their burden, however, is a nature-worshipping pantheism. There are not wanting, in German literature of the eighteenth century, veiled allusions to the universal brotherhood of all animate creatures, from the 'Irdisches Vergnügen' of Brockes to Herder's 'die Natur'; but it remained for Goethe clearly to voice this Buddhistic, rather than Christian, notion.

In Book iv of 'the Excursion' we read:

Happy is he who lives to understand
Not human nature only, but explores
All natures, to the end that he may find
The law that governs each; and where begins
The union, the partition where, that makes
Kind and degree, among all visible Beings;
The constitution, powers, and faculties,
Which they inherit, cannot step beyond,
And cannot fall beneath; that do assign
To every class its station and its office,
Through all the mighty commonwealth of things,
Up from the creeping plant to sovereign Man. . . .

The result of intense nature-study, according to both poets, is not knowledge alone, but love, and devoutness.

Vergönnest mir in ihre tiefe Brust
Wie in den Busen eines Freunds zu schauen. . . .
. . . . . zeigst
Mich dann mir selbst, und meiner eignen Brust
Geheime tiefe Wunder öffnen sich. . . .

The 'moral' of Wordsworth's above-quoted contemplation—Wordsworth is certain not to dismiss us without one—falls in with a chief tenet of Goethean philosophy:

Such converse, if directed by a meek,
Sincere, and humble spirit,[1] teaches love;
For knowledge is delight; and such delight
Breeds love; yet, suited as it rather is
To thought and to the climbing intellect,
It teaches less to love, than to adore;
If that be not indeed the highest love.

Geheimnissvoll am lichten Tag
Lässt sich Natur des Schleiers nicht berauben,
Und was sie deinem Geist nicht offenbaren mag,
Das zwingst du ihr nicht ab mit Hebeln und mit Schrauben.

For Goethe, reverence, 'Ehrfurcht,' was the greatest among the virtues. The reverential attitude towards the sublime in all its manifestations he praised as a privilege of man:

Das Schaudern ist der Menschheit bess'res Teil.

But the seat of Wordsworth's nature-worship is, after all, the intellect. He *admires* nature, Goethe *loves* her.

---

More striking yet seems to me the resemblance of two other passages, not only in contents, but this time also in poetic technique: (Faust i, 1092–1099)

Doch ist es jedem eingeboren,
Dass sein Gefühl hinauf und vorwärts dringt,
Wenn über uns, im blauen Raum verloren,
Ihr schmetternd Lied die Lerche singt;
Wenn über schroffen Fichtenhöhen
Der Adler ausgebreitet schwebt,
Und über Flächen, über Seen
Der Kranich nach der Heimat strebt.
. . . . . .
. : . . The soul ascends
Drawn towards her native firmament of heaven,
When the fresh eagle, in the month of May,
Upborne, at evening, on replenished wing,
The shaded valley leaves; and leaves the dark
Empurpled hills, conspicuously renewing
A proud communication with the sun
Low sunk beneath the horizon.

Schröer, in his comment upon the passage from Faust, quotes a still earlier poem (of the year 1766; our passage was probably composed in 1775), wherein Goethe compares himself to a worm "der den Adler sieht zur Sonn' sich schwingen und wie der hinauf sich sehnt."

---

Oh! what a joy it were, in vigorous health,
To have a body (this our vital frame
With shrinking sensibility endued,
And all the nice regards of flesh and blood)
And to the elements surrender it
As if it were a spirit! How divine
The liberty, for frail, for mortal man
To roam at large among unpeopled glens
And mountainous retirements. . . .

Mood, thought, and expression alike bring up a recollection of Faust's words

Ach könnt' ich doch auf Bergeshöhn
. . . .
Um Bergeshöhle mit Geistern schweben. . . .

It were needless to comment upon the discursiveness of Wordsworth as compared with the terseness of Goethe.

---

The drift, too, of Mephistopheles' half-cynical counsel to Faust in the *Witch's Kitchen* (written in 1788):

Begib dich gleich hinaus auf's Feld,
Fang' an zu hacken und zu graben, etc.,

is in the same direction as the Sage's

Take courage and withdraw yourself from ways
That run not parallel to nature's course. . . . etc.

* * *

Did Goethe, then, have a shaping influence on Wordsworth?

Only a few years after the publication of the Faust-fragment we find Wordsworth spending four months in the little town of Goslar, wrestling, not very successfully, with the German language. He had gone to Germany in the company of Coleridge, who was studying "the old crazy mystical metaphysics" (Macaulay).

1 Cf. also Faust, i, 672–675.

But I do not attach much importance to that question. For the analogies cited above, and for many others, I find a satisfactory explanation in the fact that all nature-poetry in the time of the Lake School was pantheistic, frankly so in some cases, though in others under a theistic cloak (see Brandes, *Der Naturalismus in England*). In view of this, it is small wonder that Goethe's and Wordsworth's thoughts should frequently flow in the same channel.

OTTO HELLER.

*Washington University.*

## *A SOURCE FOR THE TOWNELEY "Prima Pastorum."*

THE *Prima Pastorum* of the *Towneley Mysteries* mentions through the mouth of Jack Garcio (Edition of Early English Text Society, l. 180) "the foles of Gotham." It is with no great surprise, then, that I find among the *Merry Tales of the Mad-men of Gotham*,[1] printed by W. Carew Hazlitt in his *Shakespeare Jest Books* (iii, pp. 4–5), a tale which very closely corresponds to a portion of the First Shepherds' Play. My surprise is that, so far as I have been able to discover, this correspondence has not been noticed before.

The tale (No. 1 of the *Merry Tales*) is briefly this:—A man going to market to buy sheep, meets another who tells him that he shall not bring his sheep home over the bridge. The first says he will: and they fall to quarreling "as there had been an hundred sheepe betwixt them." Thereupon a third enters with a bag of meal on his horse. To convince the quarrelers of their foolishness, he empties his meal into the river; and then tells them that there is as much wit in their heads to strive "for that they have not," as there is meal in his sack.

This in general outline is almost identical with a portion of the First Shepherds' Play. The only difference of importance is that there is no mention in the play of a bridge.

When this correspondence of the play and the tale is indicated, there is no further need to show that the story of the Men of Gotham is a source of the *Prima Pastorum*. For the mention in the play of the Men of Gotham proves at once that the Gothamites were well known when the piece was written, and excludes all possibility of the play giving rise to the tale. Thus in the First Shepherds' Play we have the earliest instance of a dramatized tale in English. Besides, we have an indication that a source may yet be found for the comedy portions of the more significant *Secunda Pastorum*.

Beyond the fact that the Tale of the Men of Gotham is a source for the comic portion of the *Prima Pastorum* in general outline, I think it probable that the tale, as it is printed by Hazlitt, is very near in phrasing to the form of the tale used by the early dramatist. I draw my inferences from the following correspondences:—

In the tale the two men meet.

"Well met, said the one to the other. Whither be yee going? said he that came from Nottingham. Marry, said he that was going thither, I goe to the market to buy sheepe."

In the play (ll. 82 ff.) the shepherds greet thus:—

*Secundus Pastor.* "how, gyb, goode morne / wheder goys thou?
Thou goys ouer the corne / gyb, I say, how!
*Primus Pastor.* Who is that? John horne / I make god a vowe!
I say not in skorne / thom, how farys thou?"

After some little conversation about the misery of life, the First Shepherd says (l. 101), "I go to by shepe." Above at the end of his first monologue (ll. 42–3) he has said,

"To the fare will I me,
To by shepe, perde."

In the tale when the two men fall to quarreling, and the sheep become real to them in their excitement, "Then they beat their staves against the ground, one against the other, as there had been an hundred sheepe betwixt them."

In the play the same number is introduced a bit earlier. Before the shepherds come to active quarreling the Second Shepherd says (l. 109),

"Not oone shepe tayll / shall thou bryng hedyr.
*Primus Pastor.* I shall bryng no fayll / A hundreth togedyr."

In the tale, when the third man had appeared,

"Help me, said he that had the meale, and lay my sack upon my shoulder. They did so; and he went to one side of the bridge, and unloosed the mouth of the sack, and did shake out all his meale into the river."

1 From an edition of 1630.

In the play the Third Shepherd says (ll. 164 ff.):—

"hold ye my mare/ this sek thou thrawe
On my bak,
Whylst I, with my hand,
lawse the sek band."

The tale goes on,

"Now, neighbors, said the man, how much meale is there in my sacke now? Marry, there is none at all, said they. Now by my faith, said he, even as much wit is in your heads, to strive for that thing you have not."

The play goes on, the Third Shepherd speaking (ll. 170 ff.):—

"Is not all shakyn owte/ and no meyll is therin?
*Primus Pastor.* yey, that is no dowte./
*Tercuis Pastor.* so is youre wyttys thyn."

The tale ends by asking, "Which was the wisest of all these three persons judge you?"

The play introduces Jack Garcio who comments thus (ll. 184 ff.):—

"Of all the foles I can tell,
ffrom heven unto hell,
ye thre bere the bell."

The few specific differences of the play from the tale are so slight as further to show that the source of the play-wright was in nearly the same form as the tale printed by Hazlitt. These specific differences are three. The first is the omission in the play of the bridge. The omission may, perhaps, be safely assumed to be due to scenic difficulties. The second difference is in the quarrel, where the tale gives to the second man, the words, "If that thou make much to doe, I will put my finger in thy mouth." While in the play the threat is phrased thus by the the First Shepherd (ll. 120 ff.):—

"Knafe, hens I byd flytt/as good that thou do,
Or I shall the hytt/on thi pate, lo,
Shall thou reyll."

The third difference is when the third person arrives. The tale says "Another man of Gotham came from the market." But in the play the Second Shepherd says (ll. 125 ff.),

"here comys slaw-pase
ffro the myln whele."

The likenesses do not prove that the tale used by the play-wright, and the tale printed in 1630, are identical. But they, together with the differences, which, beside the general expansion of dialogue and dramatic treatment, are very slight, seem to make it probable that the two forms are nearly alike. If this could be proved true, it would show that the tale of the Men of Gotham had assumed a definite form as early as the last half of the fifteenth century, when the Towneley MS. was written.

It is, perhaps, worth noting that the story as it occurs, No. xxiv in *A Hundred Merry Talys*, edited by Dr. Herman Oesterley, London, 1866, from the edition of 1526, is not so close to the play, as the tale I have already examined. The differences are fundamental: for to mention no others, the tale of 1526 does not suggest that the sheep become really present to the heated imaginations of the disputants. Furthermore, it says that the men fell "to buffetys, that eche one knokkyd other well about the heddys wt theyre fystys;" while in the play, and the tale of 1630, the disputants never actually come to blows.

HORACE A. EATON.
*Cambridge, Mass.*

## *BRANDL'S SUPPLEMENT TO DODSLEY.*

*Quellen des weltlichen Dramas in England vor Shakespeare:* ein Ergänzungsband zu Dodsley's *Old English Plays*. Herausgegeben von ALOIS BRANDL. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner 1898 (*Quellen und Forschungen*, No. lxxx). 8vo, pp. cxxvi+667. Price 20 m.

THE idea and the general plan of this work are excellent, and the republic of letters is under great obligations to Prof. Brandl for carrying through so laborious an undertaking, and for making easily accessible so many historically important plays from the exceedingly important transitional period just preceding Shakspere. A few of the pieces included in this volume, such as *Pride of Life*, *Mankind* (to be found in Prof. Manly's recent work), *Johan Johan*, *Respublica*, *King Darius*, and *Horestes*, were to be found, generally in very limited modern reprints. The rest have never before been reprinted. The morality of *Nature* is here for the first time reproduced; the three plays of John Heywood given are all of that author's strictly dramatic works of unquestioned ascription not previously reprinted; *Misogonus*, printed from the Duke of Devonshire's manuscript, has never before seen the light, and proves to be a historical treasure and

the most valuable item in the volume; *Gismond of Salern*, I believe, has also been printed by Mr. Gollancz, although his edition I have not been able to find; while *Common Conditions*, the last play in this collection, is in modern type a novelty, and is also of considerable historical interest. The others from this period which have escaped the zeal of the present editor and of Messrs. Bullen, Hazlitt, Collier, and Halliwell-Phillips, and are still unedited, are mostly of little value and can well await their turn. Two or three of them indeed, including the pre-Shaksperean *Richard II* and the morality of *Marie Magdalene*, are already in the hands of editors. This generation is doing its full share in the accumulation of materials for the coming history of the English Drama.

The plan of Prof. Brandl's volume, as I have said, is excellent. As to its execution, in all its parts, the same cannot be said. It is indeed much better than the work of Hazlitt or of almost all other English editors. The Introduction is full of suggestive, if not always indisputable, generalization. Questions of provenience, date, authorship, analysis of plot, sources, language, versification, and stage presentation, in each play receive abundant attention. Questions of sources and literary affiliations probably receive more thorough treatment than any others. The general groupings proposed for the dramas of the period are very convenient. The main groups suggested are as follows: 1. The Death and Judgment Group; 2. The Death and Mercy Group; 3. The World and the Deadly Sins Group—these three for the Moralities; 4. The Interludes and Disputation-pieces; 5. Polemical Dramas of the Reformation including (a) Bale and his School, (b) Lyndsay and his School; 6. School Dramas; 7. Early Tragedy; 8. Early Romantic Comedy. Prof. Brandl's main error is in apparently not recognizing the fact that any grouping of plays so diverse in character is necessarily tentative and partial. Minor points in common there are enough in the plays within each of his groups; and the analogy of motif to the *Ship of Fools* in one, or to the *Battle of the Virtues and Vices* in another, is sufficiently suggestive and suggested. But the contention that there was direct dependence on a common model throughout does not seem to be entirely substantiated in all his cases. In the question of stage presentation, moreover, the editor's discussion offers much that is very questionable with much that is original and valuable. In this as in some other topics, Prof. Brandl has perhaps been too ambitious of immediate results. A more thorough investigation of these matters is demanded before we can safely generalize. I add below queries on some particular points in the Introduction which seem to need further consideration.

The texts themselves, so far as I have been able to test them, are generally good, although not all of the same degree of excellence. Occasionally the proof-reading has been a little careless, especially in the matter of punctuation, so that in a number of cases in this way the meaning has been entirely obscured or perverted. The notes are either too many or too few, and seem too frequently ill-considered. A great many points are passed over which are of equal obscurity with those of which the explanation is attempted.

Page xx: It is difficult to understand from lines 9, 109 ff., 269, and 474 of *Pride of Life*

> ("Nou stondit stil & beth hende" . . . .
> "Nou beit in pes & beit hende
> & distourbit no ȝt oure place" . . . .
> "li ȝtly lepe oure þe lake" . . . .
> "Pes & listenith to my sawe
> . . . . be ȝe neuer so bolde.")

how Prof. Brandl can bring himself to infer that "der Spielplatz sei dagegen durch einen Graben geschützt gewesen." This is one of many instances relating to matters of the stage in which the editor's imagination seems to run away with his judgment. The collateral evidence from Sharp and others cited to support this theory rests on an entirely different basis.

P. xxi: The reference to Scaliger's *Poetices* should be to "Lib. 1, Cap. 21." The quotation is not very accurately given.

P. xxxii: "Die Vorderbühne heisst *deambulatorye*" . . . . "Hinterbühne heisst *cryke*, war also ein dunkler Raum," etc. This by way of comment on lines 830 ("Ryse now and go wyth me in this deambulatorye") and 763 (. . . . my [ny=nigh?] dede in þe cryke") of *Mankind!* How can these passages be taken to refer to the stage as such? And what is the editor's interpretation of *cryke?* Is it, per-

haps, connected with the "Graben" and "Wassergraben" of the previous discussion? But then how "ein dunkler Raum?"

Pp. xxxiii, xliv: For the date of printing of *Nature* 1538 is conjectured. The *Dict. Natl. Biog.* conjectures 1510–20. For the date of composition "before 1500" is usually assumed, on the ground that the piece was written by Henry Medwall, chaplain to Cardinal Morton (the latter died in 1500), and from line 1438 (at end of part 1: . . .

"there ys myche more of thys processe, wherein we shall do our besynes . . . To shew yt vnto you after our guyse; whan my lord shall so deuyse, I shal be at hys pleasure")

it is supposed that the performance took place before the Cardinal. The evidence is somewhat uncertain, but in default of better may stand. Medwall lived on into at least the second decade of the sixteenth century, and in 1516 another piece of his, now lost, was produced before the king. The style and diction of *Nature* seem rather to place it after 1500 than before, but perhaps it was revised before publication. It is a very tedious piece, but shows some advance in handling dialogue, and in conceiving comic situations. Coarseness beyond even the Elizabethan wont disfigures this and many of the plays in this volume.

P. xxxvii: The statement that lines 835 f. of *Nature* are "die ersten Sätze in ungebundener Rede im englischen Drama" should inspire some investigator to seek for some still earlier specimen. The statement seems hazardous.

P. xli: *The Four Elements*, it is suggested, is a direct imitation of *Nature*. This seems improbable, for the fundamental motives in the two pieces are different; in one the praise of learning and "many proper points of philosophy natural," in the other the familiar morality story of the progress of man subjected to the temptation of the world's vices. "Nature" seems to be an essentially different conception in one from the other.

P. xlviii: I wish that Prof. Brandl could have found room for the interesting Disputation-piece *Of Gentylnes and Nobylyte* (c. 1535), which is often ascribed to Heywood. A reprint edited by J. H. Burn appeared in 1829, but of only twenty-three copies. The British Museum copy of the original unfortunately is partly in fac-simile. There is also a copy in the Bodleian (Ashmole 1766; old mark Ashm. E. 38). "Two leaves of a Morality by Heywood," entered in the B. M. catalogue (C. 39 R) I find are from this dialogue.

Pp. liv–lv: What is the evidence for the statement that the *Pardoner and the Friar* "spielt in einer Kirche?" Simply because the disputation is *imagined* as taking place in the curate's church? How far are we to go then with this manner of reasoning?

How much "Decorationswechsel" there was on the stage before Shakspere is a highly interesting question; but nothing can be inferred from the use of the name "The Curtain" in 1576, for the second London theatre, which was so-called because the ground on which it was built had long borne that name—presumably derived from low Latin *curtina*, a little court, as Mr. Symonds suggests (*Shakspere's Predecessors* 277; cf. also Halliwell-Phillipps, *Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare*, seventh ed. i 364).

P. lxxvii: Was *Misogonus* the play performed 31st December, 1559, and stopped as offensive to the Queen, as Mr. Fleay conjectures? The probable date of the play agrees well enough, but so far as I can see neither the analysis in Collier nor the complete play as here presented show "ample reason for the Queen's offence;" for the virgin Queen on other occasions bore without blushing even greater coarseness than *Misogonus* contains. Prof. Brandl's objection, however, that the term "sport" could hardly be applied to this play is not well taken. Our ancestors freely applied that and similar terms to many a far more "frommes Stück" (see p. lxxviii) than this; and the parts of Cacurgus and the rustics are, even to moderns, sufficiently diverting.

The question of the authorship of *Misogonus* is an interesting puzzle. The name of Laurentius Bariœna with the date "Ketther-ringe Die 20 Novembris Anno 1577" appears on the title page of the MS. Was "Bariœna" author, transcriber, or owner of the MS.? And is "Bariœna" really a name, either proper or common? Is the word an anagram? Doubtless the latter and standing for Johnson, as Prof. Kittredge has so ingeniously demonstrated (see his letter to the *Nation* of March 16, 1899,

p. 202). For the personal history of "Lawrence Johnson" see further the letter of Prof. Kittredge just referred to. The prologue is signed "Thomas Rychardes." Was the latter also author of the entire play, as Prof. Brandl and Collier believe? This seems highly improbable, because of the allusion to "our author" in line 24, which Prof. Brandl apparently overlooks. The whole question is involved in a further complication which Prof. Brandl ignores in both Introduction and text. On the original MS. under the name of Thomas Rychardes is written in another hand and in a lighter ink the words

Thomas Warde
Berfold * 1577.

I submit the conjecture that Thomas Warde was the owner of the MS. in 1577; that Thomas Rychardes was the author of the prologue and translator and adapter of the entire play from some Latin or Italian source as yet unknown, inserting very freely from his own invention most of the low comedy scenes with their marked English flavor; and that "Laurentius Bariœna" or Johnson was either only a transcriber or another owner of the MS.,—probably the latter. It is noteworthy that the division of scenes in the play is after the continental rather than the English manner; that is, a new scene is marked whenever an important character comes on the stage. For the date, the diction as well as most of the allusions corroborate the conjecture of circa 1560. Page 426, line 148, "with conscience and dewty and lawes of the kinge," however, seems to contradict this, and to conflict with 437, line 1, "stay, 'ith quenes name."

Pp. lxxxv–vi: Again the whole question of what may be fairly inferred as to scenery and properties from references in the dialogue comes up:

"At yone same turrit which you see is your father's place"—must we infer from this that a "gemalte Façade" representing this "turrit" stood on the stage? Or was it not probably all imagined, as we know was more often the case on the later Elizabethan stage? A thoroughgoing history of English stage-craft down to the Restoration, which will do for the English theatre what the recent work of Germain Bapst (*Essai sur l'Histoire du Théatre*, Paris, 1893.—Cf. especially Part ii, ch. ii, on "La Scène et le Décor au xvie Siècle") does for the French, is urgently needed, before we can make definite conclusions on these and similar points.

Pp. xcvii f.: The editor gives British Museum MS. Lansdowne 786 of *Gismond of Salern* with reference to the versions of MS. Hargrave 205 and the edition of 1591 reprinted in Hazlitt's Dodsley, but ignores the version in Add. 34, 312 (with *Political Tracts*, etc.). This is doubtless a later version than any of the others (conjecturally about 1600, or even later), but is interesting in the whole series of English versions of the Gismonda story. It is mostly in blank verse. At fol. 139 begin

"The Actors Names
Tancred King of Salern
Ghismonda the princes, daughter to the King, & widdow to the Duke of Capua's son
Guiscardo a gentleman appoynted by the King to attend her, & of his councell
Gabriello & Pasquino } 2 courtiers
Glausamonda a Chronomasticall courtier
Mris Minks, the princes wayting woman
Embassadour from the Duke of Capua
An Executioner"

The Prologue begins:

"Ift be a fault to show you, how a story
May be preservid longer in memory." . . .

And Act I:

"Enter Gabriello & Pasquino

Gab. It cannot strike into my head, a Lady
So fresh, so fasting, plumpe, & prurient [sic]
As our great widow princes is," etc.

At fol. 153 b occurs the following passage with an attempt at a lyric, rather in the seventeenth century manner, as it seems to me:

"Embass. Douth she mourne still?
Glaus. As Cloris for Amintas.
Embass. How was that?
Glaus. Will you know in verse or prose?
Embass. Either so it be breefe
Glaus. Then you shall heare it two wayes
Musically, & wittilye yet both at once
"Cloris sate, & sitting slept,
"Sleeping sight, & sighing wept,
"And slept, & sight, & wept againe,
"For Amintus that was slayne.
"Oh, had you seene his face quoth she
"So sweet, so full of maiestye
"And then she stopt, & then she cries,
"Amintus, Amintus, & so she dies."

In Mr. J. Churton Collin's *Essays and*

* Berfold, or "Barfolde" is mentioned in line 200 of Heywood's *Play of the Wether*.

*Studies*, p. 121, the statement is made that "from such plays as Cammelli's *Pamphila*, Rucellai's *Rosmunda*, and Groto's *Hadriana*, sprang *Tancred and Gismunda*. . . ." These pieces are not considered in Prof. Brandl's discussion of the source. The statement should at least have been noticed and checked. It is important if true.

The text of the plays should have been provided by the printer with running page-heads. Without them it is difficult to find anything except by continual reference to the Table of Contents.

In the present text of *Mankind* there are numerous smaller divergencies from the text recently printed by Prof. Manly, in his *Specimens of the Pre-Shaksperean Drama*. A few of these cases I subjoin as interesting illustrations of the difficulties of manuscript interpretation.

Line 19, Brandl reads "Dyverse not yowur sylffe;" Manly, "Dyverte not;" L. 36, B. "*þe* precyose rew that runnyth;" M. "precyose reu*er;*" L. 38, B. "so nedefull to owur entent;" M. "so redefull." Prof. Brandl's note to line 80 ("Do wey, goode Adam, do wey") is curious. "*Goode adam:* die heutige Verwünschung *god dam(n)* mit euphemistischen *good* und *a* als Rest von *thee!*" Line 103, B. "how wrechys delyte in *þ*er sympull weys;" M. "*th*er synfull weys."

In *Nature* the notes should explain, among others, lines 756–7, and 827, in Part I; and in Part II line 120 ("ye hase"=*yea, has?*)

The editor's note to Part I, lines 631, 651, 675, etc., that *þe world* in the distribution of the dialogue stands for *Worldly Affection* is obviously an error as far as concerns line 675 where *Worldly Affection* is addressed by name. *The World* in parts of the scene is plainly the same character as the *Mundus* of the introductory stage-directions. Elsewhere there is evident confusion in the distribution of the parts. Line 955: it is not necessary to conjecture "fitting" instead of "syttyng." The latter form is frequent in early sixteenth century English, as later in Spenser. Compare the French idiom "il ne sied pas." In Part II, line 53, "I now" is evidently intended in the original for *enow*. So Part II, line 776.

In Heywood's *Play of Love*, line 266, what is "shorners"? Should not the word be *skorners?* Lines 395 ("nobs for malous"), 630 ("brendryd"), 984 ("euyn a water"), and 1370 ("by my sheth well ye"), call for explanation in the Notes.

In *The Play of the Wether* the notes are silent on line 898 ("nycebyceters").

*Respublica* presents a few improved readings, but otherwise very little change from Collier's text. III, iii 14, "I polde" is *polled* or *ypolled* =robbed, cheated, rather than *pulled* as the editor thinks. The notes on this play do not seem very happy. See, for example, the note to III, vi, 58!

The text of *Kyng Daryus* I have collated with a transcript in my possession, collated in turn with the original. Numerous discrepancies in the use of *i* and *y* I find in Brandl, as well as carelessness in indicating expanded contractions by italics (especially *and* for &). But the text is essentially accurate and an improvement on Halliwell's. Misplaced commas too frequently pervert the meaning. Strike out, thus, comma in line 89 after "bad"; 782 colon after "condicion"; 868 comma after "thinke." The four following corrections are from my collation: In line 738 "haste" should be printed "harte"; in 895 "Or" in place of "Oo"; in 950 "iesting" instead of "testing"; in 1149 insert "out" after "come."

I have similarly tested the first two or three pages of the text of *Misogonus* from my transcript of the prologue and a few other parts. I should say that Prof. Brandl's transcriber has depended too much upon the old transcript which is bound up with the original MS., which has many errors, as Collier says in a note inscribed upon it. The original MS. is exceedingly difficult, and many errors may be pardoned on this account. The importance of the play is such, however, that it is to be hoped that a new edition of *Misogonus* in separate form, re-collated with the original, will be undertaken before long. As it is, the present text swarms with puzzling jargon, some of it, no doubt, due to misreading of the original. See, for example, p. 474, l. 145: "Yeaue in wenye likt me; whole we your tauke, whole yow take for your paines?" Here the editor suggests a possible interpretation, but scores of other cases are left unexplained in the notes.

Examples are pp. 431,l. 48 ("buminge"); 437,l. 6 ("swibbold"); 448, l. 143 ("sland"); 467, l. 264 ("trullit"); 470, l. 59 ("mithers eft"); 472, l. 70; 473, l. 107; 476, ll. 30, 36 ("grombold"). I subjoin a few corrections, and a few suggested emendations which I have noted, selected from a longer list. A few corrections from the MS. are indicated by an asterisk.

Prologue, l. 36*, in the MS. reads "wychat" [sic] instead of "wherat"; l. 40* "wear" for "wear"; l. 41 put comma for colon after "do." At end* add name of "Thomas Warde" as noted above.

*Dele* comma p. 434, l. 17 after "knaue"; 444, l. 25 transpose comma from after "not" to after "what"; 448, l. 152 insert comma after "Soft"; 449, l. 186 insert semicolon after "borde"; and in l. 188 after "tis"; 450, l. 236 insert comma before "Jake"; 453, l. 24 insert comma after "well"; 456, l. 135 *dele* colon after "faughte"; 458, l. 15 *dele* comma after "one"; 461, l. 107 *dele* semicolon after "far" (=farther) and for "how" read "thow"; 464, l. 178 *dele* comma after "both"; 465, l. 214 *dele* colon after "talkest"; 467, l. 265 insert semicolon after "somewhat"; 473, l. 88 transpose comma from after "dout" to after "can"; 476, l. 30 insert comma after "the" (=*thee*); so l. 33 after "the" (again =*thee*); 483, l. 7 *dele* commas after "what" and "somere", and interrogation point after "here."

I, ii 24 "his none sonne" is *his own son*, and not "sein nicht-Sohn" as the editor thinks; l. 50 "I hate everye white"=*I ha' it every whit.*

I, iii 12 "A moringe lighte one that foules face of thine!" is obviously 'A murrain light on that fool's face of thine.' Can Prof. Brandl be serious in his note: "*moringe=mooring:* ein Kettenanker (nicht bloss eine Klinge) soll dir in dein Narrengesicht fahren!"? The note on ll. 47–48 is almost equally curious.

I, iv 17 "knaue an grane" is *knave in grain*, and grane does not "=*Gabelzinke.*"

II, i 20 "fall in a fime"=*fall into a fume*, and not 'foam' at all; l. 32 "cosiner" does not =*customer;* l. 47 "with a wilde" is probably 'with a will' rather than 'with a wile'; l. 64 "will you never hinn?" should probably read "will you never linn" or perhaps "blinn", that is, cease.

II, ii 54 "stie" probably should be "stir".

II, iii 49 read "you Jack-sauce."

II, iv 8 for "tickes" read "t[r]ickes"; 65 "pu*t*es it in sure" is probably meant for "puts it in ure" that is, in use; 96 for "thie" read "th[r]ie"; 105 the simple stage-direction "quater"=four times (that is, repeat four times) is misunderstood and interpreted with superfluous ingenuity by the editor; 159 for "beat*es*" read "beat *us;*" 202 "gree groat"=*gray groat* and not "(de)gree groat=Preisgroschen;" misapplied ingenuity is shown in the (unnecessary) explanation of "saunce bell;" 212 "bonably"=*abominably(?);* 245 "Ile patert"=*I'll patter it(?);* 289 "Houle laughe"=*who will laugh*, rather than *ho, we will laugh.*

II, v. 32 "pild" is misinterpreted (cf. "polde" of *Respublica* III, iii, 14); 46 for "manger" read "mauger"; 53 "gitt"=gi' it, that is, give it; 60 "couck stole" of course is for *cucking-stool* and nothing other.

III, i, 19 read "one" for 'once'; 51 I strongly doubt the editor's explanation of "who-chittals"; 63 "cagin" is rustic for 'occasion' and not from "*cag=kränken*"; 68 "gouse" is surely misinterpreted; 165 I suspect that "loue" should be "loule", for *louely.*

III, ii, 16 for "It" read "I"; 23 presents us Lyly's "cooling card" long before either Greene or *Euphues;* 67 "fett"=feat(?).

III, iii,6 "sposation"=rustic for 'deposition'; 19 read "spea[chifye]" rather than *spea[cifye];* 72 "good land" like "land's sakes" is still good colloquial English and can hardly be derived from *la(diki)n* even with the help of marks of parenthesis; "laud" in IV, iii, 1 and 13, should probably read "land", as here; 85 "A taukes so father millerlye" (with excision of the editor's comma after "so") is, I take it, rustic for "he talks so familiarly," "millerly" does not "=of my lady" (save the mark!); 87 It is a reach of subtlety beyond my imagining to grasp how the editor sees in "bedewoman" the meaning "Gebetsweib" conjoined with that of "Bettweib"; here the editor is more "komisch" than the author, who usually does not omit such opportunities; 115 "*saft=safely*, eine Betheuerung"—Nego.

IV, i 21 "Whale" is not "statt *hail*," but a contraction for "what will ye," as the context shows; 46 "logetes wones"='logic once,' and not *logicians;* 98 "ye mist cushinge"=*you missed the mark* (*cushion*)—with no possible

reference to a "Polstertanz"; 125 "vmbert" is surely misinterpreted by the editor; so is "wo" in l. 148, which should be perhaps 'mo'; 133 for "we" perhaps read "wer[e]"—"clementid"= St. Clement's tide.

IV, ii, 6 read "Stand out of my wayy, halter," "nakte"=naked; 33 "hennardly knaves" is possibly mis-read or mis-written for "kowardly", *h* for *k* and *uu* for *w* are not infrequently mistaken.

IV, iii, 26 "peke pies" I suppose=*pick pease;* 76 "this geare will not coten"=*cotton*, and not "*cote=vorwärts geheu.*" Halliwell, Nares, or almost any glossary would have helped the editor out on this word. Cf. (from Nares) *B. & Fl., Mous. Thomas* IV, viii "This geer will cotton," or see in Brandl p. 611, l. 363 "Now this geare cottons," as well as p. 622, l. 679 "this greare coctes" which doubtless should be "this geare cottons."—And so ends this strange eventful history of *Misogouus!*

*Horestes* I have compared throughout with my collated copy of Collier's reprint. The text is an improvement on Collier's, but is marred by faulty punctuation, which in many cases quite spoils the sense. Corrections derived from my collation are marked by an asterisk. L. 15* insert "to" after "thynges"; 91* *dele* c in "schowe"; 101 "Sought"= *soft;* 161* read "bownes" instead of "bewnes"; insert interrogation point at end of l. 198*; 229* insert comma after "kinge"; 234 "Meros" is rather a misprint for "Minos" than "Mors"—but perhaps quite right as it stands=μέρος= destiny; 251* read "we" for "me"; 282* *dele* comma after "straight"; 333 insert comma after "newse" and *dele* after "ist"; 390 substitute comma for colon after "grote"; 505 insert comma after "grace"; 522 *dele* commas after "Protegeus" and "kinge"; "lykenes"=likens; 528 add commas after "world" and "knowe"; "scoll"=*school;* 684 perhaps read "*f*tey" instead of "fley"; 698 *dele* comma after "the"; 836 *dele* comma after "prouide"; 954* read "so" instead of "to"; 996, 1000, 1012 *dele* commas within the line; 1016 *dele* comma after "craue"; 1055 *dele* comma after "clothes"; 1118 *dele* comma after "intend"; 1136 insert colon after "consyst".

*Gismond of Salern* III, ii, 34 for "streaue" read "streame": V, iii 37 *dele* comma after "secretely".

*Coumou Couditious* l. 363 insert comma after "cottons"; so in l. 693 after "awaie"; 768 for "a baste" read "avast" (a mariner's term); 845 read "the[e"] in place of "be"; 1091 *dele* comma after "self" and add comma after "matched"; 1095 *dele* comma after "For"; 1110 for "it" read "yet"; 1149 transpose interrogation mark to follow "herein"; 1161 "barlakyng"=*by our ladykiu;* 1174 "a napell a nan"=*an apple anou.*

These are but a part of the corrections I have noted. It is evident that sufficient care has not been given to the printing of the texts, and that the notes should either have been omitted altogether or made much better. The many who have profited by Prof. Brandl's work in other fields must deeply regret that he allowed such work as the Notes to this volume to appear with his signature.

FREDERIC IVES CARPENTER.
*University of Chicago.*

---

## *FRENCH LITERATURE.*

(Conclusion.)

E. *La main malheureuse*, anonymous, with complete and detailed vocabulary, by H. A. GUERBER. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1898. 8vo, pp. i+106.

F. *Le chieu du capitaine*, par Louis Énault. Edited with notes and vocabulary, by C. FONTAINE, B.L., L.D. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1898. 8vo, pp. iv+142.

G. *La fille du député*, par Georges Ohnet. With notes by GEORGE A. D. BECK. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1898. 8vo, pp. v+204.

E. MISS GUERBER is singularly happy in her selection of stories. Her two volumes of *Contes et légendes* contain charming tales for beginners, the first volume being ideal for children, omitting as it does the foolish, more than childish, stories so often found in texts prepared for the youngest pupils. Her recent choice of the anonymous story *La main malheureuse* is as fortunate as her other selections. It consists of a simple story of everyday life. It is prepared mainly for beginners, as it should be, and the editress follows a plan, more or less original, of combining vocabulary and notes. A vocabulary added to a text is always

a bad thing, except from a financial point of view. If it ever approaches the stage of usefulness, it would be when it is joined to a text prepared for beginners, or rather for young beginners, for pupils who have not yet learned how to handle a dictionary of any size. In connection with a vocabulary arranged for beginners of this age, Miss Guerber's idea of introducing into it all the necessary notes, or explanations of peculiar formations, is very happy and deserves the consideration of persons wishing to edit texts of this type.

The text is, perhaps, too easy for college classes, unless used for sight-reading, in which case an introduction would enhance its present merit, and an introduction evidently not on the life and writings of its anonymous writer, but on the growth and influence of anonymous writings in France.

The following are a few suggestions as to changes that might be made in a new edition. P. 13, 19: the *boulevard de Clichy* deserves some mention in the vocabulary. P. 21, 12: the explanation of *saint Georges* had better be placed under *Georges*, rather than under the English form "St. George." P. 24, 24: a note on *Fontainebleau* would be useful, and also, possibly, one on *la rue Lepeletier* (pp. 47, 25 and pp. 60, 20). P. 50, 3: the possible modern value of an *écu* ("about a dollar," being five francs) is given in the vocabulary. In this passage the value meant is, however, in all probability, the older one of three francs, each vase costing three hundred francs apiece, or the two for five hundred. P. 50, 28: add a note on *la salle Drouot*. P. 51, 16: *grever* is translated "to break," but this is the meaning of *crever; grever* means rather "to oppress," "to burden," "to weight."

It is pleasant not to have to note in the text any misspelled words, or so-called "printer's errors," due to the editor's or proof-reader's carelessness.

A few remarks may be made on the vocabulary itself. P. 62: "Which was eked out by" does not seem the best rendering for *à laquelle venaient en aide*, and *alors même*, "even when," had better be *alors même que*. P. 64: separate in some way *au* from *aux*, as otherwise a beginner might think possible the compounds *aux-dessus* and *aux-dessous*. P. 69: *la concurrence sera chaude* does not strictly mean "will be in great demand, will be hotly disputed." P. 70: the translation of *coup d'ébauchoir* had better be given under *ébauchoir* (p. 74). P. 71: use either a different punctuation or italics, in "*dame*, f., dame, lady, exclamation, can be translated well!" P. 74: for *dû, -e* read *dû, due*. P. 76: read "to hint" for "hinted," as rendering of *donner à entendre*. P. 77: after *vous n'y êtes pas* read "you have not guessed right, you have guessed wrong," for "you have not guessed right, wrong." P. 95: add *de* after *faire part*, translated "to impart." P. 93: read *à* for *a* in *a ce point*. P. 94: change *près de* so as to avoid the possible erroneous formation *à peu près de*. P. 95: print *quelquefois* in full, so as to avoid the unusual forms *quelque fois* or *quelques fois*. P. 97: insert *de* after *se rendre compte*, if the translation "to ascertain" is to be given. It would not be needed if "to render an account" were the only rendering offered. P. 101: "corresponds to a county" is not a sufficient explanation of *sous-préfecture*. P. 103: change the construction of the English sentence under *thébaïde*: "The ruins of Thebes in Egypt which were occupied by hermits, some of them being in walled-in cities." P. 106: add *à* to *en vouloir*, translated "to owe a grudge to."

Such are the few changes to be made in a text which, in every other respect, is eminently satisfactory.

F. *Le chien du capitaine* is edited by Prof. C. Fontaine primarily for beginners, and has, therefore, very complete notes, a vocabulary, and a very short preface. There can be no doubt about the charm of this story of Énault's, but some instructors may reasonably question the wisdom of giving this text to beginners, who will have to proceed very slowly, and are in danger of finding this tale long drawn out. Beginners had better be given a story full of incident, all the pages of which are of about equal interest. *Le chien du Capitaine*, is not such a tale; an ideal story for an hour's reading, it may become wearisome if stretched over several weeks. This criticism must nevertheless be modified according to the class of students using this text. The fault lies, not with the story, but with the pupils. As to the vocabulary, it is doubtful whether its

use is advantageous to a student in our colleges. A text containing a vocabulary will sell much better than one without any. From a financial standpoint there can be no two ways of looking at the matter. From the educational point of view, however, some instructors object to a vocabulary; such instructors would rather have the student familiarize himself with one standard dictionary for all the texts.

A few important facts of Énault's life are presented in the preface. The misprints in the text proper are not many. Change the alignment of line 24 (p. 8). Print a *:* instead of the *;* (p. 10, 17). Read *été* for *eté* (p. 21, 7). *Crèvecœur* (p. 56, 21) had better be spelled *crève-cœur*. Put a comma after *considéré* (p. 67, 4). Read *mesdames* for *mesdame* (p. 72, 14). Place the reference to the note after *force* (p. 80, 8), instead of after *Sénégal*.

The notes are very thorough, and yet are not superfluous if this text be used with beginners. Is "under foot" a good translation of *dans les jambes*, on p. 1? *Mais*, in *qui n'en pouvait mais* (p. 5, 1), had better be explained more fully than it is. It is not actually necessary to supply *à rester* after *obstinée* (p. 19, 3). *Ce n'est pas tout cela* (p. 27, 3) is not quite equivalent to *ce n'est pas la question*. Might not "get off" be preferable to "come off" (p. 28, 1)? "They pull on the reins" is not quite the meaning of *ils prennent un point d'appui sur la main* (p. 35, 3). Such translation expresses only the result, not the action itself. "At a respectful distance" may, perhaps, be better than "at the same distance" (p. 52, 2). The literal translation of *file ton cable* (p. 57, 1) is "pay out your cable" rather than "let your line go." Does not *s'emporter sur la nourriture* (p. 65, 4) mean "to find fault with the food" rather than "to indulge too much in food?" On p. 96, change 70, 11, 42 to 80, 81, 82 respectively.

The vocabulary is very complete and carefully prepared. It is, in fact, better than the average vocabulary which accompanies French texts. Read *adroit-e* for *adroit, e*. *Allons* might be translated "come". Rather than translate *au* by "to the, in the," state that it is a contraction of *à le*. Insert *de* after *auprès*. Read *br-ef-ève* for *bre-f-ève*. Mention the tense of *eût*, since this is done for *fût*. Are not *le leur, la leur* found in the text? Omit the *nôtre* not preceded by the article. Read *pâtée* for *patée*. *À* had better be inserted after *faire tort*, and *de* after *faire le tour*.

The text just reviewed can be given both to beginners and to advanced pupils. The former will be abundantly helped by the notes and vocabulary, while the latter will enjoy the story itself.

G. A few remarks will be made in this review of Mr. Beck's edition of *La fille du député*, remarks which will not bear especially on the editor's own work, but rather on the general principles involved in the editing of Modern Language texts.

At the recent Modern Language Convention, held at the University of Virginia, there was presented the report of the committee appointed some two years ago to examine into the standing of French and German in the schools and colleges of the United States. In this report mention was made of the value of Modern Languages in the training of the mind, and it was stated that the mental training obtained from learning these languages should be in no wise inferior to that derived from the study of Greek and Latin. Modern Languageinstructors believe this assertion correct, but it must be confessed that this belief is based on theory rather than on practice, because most Modern Language grammars and texts are prepared in such wise as merely to make easy the student's work. In the notes of these texts constructions are translated in full which could and should be worked out with care on the part of the student himself, and the latter's mental training, in this one respect at least, is neglected. From a practical point of view, these notes may be useful; useful, that is, to one who wishes to acquire rapidly a knowledge of Modern Languages. But from the standpoint of the mind's training, these notes are positively harmful, and if ever Modern Languages are to compare with the Ancient Languages in the mental development of the student, a different type of annotation is needed. Such annotation has been proved possible by many of America's leading Modern Language editors, and what now remains to be done, is to increase the number of such editions. Texts

should be edited with the definite idea of training the student's mind, and should be prepared in much the same way as are Greek and Latin texts. The notes should rarely contain out-and-out translations of passages, but should give all the legitimate help a student may need, most frequently in the way of suggestion or grammatical reference. In this very connection, it may be stated, that it is a pity we have so many good French grammars, but no one or two better than all the others; the question of grammatical reference is, therefore, an awkward one for the Modern Language editor to solve.

Plenty of excellent texts exist for those who do not care for, or do not believe in, this mental training; and it is high time that the needs of those who do believe in such training be consulted,—be consulted, let it be said for the sake of argument, more frequently than is now done.

A few notes, taken from the present edition of *La fille du député*, will illustrate the bearing of the above remarks. But it should, however, be repeated that the illustrations are taken from this edition simply because it happens to be the one under consideration. Similar examples could be had from more than one other Modern Language text.

*C'était toujours ça de sauvé pour l'enfant* is translated "it was at least so much saved for the child," and it is stated that *ça* stands for *cela*. Supposing the student translated this sentence literally, he would get "it was always (*or* still) this of saved for the child," and from this rendering, with a little thought, he could readily develop the correct English phrase. This unraveling of the original meaning, and rendering into idiomatic English, would be one of the thousand steps necessary for the training of his mind. *Il ne s'est pas battu en duel* is translated "he hasn't fought a duel," but the average student would have had very little trouble in understanding the original French in this instance. Again, *n'y était pour rien* is rendered "had nothing to do with it." The student's literal translation would be "was there (*or* in it) for nothing," which could easily be turned into a good English sentence.

These three illustrations are taken from one page of notes, which page contains, in addition, the following "helps": *empressement inquiet*, "troubled eagerness;" *mon gaillard*, "the fellow;" *filait*, "slipped away;" *narquois*, "bantering;" *fort à propos*, "very opportunely."

Let those who do not intend to "teach French," but who wish "to use this language as a sort of intellectual machine for the mind's training," avoid these editions, may say some opponent of the mental training idea. Very well. These misguided and misguiding teachers will most assuredly avoid such texts, but are they not justified in requesting American publishers, than whom none are more efficient, to meet their needs, while at the same time catering to the wants of teachers who have no occasion to train the mind of their pupils, but have simply the ambition to teach the Modern Languages in as short a time as possible, and, again for argument's sake, in as thorough a manner as may be generally useful?

Mr. Beck has in his notes a large number of just such renderings as have been mentioned. There is no need of calling attention to each one separately in this already long review, since it is the underlying principle which is under discussion.

In other respects this edition is satisfactory. The following errors in the text itself may be noted. P. 2, 19: read *entendu* for *en tendu*. P. 20, 5: read *regagna* for *régagna*. P. 23, 6: read *devoir* for *de voir*. P. 34, 2: read *malgré* for *malgre*. P. 33, 12: correct printing at beginning of line. P. 40, 9: read *chassée* for *chassé*. P. 44, 2: change period to point of interrogation. P. 46, 23: add hyphen at end of line. P. 68, 6: read *il* for *li*. P. 71, 11: correct *vous*. P. 87, 18: insert *r* at beginning of line. P. 90, 7: read *au-devant* for *audevant*. P. 96, 22: correct *enfant*. P. 110, 19: insert — at beginning of line. P. 116, 18: separate *biencomprise*. P. 122, 23: correct *j'aime*. P. 147, 14: read *deviendrai* for *de viendrai*. P. 148, 20: insert — at beginning of line. P. 151, 11: insert comma after *vous*. P. 153, 9: read *Courcier* for *Courcîer*. P. 157, 26: omit comma after *montré*. P. 161, 1: insert — at beginning of line. P. 91, 1: *giletières* might be explained in the notes, and also *concussionnaire* (p. 154, 20).

The following remarks concern the notes.

P. 2, 21: *aménager un magasin* and such phrases are not unusual, and the noun *aménagement* is also used in the same sense, which would seem to constitute "sufficient authority." P. 14, 4: most students are familiar with the mere name *Marseillaise*, and a reference to its composer and to its use in France would seem appropriate. P. 21, 7: students should avoid the term "Congress" in speaking of French elections. P. 23, 8: the wording of this note would seem to allow the sentence *on à lui aurait vainement cherché*. P. 27, 28: one explanation at least of *entresol* appears satisfactory: *entresol* stands for *entre*+*soles*, "between floors;" the original meaning would thus be "between two stories," and, by reduction, "between the first story (*rez-de-chaussée*) and the second story." The Academy allowed, at first, the spelling *entresole*, and this word was sometimes feminine, even in the seventeenth century. P. 44, 25: join these remarks to those of the note on p. 45, 17. P. 47, 13: "a sunshade" is not the exact meaning of *un en-tout-cas;* this French term cannot be translated by a single English word. P. 53, 3: *invite* does not mean "signal for trumps," at least not with the usual significance given to this phrase by modern whisters. P. 55, 2: state that *clamer* is not a modern French word. P. 59, 15: read *le* for *de*. P. 74, 8: read *démarche* for *demarche*. P. 108, 13: there exists in English the expression "bristol board." P. 125, 10: this note should correspond with the one to p. 37, 9. P. 130, 22: explain why *eût sacrifié* means *aurait sacrifié*. P. 138, 27: omit hyphen. P. 154, 29: the expression "Evolution" might be preferable to "Development." P. 157, 8: change the wording. P. 161, 1: the wording seems to imply that *certainement que* is an unusual expression, whereas it is quite common, just like *bien sûr que*, *sans doute que*, etc. P. 175, 12: it might be well to explain how *suisse* came to have this meaning.

Mr. Beck has been painstaking in the preparation of this edition and the errors he has overlooked will not prevent this text from being acceptable to those teachers who do not object to frequent assistance in the line of translated passages.

EDWIN S. LEWIS.

*Princeton University.*

## *ENGLISH POETRY.*

*English Meditative Lyrics*, by THEODORE W. HUNT, Ph. D., Litt. D., Professor of English in Princeton University. Illustrated. New York: Eaton & Mains. Cincinnati: Curtis & Jennings, 1899.

DR. HUNT'S *English Meditative Lyrics* (with its companion volume of *American Medititive Lyrics*) fills a neglected place in the special study now given to the lyric as the characteristic poetic type of our eminently speculative and subjective age. As in the line of his study of the ethical teachings of English literature, this variety of the lyric receives from his trained critical judgment a sympathetic treatment.

It is not a volume of selections of meditative or reflective poems, as its title would seem to indicate, but an historical and critical review, with copious and pertinent extracts, and references in illustration of the varying moods of the most representative poets.

We have in the introduction a discussion of the lyric in general, and of the meditative variety, followed in successive chapters by a description and criticism of the leading representatives in lyrical poetry, arranged in historical, and, in a measure, evolutionary sequence.

Dr. Hunt regards the lyric as the most poetic type of poetry, as eminently emotional, with a range of the widest province, holding in combination all the elements of poetry, in which the ideal and the real are most thoroughly blended, with an historical development in keeping with the general development of English literature, without artistic limitations, and intimately involved in life.

Dr. Hunt's exposition of the meditative lyric correctly describes it as a form which solves the apparent contradiction of thought and feeling in the living unity of the thinking, sentient soul; it is thought in its process, and not in its abstract product. He makes the condition of its successful achievment, "that the feeling shall control the thought, and never be controlled by it"; and that "the intellectual element shall never be an end in itself." This condition excludes all didactic poetry, lyric as well as epic. It is very difficult in a literature

so ethical throughout, as Dr. Hunt has elsewhere shown English to be, strictly to adhere to the type in the illustrative references, but his trained judgment has rarely failed him.

The critical review of the representative poets is introduced by a chapter upon the meditative lyrics of the Elizabethan age, in which the courtly lyric took its rise. Dr. Hunt selects from representative poets for treatment in separate chapters, Spenser, Shakespeare, Milton, Wordsworth, Byron, Keats, Robt. and Mrs. Browning, Arnold, and Tennyson. His aim, to give only the most representative, explains the omission of many minor poets, who in the lyric attain to a higher reach of excellence than would be possible for them in the epic and dramatic. A compensation for such omission is found in the concluding chapters upon "English Elegies," and "Devotional Poets," and "The Larger Lyric List." These two classes are not commensurate with the meditative lyric; all elegies and hymns are not meditative lyrics; but as the meditative lyric abounds in these classes of poetry, a separate treatment is justified.

The representative lyrical poets given in historical order exhibit an evolution which, though continuous, is best described as "a spiritual ebb and flow." The lyric is as sensitive as mercury to the fluctuations of thought and feeling in life, in which it is intimately involved, and its course is less formal than the evolution of epic and dramatic forms. Dr. Hunt takes, as he says, a long leap from Milton to Wordsworth over a period of unimpassioned didacticism. The Restoration checked the development of Puritan poetry in English literature, but the stream disappeared from England only to emerge in "the fountain Arethuse" in New England. It is here, though late, we are to place the American lyric in its historical connection. The American lyric, as Dr. Hunt's American volume shows, is the lyric of the impassioned, serious, and thoughtful Puritan, quickened in some of its representatives by German transcendental and spiritual philosophy, received directly, or mediately through the later English poets. No just estimate of the Puritan poetry of English literature can be made without including the American lyric; and it is in the meditative variety it finds its highest distinction.

Dr. Hunt's volumes strengthen the impression of the profoundly ethical temper or character of English literature made by his work upon the ethical teachings of English literature.

He spreads before the reader a wealth of the purest and most ennobling poetry in our tongue, unexcelled by that of any other literature except the Hebrew, from which English literature has been enriched. It is evidence of the gravity and sanity of the English mind, in which the morbid, decadent, and unwholesome are not admitted. The meditative lyric, though finding its motive in the great problem of existence, is, as Dr. Hunt shows, as varied in its notes as any other type. The stream is not shrunk by "the dread voice," but runs full to "the higher mood." Character, motive, mental attitude diversify it. We have the reflective lyric of grief, of nature, and even of *vers de société*, running through the length of the gamut from the elegiac and pensive to the playful. Byron and Browning, Milton and Arnold, Poe and Holmes, may all come together in the group.

Dr. Hunt is justified in commending the English meditative lyric to the most delightful and ennobling study, and especially to the clergy. As genial to the subjective temper of our time, it offers an impulse to poetic production, which promises easier success than is possible in other types. These volumes are an admirable introduction to the study. They are full and accurate in their references. The only error discovered is in the title of Bishop given to John Donne.

CHARLES EDWARD HART.
*Rutgers College.*

## *FRENCH LITERATURE AND LANGUAGE.*

*Het Zoeken van "l'âme française" in de Letterkunde en de Taal van Frankrijk.* (Redevoering uitgesproken bij de Overdracht van het Rectoraat der Rijks-Universiteit te Groningen, den 21sten September 1897.) Door Dr. A. G. VAN HAMEL. Groningen: bij T. B. Wolters, 1897. 8vo, 54 pp.

ON the 21st of September, 1897, Dr. A. G. van Hamel, the well-known Romance scholar, marked the close[1] of his functions as Rector of

[1] According to the traditions of the Dutch universities, the Rector delivers his official speech on the very same day he makes room for his successor.

the University of Groningen by a most eloquent and interesting discourse on Psychological Researches in the Literature and Language of France.

The chief programme of this elaborate speech is announced in the concise preliminary sentence: Apart from its special purpose, every single study of language or literature comprises a psychological result.

This brilliant apology of the highest aims of all our philological studies is praiseworthy in every respect, though of course, now and then, opinions may differ on one point or another.

The study of literature, which undoubtedly furnishes the best psychological results, holds a prominent place in van Hamel's speech; the linguistical researches are kept more in the background.

A summary statement of the chief arguments of this interesting discourse will best enable us to examine his theories.

The significance of the spoken word, says van Hamel, depends even when it is taken as a mere complex of sounds on the meaning it conveys or on the mood it reveals. For good reasons speech has been always considered as the directest and finest revelation of our intellectual life. And though according to Maeterlinck's views, silence is a still better interpreter of the soul (I recall his most appropriate paradox: "Toutes les paroles se ressemblent, mais tous les silences diffèrent"), its high value depends certainly on the single circumstance, that the line of distinct sounds is temporarily broken, so that its effect equals that of a pause in music, of a dumb-show in a theatrical performance, filling the gaps in the rhythm of speech.

He who examines the phraseology, the vocabulary, the rhetoric of a writer, endeavors to understand a process of thinking, to appreciate a taste, to watch a fancy in its mysterious moods of creation. He who examines and analyzes another—less personal—element of the style, the coördination and subordination of clauses, learns from the arrangement of the words, from the use of tenses and moods various modifications of thinking and feeling. One need but remember the different meaning which in French the place of the adjective may lend to the relation between substantive and adjective, or the now-a-days so keenly felt value of the "imparfait" which has become a characteristic of the way in which modern novel-writers regard the events they relate in direct opposition to their predecessors.

He who watches the change of meaning of the words of a language discovers the laws which govern this remarkable phenomenon, and sometimes divines from a simple fact a complete change of the manner of thinking, feeling, or even hearing. How often words which were formerly considered elegant and decent, are forever degraded by our euphemistical tendencies; while at the same time a sort of "snobbism," or the desire for characteristic terms, makes us continually borrow words and similes from the lumber-room of the "argot" in order to deck our speech with these expressions. Even the phonetician who examines how the sounds and noises which form the elements of the spoken word are produced, does not only study psychological or physical phenomena; he sometimes feels the "psyche" in observing the degree of swiftness and regularity with which changes have come about, in witnessing the talent of imitation which secured the success of certain combinations of sounds, or, finally, the effects worked by analogy; namely, the way in which the original vowel or consonant is replaced by the one which is to be met with in a synonym.

That literature and its history belong to the dominion of psychology, does not need any further proof. Literary creations which are written with uprightness, bear witness of noble passions, choice sentiments, artistically refined moods, rhythmically felt sensations, immortal aspirations—fragments of internal life which are sufficiently concreted before reason, fancy and the ear, and therefore, may be revealed as far as it is possible by means of the instrument of language, by word-symbol and sound. Great artists are inclined to think that language is not to be considered as the most perfect instrument of art, and perhaps, it is true that the literary art can but imperfectly reveal our finest sentiments and thoughts, still it cannot be denied that this way of uttering beautiful ideas is within the reach of most people and may meet at least with partial understanding.

The psychological importance of language

and literature renders the value of philological studies independent of the predilection of partial scholars for literary and linguistical researches and preserves them from the temporary flourish which the exploration of limited phenomena may take in narrow circles. Such studies derive their scientific character from the method to which they are subjected. Their importance depends on the scope they aim at. The claims and tasks of philological researches oblige us now and then to turn our attention to trifles, in order to examine the soundness of our methods or the handling of our critical apparatus; but he who does not forget the chief interest over the bagatelles which form the subject of his daily work, does not run the risk of losing himself in dry pedantism.

He who fixes his attention on a foreign living language and on the prose and poetry which are written in it, is especially struck with the psychological character of literary and linguistical studies. Now and then in reading, hearing, seeking, thinking, he feels the contact with the strange soul. And when this language, moreover, is daily spoken around him, so that he does not merely *see* it before him in an unwonted form of writing and a peculiar construction, but *hears* its identical sounds, its peculiar accentuation, with a "timbre" and articulation which he must forever fail to attain; when moreover its literature, far from presenting a well-rounded totality, continually urges upon his knowledge new works, which with perplexing rapidity pile themselves up on his writing-table;—but then, even then he receives an overwhelming impression of the life which is quivering in all these letters, thrills within these sounds, stirs in all these words, a life, to understand whose mysteries he daily aspires—and fails.

Sometimes peculiar,personal elements which appear momentarily in the words and works, claim our special interest. It would betray a lack of penetration and seriousness if he who wants to seize the national generalities, could not condescend to the study of individualities, of trifles, even most insignificant things. But generality maintains its rights. The poet's word: "Malgré nous l'infini nous tourmente" must also be applied to scientific studies. He who devotes his full attention to special phenomena views them as but he himself can view them; namely, surrounded by a peculiar atmosphere. And when the condition of these surroundings imposes itself heavily on his consciousness, how can he then manage to escape from the tormenting problems which are stirred, not by the object in view, but by the atmosphere itself, which necessarily incites his curiosity and his desire for a clearer insight? Thus it becomes nearly inevitable to search for the national nucleus which is hidden in a foreign living language and its literature, the more so, as now and then we receive distinct impressions of the peculiar type of foreign nations even outside of the narrow circle of scientific researches.

When Goethe proclaimed Diderot as the writer who the most of all French writers approached German ideas—this judgment did certainly not depend on the supposition that the favorite dishes of the leader of the encyclopedists may be prepared in the best manner in the kitchen of a German "Kneipe." When French critics designate Macbeth as: "la plus française des pièces de Shakespeare," when Paris society calls one of their present novel-writers with a charming nick-name Anatole Suisse, in order to distinguish him from Anatole France with whom he bears a certain resemblance; when several broad-sounding exclamations of wonder call forth the impression of Germanic slowness, or the frequent use of superlatives and diminutives invokes the graceful image of Italian vivacity or Italian fondling: all these impressions we receive correspond but with a safe reality and allow the forming of a strict judgment according to a measure which is, perhaps, rather to be felt than to be precisely defined. To him who thinks that such ideas depend on a mere prejudice, I oppose a statement of my colleague Sijmons: The scientific treatment of a question is not separated by a wide gulf from mere dilettanteism . . . . Everywhere we find a gradual climbing up from aimless perception to conscious seeking, from dilettanteism to science.—The inquiry for a national essence, for a collective—psychic element in the language and literature of France is consequently included in the frame of scientific studies. The rather curious expression: Het Zoeken van "l'âme française"

was chosen by me on purpose, in order to suggest the great problem in question. The term *l'âme française* is actual. This somewhat sentimental expression, which is perhaps due to German or Russian influence, is often heard now instead of the frequently used: *le génie national, le caractère français ou l'esprit gaulois.* Often it is used when the national character in its various revelations and national tendencies which emerge in language and literature cannot be indicated point-blank. Repeatedly the term *l'âme française* occurs in the debate which is carried on between nationalism and cosmopolitanism. Many people who wish to preserve *l'âme française* from foreign contamination, claim that Ibsen is to be forcibly excluded from the French stage. Others try to justify their sympathy for this poet of the North by maintaining that "l'âme norvégienne" must be of French origin having been imported into Norway by the editor of George Sand. The dissension on the qualities of *l'âme française* and its literary monopoly has been the cause of numerous debates—even of unbloody and rather awkward duels. Even in the interesting controversy between the new-classic verse of the Parnassians and the so-called "vers libre" of the young ones, which by their antagonists is called: "le vers amorphe" or "le vers invertébré"—the term "l'âme française" is now and then to be heard. And academical critics, such as Lemaître and Brunetière, historiographers such as Texte and Rossel, scholars such as Gaston Paris, speak of "l'âme française" as soon as they investigate the inspiration of the literary phenomena which form the subject of their diligent philological and historical researches.

Closely connected with our national-psychological problem is another phenomenon which furnishes one proof more of its importance. I mean the awaking of the idea of unity, of the spiritual oneness (to use a theological term) which exists between the French literature of the Middle Ages and that of modern times. The ignorance and indifference of the French in regard to their oldest literature and language—an ignorance which already dates from the sixteenth century and which through Boileau and his school had become the mark of literary superiority, began to vanish towards the middle of our century. But the indisputable fact that the knowledge of mediæval literature could only be revived by scientific studies, served but to widen the gulf which already existed between ancient and classic periods. The glowing zeal with which the professors and students of German High Schools devoted themselves exclusively to the study of Old French (both language and literature), mostly without any connection with the forms of the living language and with the products of modern literature, but contributed to aggravate the separation between ancient and modern times.

But during the last decennium the constellation of French philology has visibly changed. In Germany as well as in France a more important place has been yielded to the living language and modern literature than ever before.

Living and dead joined together as the expression of one intellectual literary and artistical life of a nation, forming the object of one and the same method, render more obvious the uniform national character of French language and literature, and cause the various shades of the details to fade before the general tint of the totality; and at the same time the strong desire of searching for the individual life of a nation in the history of its language and in its various literary products becomes a necessity.

The earnest endeavors of the French nation towards "concentration" of their national life facilitates the search after a collective-intellectual element. The cause of these endeavors is chiefly to be sought in the political history of France, and the supremacy of Paris over the provinces may be considered as one of the chief factors and the symbol of this tendency. "Le peuple français si homogène, si ramassé dans son unité" runs one of Alfred de Vigny's letters, and has not the same thing been said over and over again?—It is true that the French nation is born from a combination of many races, but a keen sense of national unity was developed in the course of centuries. It cannot be denied that French literature in nearly all its periods has been chiefly of foreign origin. I but mention a generally known fact when I point to the strong influence of Italy in the sixteenth century, an influence which continually

leads to further discoveries, or the impulse which the French stage received in the seventeenth century from Spain and Italy, the influence of England in the eighteenth, of Germany in the beginning of this century. The chauvinists who would anxiously bar the way to Norway and Russia, are not at all versed in the literary traditions of their nation. In the intellectual barter of nations France always understood how to give, to claim and to appropriate. The foreign borrowed goods, however, were with extraordinary dexterity transformed into national property and this talent of refining and harmonizing is so great that the peculiarity of the French genius, the personality of French art has been said to consist in it. If France in the age of Louis XIV had done homage to protectionism, the literature of this epoch would have missed its greatest splendor.

One of these adaptations of the national genius to foreign literature has been so intense, so complete and so persisting, that it becomes impossible to distinguish the native from the foreign elements. The Renaissance has put a Classical stamp on French literature which leads us to misconceptions. Often we feel tempted to proclaim those poets as genuine national interpreters who imbibed the Hellenic esthetics or whose artistic forms reproduce those of the poets of ancient Rome. It would lead us too far if we tried to find the causes of this phenomenon. The infiltration of the Greek-Latin element has been so strong that one may speak of a complete metamorphosis, of a kind of regeneration of "l'âme française," the antique fold of which represents one of its most striking qualities. French "Romanticism"—to risk a paradox—may be considered as an effort to restore pure Classicism. Perhaps the numerous recent tendencies which at present appear in French literature, will once more replace its foundation and achieve the complete emancipation of the French genius from the supremacy of the Classics. In the meanwhile it seems but natural that many who at present fervently cling to what they call the "national" element of their literature, strive in good faith for what they themselves call *la tradition gréco-latine ou l'esprit classique.*

The specific national character of French literature may, therefore, chiefly be sought: first, in a wonderful capacity for adaptation, a curious gift of artistically combining various elements; secondly, in the language itself in which this literature is written. But the solution of this question is not so easily attained. The instrument of the language, for instance, cannot be entirely trusted for individual inquiries. The young Belgian poets who write in the same language as their Paris "confrères" are often expressively called the representatives of "l'âme flamande." By and bye, perhaps, the cosmopolitan tendencies of our age will create "une âme européenne," which though speaking various tongues, will yet be the same in all other respects. But we in the meanwhile may still look for nationality in the world of literary ideas and styles, and above all in its views and moods.

For our purposes we must first of all pay attention to the *critical moments* in the history of French literature, moments during which it comes into contact with foreign literary elements. From the sympathy with which the foreign infusion is received, from the reserve with which this sympathy is tempered, from the modifications which half unconsciously are applied to the appropriated ideas, one may guess the divergence and similitude of mood, taste and temper, that for the moment at least exist between the two nations. The history of French literature rather abounds in such critical moments. They already emerge in the Middle Ages, when a Frenchman of the twelfth century adapts the masterpiece of Virgil to the taste of his countrymen, when the mystic German knight Wolfram von Eschenbach borrows the *Legend of the Holy Grail* from Chrétien de Troyes, or when a Dutchman of the thirteenth century in every respect "verdietscht" the *Parthenopeus de Blois.* Ample materials for both psychological and philological studies are furnished by these heterogenous productions. When Gaston Paris tried to make out the Celtic nucleus of the legend of Tristan and pursued its transformation through French taste and French customs, he but treated with the accuracy of the scholar and with the keen interest of an eminent thinker, a fragment of historical psychology—and strangely must have rung on

his ear the remark of his confrère Joseph Bertrand, who in the French academy, directly after having cited his work, risked the unjustifiable criticism "Renan appelait votre méthode scientifique, elle n'est que savante."

These critical moments occur still more frequently in the modern periods of French literature. We need but remember Corneille's genuine French *Cid*, which is born from a broadly expounded Spanish drama, or the national metamorphosis which the Spanish and Italian *Don Juan* underwent in the skilful hands of Molière—or the typical French Voltaire, who in England discovers Shakespeare, becomes his fervent admirer, tries to copy him while at the same time he abuses him as "sauvage ivre" and as "vilain singe"—or the visit of Mme de Staël to Weimar, where she received such an imperfect impression of German poetry: in short, numerous literary contacts and conflicts which deserve a most accurate observation and description, because they reveal national antipathies as well as affinities.—The period in which we live furnishes ample material for psychological researches and may be called already an extraordinarily "critical" era. I pass to another method, the explanation of which offers me an opportunity of describing at length a few literary phenomena of ancient times. According to Brunetière, French literature bears a prominently social character which reveals itself in the tendency to please a greater number of countrymen, to give expression to the ideas of the multitude and to exercise a certain influence upon the forms of social life. French literature may be called social in opposition to the English which may be described as individual, to the Italian which appears artistical, to the German which is rather philosophical, to the Spanish which is "chevaleresque."—But this characteristic rather indicates the direction in which we must seek for the occult psychological elements than the essential faculties themselves. It denotes much more a formal than a material quality, and contains rather the formula of a temperament than the aspect of a distinct mental life. At any rate Brunetière's formula gains strength by the assertion which I will illustrate by a few examples.

In a "geste" which in the beginning of the literary development arose on national ground, which was immediately adopted by a multi-,ude of poets and was received with approbation in wider circles, which moreover preserved its distinctive mark in the course of centuries in spite of the change of taste and social institutions—in such a fragment of French literature we are fully entitled to seek for "l'âme française." In this regard, perhaps, the national heroic poems of the Middle Ages, the powerful literature of the "chansons de geste" surpass everything else. The standpoint of historical research has attained here a degree which is suitable for drawing general conclusions. In the Germanic cult of heroes—while history and legend were blending—introduced by the Franks on the conquered ground of romanized Gaul—must be sought the origin of the heroic-poetical disposition which called forth the French national epics. But the conditions which favored this new creation, did not exist before the Romance elements, helped by the definitive victory of the Gallic-Romance forms of language and by the propogation of orthodox Christianity, had completely pervaded the germanic element and given birth to a new nationality.

From the baptism of "Chlodovech" Gaston Paris dates the "epic ferment," by which term he so appropriately designs the fertile disposition which called forth the national heroic poems, representing the first powerful expresion of an exalted collective sentiment, a national ideal, of an "âme française."

This ferment lasted for centuries, foaming up with fresh vigor, as often as the fame of a herioc deed spread in wider circles, as often as one of the Merovingian princes seemed to approach the standard of the princes of Franconia, who exclusively devoted their services to God and their native country.—About the essential qualities of the old Merovingian epics we are still in the dark. The golden age of the "chansons de geste" dawns towards the end of the eleventh century. In the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth centuries, France appears covered all over with a continually growing vegetation of heroic poems, which sometimes spread too exuberantly, sometimes even throw out new sprouts. One may hardly conceive a satisfactory idea of the inner and

outward life of this literature, of the poets by whom it was created, or of the audience for whose benefit it was destined. But this literature, which in the form in which it was preserved, embraces more than two centuries, and the origin of which must be sought still some centuries earlier, coincides with the birth of French nationality, making its appearance in a pure Romance form, reveals in its contents the intrinsical blending of Germanic heroism and Christian idealism which changed the romanized Celts into French. The character and importance of this ancient heroic poetry are sufficiently determined by diligent researches. Surprising discoveries on this matter are no more to be expected. We are, therefore, fully entitled to hail with the national epics of the Middle Ages the first conscious appearance, the first vigorous manifestation of "l'âme française" and to describe the aspect we may here obtain of it, in the following manner: an exalted patriotic sentiment, supported by an idealism which exceeds the bounds of common national ambition. So much about France of ancient times. But is this same element of "l'âme francaise" to be found in the literary tendencies of later periods? Here we have to surmount two different obstacles. First, France has not produced any high-spirited heroic poetry since the Middle Ages. Secondly, patriotism, at least in the classic periods, never was an essential ferment in French literature. The first objection need hardly be noticed. Epic poetry depends on pecular circumstances; it represents the poetical form of a very limited space of time; and Voltaire really took too much pains with his "Henriade," in order to contradict the "boutade" of the marquis of Malèzieux: Le Français n'a pas la tête épique. The second objection is of more consequence. France never was entirely destitute of patriotic poetry. One of the professors of the Sorbonne even published a considerable number of "conférences" on the "Poésie patriotique" of modern times, among which the poetry that dates from the wars of the first republic holds a prominent place. The popular names of Béranger and Auguste Barbier are quite characteristic of a later period, as that of the poet of the *Châtiments* and of *Auuée terrible* of modern times. From the campaigns of the Valois and the civil wars of the sixteenth century, literary monuments have been preserved, but this literature recalls no remembrance of the heroic poetry of the Middle Ages. But with the historiographers about the middle and towards the end of the sixteenth century, for instance, in the memoirs of Monluc or with Agrippa l'Aubigné, now and then some reminiscences of the "chansons de geste" are be found. In the seventeenth century, French patriotism was absorbed in adulation of the sovereigns, and in the first half of the eighteenth century it became so faint that according to Höffding, Rousseau's vocation was to revive this feeling; without the *Coutrat social* and *Emile*, the *Marseillaise* would have been impossible. But the difficulty is not yet entirely removed: France does not possess a brilliant national-historical drama. Voltaire's, Du Bellay's and Chénier's attempts failed, and Brunetière in speaking of *Laïre* and *Adelaïde du Guesclins*, mentions how interesting it would be to find out for what reasons *Andromaque* and *Le Cid* have remained the national tragedies of France. It is strange, indeed, that such a literary *geure* as the drama, which especially is fit to develop collective ideas and sentiments, and which perhaps in no other country has become and remained as popular as in France, completely ignores the brilliant events that were crowded together in the history of the King's wars. Even the author of the ancient mystery-plays took their subjects very rarely from profane national history, when Scripture topics were forbidden. The question is too complicated to be discussed here. Undoubtedly the drama—apart from the circumstance that it must be considered as the most conservative of all literary *genres*, and therefore does not allow important changes to take place abruptly—permits chiefly a sympathetic participation of the suspense which is born from mental conflicts, so that the outward costume, in which this conflict appears, is but a matter of small consequence, while the principal attention is fixed on the main interest, as long as neither national nor special sympathies disturb the dramatic effect. At any rate, the element of "l'âme française" which so vigorously appears in the "chansons de geste"—an ex-

alted patriotic feeling, national heroism, supported by an idealism which strives for the highest goods of humanity, never ceased, even in the days of deep humiliation, to bear witness in the mind of the French nation. Is this national pride not nearly swollen to a bursting point, when the rights of humanity are proclaimed in the name of the French nation, when the empire of liberty and justice is declared to be identical with the one and indivisible French republic? May the soldiers of 1794, who with Stendhal abused all their enemies as "des imbéciles ou de pitoyables fripons," not be called genuine descendants of Roland and Guillaume? In our days the ferment of the ancient epics is again busy to pervade literature. One need but remember the forever renewing popularity of "Iehanne la bonne Lorraine, Qu'Englois brulèrent à Rouen" or the recent revival of "l'époyé napoléonienne," which conquered a convenient corner in all modern literary *genres*. But our time does not yet belong to the domain of scientific studies; I but mentioned it to gain some further proof for my assertion that a national-heroic and at the same time human idealism is not only an ancient but a stable element of "l'âme francaise." . . . . .

By means of another quite different example I will attempt to prove that the study of a literary phenomenon of the Middle Ages may serve as a "point de départ" for the treatment of our psychological problem. For a long time there was a firm belief in the existence of love-courts in France, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. In 1825, Diez contested for the first time this hypothesis, which was chiefly due to Raynouard. His arguments, which later on were taken up again by Gaston Paris and Pio Rajna, remained unassailable until the Danish scholar, E. Trojel, subjected the whole question to a new treatment. But neither Trojel's dissertation, nor his critical edition of the book of Andreus Capellanus, suffices to overthrow Diez' conclusions. The young Dane was obliged to admit that among the twenty-one "judicia amoris" quoted by Andreas, but four in case of need, may by considered as real sentences. The first case concerns a lady whose knight, engaged in a Crusade, sends her no message from the Holy Land. The lady wants to accept another lover though the confidant of the absent knight, his "secretarius," disapproves of the untimely substitute. The Countess of Champaign, before whose tribunal the cause is pleaded, finds fault with the lady. The knight, says she, left his lady-love for the sake of a good cause, and his sending no message must be called laudable discretion. The second case concerns the "secretarius" of an enamored knight, who by abusing his privileges, insinuated himself into the graces of the fair lady. The Countess of Champaign, this time backed up by sixty ladies of her court, pronounces a terrible sentence on both the seducer and seduced: they shall forever be excluded from the land of true love. The third case has to do with a knight who betrayed the love-secret of his friend. The culpable tale-teller is condemned by a court of ladies from Gascony to live in future a loveless life. The fourth case refers to a lady who disdains the love of a knight without refusing his presents. A sentence delivered by the Queen of France herself compels the wicked flirt to refuse all presents or to accept the lover.

The controversy about the "cours d'amour" remains vital on account of the connection into which it is brought by Rajna and Trojel, and most explicitly by Gaston Paris, with "l'amour courtois," which about the same time made its appearance in France and in French literature. This appellation indicates a peculiar conception and a peculiar practice of love which attributes to this simple and natural feeling the character of a refined culture, stamps it as an art, a science, a social virtue, selects it for the finest and noblest theme of artistic poetry and literary fiction, claims scholasticism for its analysis, and devises a kind of metaphysics for its glorification. Gaston Paris, who characterizes this love by contrasting it with the fatal passion of Tristan and Isold, and the innocent playfulness of lovers in the *Lais* of Marie de France, as un "amour exalté et presque mystique sans cesser pourtant d'être sensuel," designates the *Conte de la Charette* by Chrétien de Troyes as the standard work in which this kind of love is described and praised.

The guilty passion of Lancelot and Queen Guenièvre—the chief persons of this novel—

became indeed the unique model of true love, of which Francesca—one of the numerous victims of the Lancelot—will bear witness later on: "Amor che al cor gentil ratto s'apprende." This love springs from unknown sources; through the eyes it enters the heart and wounds it suddenly. It is at once full of mystery and refinement, ennobling and civilizing in its effects, and its claims are so imperious, that even the knight's honor must yield to it. This love is lawless and cannot be otherwise: for in wedlock true love cannot exist. The Countess of Champaign, on being solemnly consulted by letter *an inter conjugatos verus amor locum sibi valeat invenire*, answered by a missive, dated on the first of May, 1174, that true love must be exempt from right and duty, terms which serve to regulate the relations between husband and wife: *Dicimus enim et stabilito tenore firmamus amorem non posse suas inter duos jugales extendere vires.*

At the court of this same Marie de Champagne Chrétien de Troyes composed his novel. Probably he wrote under the influence of the minstrels of the South. For "l'amour courtois" springs from the southern parts of France: Bernard de Ventadorn and somewhat later "Peire Rogier" sang, lived, and loved at the courts of the very same ladies whose "judicia amoris" had gained such a far-spread reputation. But Chrétien de Troyes, the subtle anatomist and painter of sentiments, is the principal northern representative of this love. The charm of his poetry and his growing fame enlarged the dominion of this love both in literature and in manners. With him the subtle curiosity of this love—the detailed description of which appears now and then rather childish; for instance, when the poet takes great pains to illustrate by fitting examples that love can make two hearts into one, while each of them remains dwelling in its own body—has become popular. Pre-existing forms of literature such as *Tristan*, nearly all the lyrics of the thirteenth century, even the heroic poetry of more ancient date, were pervaded by the influence of this peculiar conception of love. In the South it assumed forms which became more and more abstract and crystalized—and when Dante wrote his *Vita nuova*, he but revived the old French love-song, the song of "l'amour courtois."

In many respects "l'amour courtois" is closely connected with the peculiar manners and ideas of the Middle Ages and presents, therefore, a transitory character. But one of its features goes deeper and reveals a state of mind, which allows us to find analogies in the further course of French literature. We have to do with a refinement of love which proceeds from an intrinsic blending of the sensual desire with subtle reflection and analysis, a tendency to enjoy this sentiment not as a mere sentiment, but to taste and to comprehend every single element of which it is composed, so that love finally ceases to be a mere feeling and supplies at the same time an intellectual want. I might trace, here, how this cerebral element of French love—which in the first part of the *Roman de la Rose* is still gayly tempered with Ovid's cheerfulness, while the second part of it is fast degenerating with Jean de Meung into dry pedantism and encyclopedical science, called forth the love-allegories which were so pernicious to the literature of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. But I prefer showing how this element—even after the complete regeneracy of French literature by the Renaissance—persisted and created, perhaps, under the influence of the predominant philosophy—social phenomena which remind us of "l'amour courtois," curious reflections on love which recall the novels of Chrétien de Troyes. The movement of the "Précieuses" with their burlesque misconception of love, with which the rather tame suitors of the "Hôtel Rambouillet" complied with admirable patience and of which both the genuine and the counterfeit beaux-esprits tried to profit, does it not present a curious counterpart of the circles of the ancient "jugements d'amour" in Champaign and Gascony? Does the classic French drama not bear the same stamp? Tightly coërced by the fetters of the Aristotelian rules, it is directly driven by this one-sided check of its development into the direction of analytical psychology, of the erotic casuistry which, insipid and tasteless when handled by subordinate intelligences, helps to create immortal masterpieces, as soon as a genius of the rank of Corneille dramatizes the sublime love—debate of Chimène and Rodrigue, or a psychologist of unrivalled acuteness as Racine chooses for the exquisite theme of his tragedies (which

in spite of their bland harmonious form are so adroitly devised) the mental struggles of Hector's widow, the pricks of conscience which torment Phèdre or Bérénice's unfortunate love for Titus.

I pass rapidly over modern times. A trace of the old "judicia amoris" may perhaps be discovered in the so-called "pièces à thèse" of Alexandre Dumas, in the dramatized "plaidoyers" of the *Dame aux Camélias*, of the *Femme de Claude* or *Denise*, or even in the plays of the young writers, who as soon as they write "pièces à idées" deposit not only a fine sentiment but a fragment of subtle erotic philosophy in their dramas.

Are not the psychological novels of Paul Bourget and his school (the finely-spun analyses of *Mensonges* and *Cœur de femme*) in many respects but modern counterparts of "tirades" we encounter in the romantic tales of Chrétien de Troyes? And the subtle questions, which in Paris as so-called "jeu des petits papiers" are asked about love, and the solutions of which are now and then collected by a high-spirited countess in a "Livre d'or," what are they in reality but a revival of the questions which in the twelfth century were settled with decent grace by a "réunion de dames de Gascogne," or by the Countess of Champaign and her sixty ladies? When now-a-days love-affairs in Paris are approved or disapproved by quite serious people according to a standard which puzzles the judgment of the foreigner, the latter invariably receives the impression that even in modern France "regulae amoris" prevail, which unintelligible to strangers, recall the days of Andreas Capellanus!—At any rate—and farther does my conclusion not tend—the erotic-cerebral element which so frequently appears in literature, may be considered as one of the main features of "l'âme française." It is a fact that the soul of a nation reveals itself the most frankly in its language; nevertheless we can hardly discern with which psychological features the linguistical peculiarities correspond. The very best thing one might do would be to advise every one who searches for "l'âme française" in the language of the French nation to try to learn the language as carefully and thoroughly as possible, to try to write it as it *must* be written, to speak it as it *must* be spoken; for a reproduction which is in accordance with the rules of art, carries with it a keen sense of the identical language and enables us to perceive more accurately the contact with the foreign soul, allowing a more intimate acquaintance with the occult "psyche."

One may examine, however, whether among the various elements of the language none may be found, the study of which would be of the greatest consequence for the pursuit of the so often mentioned psychological aim.

The study of semasiology promises more than it fulfils. The national significance of metaphors, for instance, depends much more on the degree of civilization to which they refer, on the institutions and customs from which they are borrowed, than on a disclosure of peculiar feelings or of a collective temperament. In the "musée des métaphores" which might be got up by every nation the historical pictures are more numerously represented than the symbolical figures.

The formation of words and the chapter on syntax help many to make an interesting discovery, but the most important element seems to be the one which belongs to the phonetic department, and consequently to the least conscious faculty of expression, I mean the system of accentuation, understanding by it the more or less heightened intensity with which we pronounce one of the syllables of a word by means of a stronger expiration and a sharper articulation. That this accent reaches so far back into the history of the language, that it remained stable in the course of centuries, that with very rare exceptions it is to be found in all French dialects, that it strikes immediately the ear of the foreigner without revealing its mysteriousness, that the phoneticians of our day still disagree about the character of the French accent,—all these circumstances combine to lend a higher value to its study, even with regard to the psychological examination of the French language.

We all know that during the transformation of Latin into Romance, while new languages sprang from the mixture of the forms and words of Rome's *lingua plebeja* with the language of the barbarians of the various provinces, the Latin word-accent has been the sport of this transformation.

But in none of the Romance languages was the power of the accent so prevalent as in the Gallic-Romance, especially in the language of the northern parts of France, where it operates not only as a forcibly striking but as an incisive instrument.

In the sixteenth century the volubility and fluency of this accent has already become so obvious that in grammarians of this and later periods the absurdest ideas on the place and character of the French accent are to be met with; perhaps only those who understood English and taught their native tongue to English people, had attained a better insight by means of the contrast offered by the two languages. By and bye the weakening of unaccented syllables and the disappearance of several consonants helped to increase the fluency of the French accent. As if this riddle needed a better solution, both linguists and phoneticians, Frenchmen and foreigners, zealously seek for the accent of the French language with the help of the ear and various instruments. "Où est l'accent?" has become one of the phonetic puzzles of the present day. Phoneticians such as Ellis and Sweet, linguists such as Schuchardt, maintain that the accent has been tranferred from the last syllable to the first, or at least to the root of the word. Others, such as Paul Passy and Louis Havet, believe in a gradual shifting of the accent which has not yet come to a close, wherefore in all probability but one of the following generations would pronounce "le *Pa*lais *Roy*al" and "le Théâtre *fr*ançais."

The researches are much hindered by the fact that French people do not trust the ear of the foreigners, while the latter maintain that the French are the worst judges of their own diction. It cannot be denied that in 1811 the Italian Scoppor was the first who initiated the French into the real character of their versification. But is the foreign ear to be relied upon?

We feel rather sceptically disposed when we hear that the great linguist Meyer-Lübke maintains that even in Paris an "oxytone" pronunciation is considered as rather old-fashioned, while the learned phonetician Storm declares a distinct "oxytone" pronunciation is at present the rule in the northern parts of France. As to the trustworthiness of the French ear I but recall the anecdote of the German, who consulted a Frenchman about the right way to pronounce: *con*sidération, con*si*dération, consi*dé*ration, consid*éra*tion, or considéra*tion*—and who received the prompt answer, that the hearer could find no difference at all between these five pronunciations.

I agree with the scholars who believe the word-accent of the French language still to hover on the last full-sounded syllable of the words. A vigorous argument in favor of this doctrine is furnished by the peculiar French pronunciation of Latin which was already noted by Erasmus. Jean Passy reminds us that French babies as soon as they utter but one syllable of a long word in order to denote an object, invariably choose the last one: *ton* for *bouton*, *zin* for *magasin*, from which fact we may deduce that this syllable must have struck their ear most distinctly. The fate of foreign proper-names on French lips is notorious. *Ibsen* becomes *Ibsèn*, *Spinoza Spinosà*, etc.

I shall certainly not deny that the French accent may by and bye be exposed to modifications which individually exist already with orators and actors as well as in certain dialects. But the assertion that the system of Germanic accentuation will by and bye displace the old French accent seems rather inadmissible, and if France ever should pronounce l'*Al*sace et la *Lor*raine, I believe that the French soul, which is still mourning for the lost provinces, must itself be annexed beforehand.

The question about the accent is closely connected with the peculiar character of French versification. The origin of the French verse coincides without doubt with the same extensive mutilation of Gallic-Romance words which exercised a direct influence on the accentuation of the French language.

Even the debate about "le vers libre" proves, that with some right the accentuation must be noticed as soon as "l'âme française" and its manifestations are to be watched in the language itself.

Am I to look now for a formula or to invent an epithet in order to point out the peculiar aspect of its life which reveals itself here most clearly? I admit—and nobody will be astonished at my confession, because we have

here no more to do with literary phenomena or distinct thoughts and feelings—that I can offer you neither a formula nor an epithet. Perhaps the general character of French diction will induce us to praise this nation for its quickness of thought, its refined taste and its prompt expressiveness.

I remember that I once found beneath the illustration of an advertisement some words which referred to the inimitable grace of Paris ladies: Prenez un peu ça, Mesdames les étrangères! With this mysterious expressive little word "ça" I must content myself provisionally as to the psychological nucleus of French accentuation. But I believe too firmly in the power and unlimited zeal of scientific researches not to agree with the answer I received once from a German colleague on this same subject: Das "ça" soll auch noch herauskommen!"

M. J. MINCKWITZ.

*Karlsruhe.*

## *GERMAN FOLK-POETRY.*

*Poetische Beziehungen des Menschen zur Pflanzen- und Tierwelt im heutigen Volkslied auf hochdeutschem Boden.* Von M. E. MARRIAGE. Heidelberg dissertation, 1898. Reprinted from *Alemannia*, xxvi (Bonn, 1898), pp. 97–183.

A DISSERTATION, written more often for the doctor's title than for the advancement of knowledge, is not always fit material for strict revision. In the present instance, however, the authoress has chosen a topic which is of vital importance in the consideration of the *Volkslied*, and therefore, of the modern German lyric; namely, the treatment of Nature (vegetable and animal life) in its relationship to Man (human life). That she has treated the subject incoherently is to be regretted, for only a logical and full classification can help matters, and, if nothing essentially new and convincing can be offered, the investigation had better be left where Ludwig Uhland was content to leave it.

Characteristic of Dr. Marriage's treatment of the whole question is the second paragraph of her introductory remarks (p. 97),[1] where she naïvely deals with the different attitude towards nature in the *Volkslied* and the *Kunstlied*.

"For the cultured man, the dweller in the city," she says, "nature is rather a dilletantism; for the peasant it is a business. Sundays and holidays we pay her a formal visit; he is in the fields week in, week out, with the cattle, and his songs show unmistakable traces of this." [Query: Of his being with the cattle?] "Therefore nature-pictures obtrude themselves upon the poetizing part of the people for the adornment as well as the elucidation of the song." Why "therefore"? Does the peasant in his barnyard represent the *Volksdichter*, and the townsman in his shop or his study, the *Kunstdichter*?

Paragraph three defines the sense in which the authoress uses the term "modern *Volkslied*."

"By modern *Volkslied*," she says, "I understand such songs as are gladly sung by the people to-day, no matter whether they be of ancient or of recent origin."

Yet, after this sweeping statement of her position, she excludes from examination

"all songs which can be referred to a near source in the *Kunstlyrik;* besides, very generally, Low-German songs, church folk-songs, children's songs, *Lügenlieder*, *Sprüche* and *Schnaderhüpfel*."

How carefully Dr. Marriage excludes *Schnaderhüpfel* may be gathered when actual count of her citations reveals the fact that she calls two collections of them to witness forty-two times (Ludw. v. Hörmann's *Schnaderhüpfel aus den Alpen*, twenty-one times; H. Dunger's *Rundâs und Reimsprüche aus dem Vogtlande*, twenty-one times).

Suppose, however, that the authoress be taken at her word, and it be granted that she abides strictly by the definition of the term *Volkslied* which she sets up: of what value can a study of the *Volkslied's* attitude towards nature be, which leaves out of consideration the older *Volkslieder* as such, and deals only with the popular songs of the day, which may again be old *Volkslieder* or modern street-ballads (*Gassenhauer*)?

Confusion becomes chaos, when the treatment is closely examined: the divisions of the study will serve to make this apparent.[2] They begin as follows:

*I. Plant and Man. A. Parallels. 1. Beauty. 2. Ugliness.—The Life of Plants: 3. Bloom.*

1 I quote from *Alemannia*, xxvi, *Heft 2.*

*4. Fading of the Blossom. 5. Falling of Leaves. 6. The withered Tree. 7. Border-land.*

Why class 7, "Border-land," appears as a division under A. "Parallels" is not clear even after reading the dissertation.[2]

Dr. Marriage's method of quotation is recondite. The cabalistic *Bratranel* (p. 99, note) doubtless refers to Bratranek's charming *Beiträge zu einer Æsthetik der Pflanzenwelt* (Leipzig, Brockhaus, 1853); Meinert's *Alte teutsche Volkslieder in der Mundart des Kuhländchens* appears under its mystifying second title *der Fylgie*[2] (p. 182), etc., etc. The collector of the *Odenwälder Volkslieder* is called Zopf instead of Zapf—a dangerous error. Schottky is likewise called Scholtky, and his (and Ziska's) book (*Œsterreichische Volkslieder*) is antedated ten years; other like mistakes occur, but *exempla sunt odiosa*.

PHILIP S. ALLEN.

*University of Chicago.*

## *WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE.*

*A Life of William Shakespeare*, by SIDNEY LEE. With portraits and facsimiles. London and New York: The Macmillan Co., 1898.

WITH a modest confidence in his ability to "supply within a brief compass an exhaustive and well-arranged statement of the facts of Shakespeare's career, achievement, and reputation,"

Mr. Sidney Lee takes his scholarly pen in hand, and the Shakespeare-loving world is to be congratulated that he has chosen so worthy a subject and that his success is so unquestionable.

The book has so firm a foundation as Mr. Lee's article on Shakespeare in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, and has the advantage of freedom from the necessary limitations of the *Dictionary*. It is not new to have imagination applied to the Shakespearian problem, to have appreciation, even scholarship *per se*, but the imagination that never forgets its need of a substantial basis, the appreciation that does not worship from afar, but meets the poet "like a vera brither," the scholarship that is not led astray by the will-of-the-wisp of some fancied discovery—these are so uncommon that Mr. Lee's work becomes of rare value in that it is marked from beginning to end by an intellectualized common sense that knows its aim and is never beguiled from the pursuit.

This volume of three hundred and fifty-seven pages covers the ground of Shakespeare's life and the development of his genius, with chapters on his descendants, the Shakespearian autographs, portraits, and memorials, and a valuable bibliography. His posthumous reputation is traced, and his influence on the stage and literature of foreign nations. There is also an appendix,—and one of the tests of a maker of books is his ability to manage an appendix, to avoid matter so disconnected with the text that it serves merely to display the learning of the author, or so closely connected that one is annoyed at the many pages that lie between the kindred paragraphs. Here, too, Mr. Lee shows his skill. His appendix treats of subjects that could not be brought into the main text without destroying its continuity, but which are too interesting and valuable as collaterals to be put without the covers of the book.

He writes for a clearly defined audience. His readers are not expected to "know it all," and to care for nothing but brilliancy of style, but they are required to be of a cast of mind that will recognize the value of evidence and will appreciate scholarly conclusions. He has a fine grasp of his subject, a straight-forward ease of style that makes us forget the words in the thought, the more practicable because the book is so absolutely impersonal. Only a lover of Shakespeare could have written it, but Mr. Lee's resolute self-restraint, and avoidance of imaginative theories and æsthetic criticism give it a calm, dispassionate tone that inspires confidence. We do not feel with any poignancy the suspicious impulse to investigate when he designates a story as "credible tradition," and when he makes a definite assertion, it is only an over-tender literary conscience that is impelled to "verify the references." Sometimes we wish that he had not barred out the imagination quite so rigidly; for example, when he states that in Warwickshire there were in the sixteenth century twenty-four villages containing Shakespeare families, and that in Rowington, but twelve miles from Stratford,

[2] It should, of course, be remembered that the classification of such material is extremely difficult and can often, as in the present instance, be based upon superficial differences only.—Class seven contains cases which belong under A as much as under B (*Beseelung der Pflanzen*), and ought, strictly speaking, to form a category distinct from both.—*Die Fylgie* is, in the tradition of the *Kuhländchen*, a benevolent spirit or deity, a patroness of folk-song (cf. the Norse *fylgja*); Meinert arbitrarily assumes the existence of a masculine deity of like name. H. K. S.

there were three Richard Shakespeares, each with a son William, why did he not suggest a possibility that the poet was credited with the misdeeds of some one of these numerous cousins? Could not so keen a brain as Shakespeare's have found some way to avenge himself at once on Sir Thomas Lucy? And on the other hand, if the sense of injury was so strong that only the lampooning a man many years dead could wipe out the insult, would he have shown such pleasure in constant allusions to a sport that had so painful associations?

Mr. Lee's style is that of a man who thinks in words. It is clear and strong; there are no obscure sentences, no half-expressed thoughts. To be sure, there are few phrases of the kind that one finds himself repeating involuntarily, and there are few inspired adjectives, though his classification of Lyly's dramatic efforts as "eight trivial and insubstantial comedies" and his summarizing Gervase Markham as a "miscellaneous literary practitioner," come very near the line of verbal inspiration.

But all this is preliminary; the crucial test of the sanity of any book on Shakespeare is its treatment of the sonnets. Every Shakespearian student has a half nebulous theory of his own about the sonnets which he expects some day to put into shape. Of this part of his subject, Mr. Lee has made a specially careful study, though with his usual modesty he claims that his researches "have covered a very small portion of the wide field." A footnote destroys any lingering claims of Mary Fitton to be the "dark lady," and a few logical paragraphs of the appendix break all connection between the Earl of Pembroke and the mysterious "W. H.," while he comes as near as circumstantial evidence will bring him to proving that the dedication was written by Thomas Thorpe, and that the mystic initials stood simply for Mr. William Hall, the probable kleptomaniac of the sonnets, and afterwards Mr. Thorpe's fellow publisher.

The decade of the sonnet was the age of literary hyperbole. Men were in ecstasies of love, in agonies—poetical agonies—of repentance for their sins, in gulfs of despair lest the worthlessness of their verse should consign it to the depths of literary perdition, in transports of joy when they bethought themselves that this same verse would celebrate the beauty of my lady's eyebrow, for instance, among future generations,—and they were all this at one and the same time. This was the public taste, and Mr. Lee finds the sonnets of Shakespeare, though "at times reaching heights of excellence that none other scaled," merely a manifestation of the punctilious regard of the poet to the demands of the public. In place of accepting them as biographical material, he says definitely:—

"The sole biographical inference deducible from the sonnets is that at one time in his career Shakespeare disdained no weapon of flattery in an endeavor to monopolize the bountiful patronage of a young man of rank. External evidence agrees with internal evidence in identifying the belauded patron with the Earl of Southampton."

However much one's footsteps may be clogged by hindering theories, he must admit, at least, that Mr. Lee's conclusions are approached through the avenues of commonsense and liberal scholarship.

Seldom does a book impress one with the belief that it is the final word on any subject, and perhaps, even in this case, it is safer to prophesy after the event than before it, but one may at least say with all moderation, that Mr. Lee's book in its uniform excellence, its grasp of the subject coupled with its close attention to details, its lucidity of style, its dispassionate judgments, its logical arguments, its accurate scholarship, and above all in its unimpeachable sanity, manifests in generous degree the qualities that mark the work that shall become the standard.

Eva March Tappan.

*English High School, Worcester, Mass.*

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### *ALLOTRIA.*

To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes,

Sirs:—I beg to offer the following jottings:

1. *Many a.*

Mätzner, *Grammatik*, ii, p. 196, in speaking of Layamon, fails to cite what is probably the most characteristic passage:

> he bi-soȝte moni enne King
> and moni enne Keiser;
> moni enne richene þein,
> moni enne baldne swein. (6592–5.)

2. *A. S. Chronicle 755.*

In Bright's Reader 15/14, Sweet's (Seventh Ed.) 2/32, the text follows MS. A.: *ond him cyþdon þæt hiera mægas*, etc. That is, *cyþdon* is plural. This is also the C-text. But B, D,

E, put the verb in the singular: *cyðde, cypde, cydde.* This is undoubtedly preferable, and is followed by Thorpe in his translation, ii, p. 43: "And he then offered them their own choice of money and land, if they would grant him the kingdom; and made known to them that their kinsmen were with him, who would not forsake him."

The clause beginning with *cyðde* is evidently part of the answer of the Atheling to Osric and Wiferth.

3. *Phoenix 56.*

All the editions (and the MS.) read:

*ne sorg ne slæp ne swar leger.*

Nobody seems to have stumbled over the sense of the first hemistich; even Grein translates serenely: "Nicht Schlaf noch Sorge." What can be meant by a happy state in which there is "*neither* care *nor* sleep?" I would propose the emendation: *ne sorgende slæp*, thus bringing the line closer to the Latin (verse 20): *Et curæ insomnes.*

4. *ðyrncin.*

Kluge, *Nom. St. Bildungslehre*, § 62, says:

"Eine verquickung des *k*- suffixes mit dem diminativen *īna* § 57 in der form *akin* gehört ursprünglich dem nnd. gebiet an, ist aber ins md. und mhd. (engl.) gedrungen."

For English, Kluge refers to Earle, *Philology of the English Tongue*, §§ 316 *b*, 377. Earle's illustrations do not go farther back than Middle English, if even that far. The West-Saxon Gospels, however, offer an instance of one word at least in the OE. period: *of þyrncinum* (*þyrcenum*)=de tribolis, *Matt.* vii, 16. This throws doubt on Kluge's position that the diminative is borrowed in English from Low German.

J. M. Hart.

*Cornell University.*

## *ANGLO-SAXON GLOSSES.*

To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes,

Sirs:—The January number of this journal contains an article by Prof. J. M. Hart in which I am unjustly charged with unfairness to the authorities consulted in the preparation of my articles on Anglo-Saxon Glosses. As I never had access either to the thirteenth volume of *Anglia*, or to any volume of the *Zeitschrift für deutsche Altertums*, I could not very well make the 'loans' Prof. Hart speaks of. So, instead of preferring charges against me, he should have given me credit for having arrived at the same conclusions reached by so distinguished a scholar as Prof. Sievers. Nor have I any doubt but that Prof. Sievers himself would give me credit for it, were he made acquainted with the facts in the case. He showed kind interest in my work in that he wrote to Prof. Wölfflin of Munich, to give me some friendly advice as to prudence, an act of kindness which he certainly would not have done me, had he thought me capable of the 'moral obliquity' of which Prof. Hart accuses me. Moreover, he and Prof. Kluge being the advisers of Prof. Goetz of Jena, as to the Old English part of the *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*, whatever I have done towards elucidating glosses or finding the sources of them, has been submitted to him. I shall not undertake to answer now all of the questions raised by Prof. Hart. I shall defer doing so until after the publication of Prof. Georg Götz's *Thesaurus Glossarum Emendatarum.* Perhaps, by that time, Prof. Hart will have seen how unjustly he has attacked me. In the mean while, I will say this: I have never, knowingly, claimed what did not belong to me. A careful reader of my remarks on Hall's *Dictionary* cannot fail to observe that I tried to bring home to him the fact that he had not fully availed himself of the elucidations of glosses as given by Prof. Sievers in the eighth volume of *Englische Studien.* That my efforts were appreciated at Oxford, Prof. Hart can see from a letter Dr. Bright wrote to me at that time, in which he speaks of the very flattering reception accorded to my articles. Whatever may be my shortcomings, I am conscious of having honestly and earnestly striven for the truth. Prof. Hart is wide of the mark, if he speaks of my *sæva indignatio* against Sweet. There is no personal feeling involved at all; but I rise in righteous indignation against the besmircher of my fair name and the belittler of my repute. I *have* done something towards the advance of Old English Philology. Even so unfair a critic as Prof. Holthausen cannot help acknowledging that. The greater part of what he contributes towards correction of Sweet's *Dictionary* is substantially an acceptance or recommendation of what I have brought forward in the *Anglia* and *The Journal of Germanic Philology*, and—curiously enough—some of his strictures are identical with those of Prof. Hart. Now, did I follow Prof. Hart's method, I would be free to say that Prof. Hart took his cue from Prof. Holthausen. But I am fair minded

enough to give Prof. Hart credit for having independently seen, for example, the 'blunder' I made in connecting *esne* not with Gothic *asneis*, but with *iesen* 'kidney, intestine.' The reason why I committed this 'blunder' is this: I was well aware of the usual derivation of *esne*—in fact, being thoroughly familiar with Kluge's *Etym. Wtb.*, I could not have failed to notice what he says under *Ernte*, but I dared to imagine that the stem of *asneis* 'Erntearbeiter' could not possibly be the same that is extant in *esne*, since Ælfric—in one instance at least—uses the word in such a way as preëminently to bring out the sense of 'virility.' Exod. 11, 2, he undoubtedly opposes *esne* to *wif*, rendering a Latin *vir* and *femina*, respectively: *witodlice þu scealt beodan Israhela folce þæt esne bidde æt his frynd and wif æt hire nehgeburan gyldene fatu and sylfrene;* the adverb, moreover, *esnelice*, I have never met with as yet in the sense of *serviliter*, but always rendering a Latin *viriliter:* proof enough, I should say, thal the primary idea expressed by *esne* is that of *uirilitas*, *uirilia*, *pubes*. If, then, the primary idea of the word is that of virility, connection with *iesen* rendering *ilia* and the like commends itself. The development of the word would have been along the lines of German *Knecht*.. That such is the case I still believe, in spite of Messrs. Holthausen and Hart.

I must, for the present, let this suffice as an earnest of my endeavor to squarely meet Prof. Hart's charges. He shall hear more from me, as soon as I shall be enabled to speak unreservedly concerning things I must not touch upon before the publication of the above-mentioned work. Finally, let Prof. Hart be assured that Dr. Georg Götz fully believes in my honesty and capability. In a recent letter written to me, he, in very flattering terms, acknowledges the help I have given to the cause of glossography, and that this also extends to Old English, he may learn from the following which I shall quote for his benefit: *Im Angelsächsischen Teile habe ich aufgenommen, was Kluge und Sievers empfohlen haben.*

Otto B. Schlutter.

*Hartford High School.*

## BRIEF MENTION.

Under the title of *The later English Drama* Mr. Calvin S. Brown has edited, with an introduction and notes, Goldsmith's *She Stoops to Conquer*, Sheridan's *Rivals* and *School for Scandal*, Knowles' *Virginius*, and Bulwer-Lytton's *Lady of Lyons* and *Richelieu* (New York, A. S. Barnes & Co., 1898) for the use of students. The introduction consists of "A brief outline of the English Drama since Shakespeare," but it attempts to crowd too much into too little space, for *nine* pages of introduction can but scratch the surface of the subject. A short bibliography is prefixed, and occasional explanatory notes are scattered through the pages. The object of the book is merely

"to present in convenient and accessible form what has been done best in the English drama from the time of Goldsmith to the present,"

and this purpose it will serve very well.

We have noticed the occurrence twice of the misprint *militæ* for *militiæ* (pp. 319 and 326), but a man must be Argus-eyed to escape all such oversights. An Appendix gives some illustrative quotations, especially six or eight pages of translation from Livy on "The Murder of Dentatus and the affair of Virginia."

In the series of "English Readings for Students," published by Henry Holt & Co. (New York, 1898), Mr. William Strunk, Jr. has edited *Dryden's Essays on the Drama*, with introduction and notes. The book includes "An Essay of Dramatic Poesy," and "A Defence of an Essay of Dramatic Poesy," and "Of Heroic Plays." The first two of these had already been edited by Mr. Thomas Arnold in the Clarendon Press Series (Oxford, 1889), but it is well to have another edition with the short essay "Of Heroic Plays" appended.

An introduction of thirty-eight pages gives a chronological table, a sketch of Dryden's life, Dryden's sources and authorities, the history of the essays, and a brief estimate of Dryden's prose style, the tenor of which may be gathered from the assertion, "Dryden's position as the first writer of modern English prose has been long recognized, with hardly a dissenting voice," and the first familiar essay is characterized as "a work memorable in the history of English style." The editor's work seems to have been well done, and the publishers have done their part in a very attractive manner. Such books increase the facilities for the dissemination of a knowledge of standard works among young students of literature.

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

**Baltimore, June, 1899.**

## *THE PARCAE IN GOETHE'S FAUST, PART II, ACT 1, SCENE 3.*

THE object of this paper is an attempt to explain two difficulties in the treatment of the Parcae in the Mummenschanz-scene of Faust II. The first difficulty is met with in the exchange of parts by Atropos and Klotho, the second in the meaning of the lines:

> Stunden zählen, Jahre messen,
> Und der *Weber* nimmt den Strang.

The mythological conception underlying the *Parcae* in the passage referred to is evidently that of the *Moirai* as divinities of the duration of human life, and not as divinities of fate in the strict sense. Whether Goethe, in his conception of them as spinning divinities, was influenced directly by the classical writers of antiquity, or whether this influence was an indirect one, through the medium of Carstens, whose paintings on the same subject were well known in the original or in various sketches to Goethe, it would be difficult to determine. At any rate, Carstens' paintings offer as little solution for the problems of the passage as the various writings of Ovid, Pausanias, Plato, or Hesiod.

The ethical import of the Parcae as divinities of the duration of human life is treated by L. Schmitz in W. Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*, s. v. *Moira;* and by Preller in Pauly's *Real-Encyclopædie der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft*, s. v. *Fatum.* Briefly stated, the idea of All-fate expresses itself in Greek mythology at first in the mysterious *Moira.* Out of this develops the idea of the two fate-sisters, and later that of the trinity: one for birth, one for life, one for death. As divinities of the duration of human life, they soon are differentiated from the old idea of the *Moira*, and no longer represent the idea of absolute fate, fore-ordained, but rather a certain capricious independence which, however, man can in no wise influence. Especially is this true of Klotho and Atropos, the divinities of birth and death. The ethical conception that underlies these two, seems to have undergone in this respect little change; somewhat analogous with the worship of Apollo and Demeter, they typify the caprice of birth and death as viewed from the standpoint of the individual. Our coming into the world, and our going hence, are facts so inscrutable to the human mind, that all philosophy must exhaust itself in attempting to fathom the laws that govern them. Birth may come under favorable conditions, or under the most adverse; death may overtake us early or late; noble talents may be born in penury and want, worthless characters in the lap of luxury and ease; useful, promising lives may be cut short in their fullest bloom, useless and vicious ones prolonged beyond all human expectation or desire. Thus in the phenomena of birth and especially of death, the ancients sought in vain for the manifestation of laws that could be harmonized with the economy of life. To human reason, and much more to human feeling, birth and death are subject to no law, but are simply the capricious determinants of human existence. The conception of the Lachesis-idea undergoes, however, a different development. At first, like her sisters, she appears to regulate life according to a fore-ordained fate. Soon, however, we find the idea of absolute fate modified, but not in the direction of caprice. The birth of the idea of free will manifests itself. Lachesis becomes a goddess of chance. She draws the lot with averted face (see the celebrated Humboldt-Tegel relief). The quantity of life may then be the result of fate or caprice, but its quality is neither fore-ordained by fate nor subject to the caprice of the gods. This idea of chance naturally leads to that of free will. And thus indeed Pindar lets Tyche, the daughter of Zeus Eleutherios, take the place of Lachesis. In accordance with his conception is the bas-relief upon a Capitoline sarcophagus, where the place of Lachesis is occupied by a figure more majestic than Klotho or Atropos, which holds in its left hand the cornucopiæ of Tyche, and in its right the scales of Nemesis, the goddess of Justice. Here, then, under the inspired touch of Pindar, the idea of chance rises to that of individual freedom and responsibility.

---

It will, no doubt, be admitted that Goethe accepts in our passage the ancient conception of the two fate-sisters of birth and death.

Upon the capricious element in the manifestation of these two phenomena, particularly that of death, he lays every possible stress. The human heart has not been able to accept the rule of Atropos, because reason has been unable to see in it anything but caprice. In vain has humanity sought to find some philosophy that would harmonize this apparent capriciousness with some supreme law. Death still remains as capricious as ever. The rebellion, therefore, against Atropos, as described in the passage, the consequent exchange with Klotho, and the continuance of the same capricious action by the latter, are but the symbolical expression of the poet's views of death and of the impossibility to harmonize its laws with any human philosophy. A quotation from his *Euphrosyne* will show how deeply Goethe was impressed with this view of the capriciousness of death:

Ach, Natur, wie sicher und gross in Allem erscheinst du!
Himmel und Erde befolgt ewiges, festes Gesetz,
Jahre folgen auf Jahre, dem Frühling reichet der Sommer,
Und dem herrlichen Herbst treulich der Winter die Hand,
. . . . . .
Alles entsteht und vergeht nach Gesetz; doch über des Menschen
Leben, dem köstlichen Schatz, herrschet ein schwankendes Loos.
Nicht dem blühenden nickt der willig scheidende Vater,
Seinem trefflichen Sohn, freundlich vom Rande der Gruft,
Nicht der Jüngere schliesst dem Aelteren immer das Auge,
Das sich willig gesenkt, kräftig dem Schwächeren zu,
Oefter, ach! verkehrt das Geschick die Ordnung der Tage;
. . . . . .
Und so, liebliches Kind, durchdrang mich die tiefe Betrachtung,
Als du zur Leiche verstellt über die Arme mir hingst.

---

Various explanations have been offered as to the meaning of the lines:

Stunden zählen, Jahre messen,
Und der Weber nimmt den Strang.

Without entering upon a detailed discussion of these explanations, it may be said in general that they take too little regard for Goethe's philosophy of life at the time when the lines were written, or that they do not attempt to explain what the poet meant by the *Weber*. The following attempt bases itself mainly upon a study of related passages from the writings of Goethe in the last period of his life.

A counterpart of the Parcae-passage of the Mummenschanz is found in the third scene of *Was wir bringen. Fortsetzung. Vorspiel zur Eröffnung des Theaters in Halle, im Juli 1814, von Goethe und Riemer.*

Klotho, the spinner of the thread of life, enters, announced by Mercury. In leaving, she delivers the thread into his hands with the words:

Du wirst es dann der Schwester übergeben,
Sie weif' es aus zum *wirkungsreichen* Leben.

Lachesis now enters. A child carries the reel. The thread of life is handed to her by Mercury with the words:

Du legst es an! Dass *in der Zeiten Schwunge*
So edle Kräfte sich *zum Zweck* vollenden.

The two lines, it may be here said, correspond to the two lines under discussion.

Lachesis begins to reel off the thread quickly, and is rebuked by Mercury for her apparent haste:

Bedenke, dass in jedem Radesschwunge
Dem Sterblichen sich Jahre vorbedeuten.

The words of Lachesis in reply are important:

Rasch schlägt der Puls des jugendlichen Lebens,
Rasch schiesst der Pflanze Trieb zum schlanken Kiel;
Die Jugend freut sich nur des Vorwärtsstrebens,
Versucht sich weit umher, versucht sich viel.
Der Kräfte Spielen ist drum nicht vergebens,
So kennt sie bald sich Umfang, Maass und Ziel:
Der Most, der gährend sich zum Schaum geläutert,
Er wird zum Trank, der Geist und Sinn erheitert.

So vorgeübt an Geist- und Willenskräften,
Zum Wissen, wie zur Thätigkeit gereift,
Führt ihn Beruf zu stätigen Geschäften,
Die er mit Lust zu sicherm Zweck ergreift,
Weil That und Wissen sich zusammenheften
Sich eins am anderen nährend stützt und steift;
Und so *von inn-* und *aussen* gleich berufen,
*Ersteigt er hier des Lehramts* hohe Stufen.

Nun öffnet ihm Natur den reichen Tempel,
Er darf vertraut, ihr Priester, darin walten:
Nun offenbart er sie durch Lehre, durch Exempel,
Ihr *Wollen* selbst muss sich in *That* gestalten;
Entziffernd leicht den vielverschlungnen Stempel
Muss sich für ihn ein einfach Wort entfalten,
Da Erdentiefen und des Himmels Sphären
Nur ein Gesetz der Menschenbrust bewähren.

The scene closes with the appearance of Atropos, who, notwithstanding the pleading of Mercury and Lachesis, severs with her shears the life-thread that has been reeled to a skein.

In the light of other passages, to which reference will be made immediately, the thread spun by Klotho may be interpreted as the essential individuality of each human being given to him at birth, whereby he is distinguished from every other; that of Lachesis (essentially in the same sense as that of Pindar's Tyche) as all the varied "accidents" of human life with which this individuality comes in contact, and whereby it is developed into

reasoning intelligence. This process is indicated in the first two stanzas spoken by Lachesis and closing with the words:

Und so von inn- und aussen gleich berufen,
Ersteigt er hier des Lehramts hohe Stufen.

This is the *Zweck*, the object and aim toward which Lachesis has been working. Until reason has been developed through the teachings of the "accidents" of life, man is a scholar of Lachesis. But when *Vernunft* results as a consequence of her teachings, man becomes independent; he is no longer a scholar, but a teacher.

A similar process is indicated in Goethe's *Urworte, Orphisch*, in a commentary to which he says:

"Der Dämon bedeutet hier die nothwendige, bei der Geburt unmittelbar ausgesprochene, begrenzte Individualität der Person, das Characteristische, wodurch sich der Einzelne von jedem anderen bei noch so grosser Aehnlichkeit unterscheidet . . . . . Dieses feste, zähe, dieses nur ans sich selbst zu entwickelnde Wesen kommt nun freilich in mancherlei Beziehungen, wodurch sein erster, ursprünglicher Character in seinen Wirkungen gehemmt, in seinen Neigungen gehindert wird, und was hier eintritt nennt unsere Philosophie: Tyche, das Zufällige."

Comparing with the above-quoted words of Lachesis: *Rasch schlägt der Puls des jugendlichen Lebens*, etc., the following found in the same commentary to the *Urworte*, we recognize the close parallelism of thought:

"Allein Tyche lässt nicht nach und wirkt besonders auf die Jugend immerfort, die sich in ihren Neigungen, Spielen, Geselligkeiten und flüchtigem Wesen bald da- bald dorthin wirft und nirgends Halt und Befriedigung findet. Da entsteht denn mit dem wachsenden Tage eine ernstere Unruhe, eine gründlichere Sehnsucht."

Lachesis is, then, the symbol of the influence of the "accidents" of life—as Goethe calls them—by which the individual's development is accomplished through contact and conflict with empirical life.

If this interpretation be correct, we have the meaning of the lines:

Stunden zählen, Jahre messen,
Und der Weber nimmt den Strang—

almost forced upon us.

The lines immediately preceding read:

Könnt' ich einmal mich vergessen,
Wär' es um die Welt mir bang—

the meaning of which would be: If the absolute individuality of each being were permitted absolute freedom, if it were not constantly checked or deflected, and thus developed into a higher state of reasoning intelligence, the great purpose of all-life could never be attained; inasmuch as there would be no reasoning being to comprehend and utilize the harmonious, though blind, forces of nature. But the educating influence of the accidents of life begins to operate with birth, each day and year, until the truly free, because rational, being is evolved from the sum total of these experiences; and then man is fitted to work by the strength of his reason as a free and intelligent agent, to take life—as Lachesis says—as a skein of multifarious experiences, through the threads of which there yet runs the same dominant quality of his own individuality, and to weave it into the fabric of all-life. The *Weber* is then no more nor less than the intelligent, reasoning human being: *der vernünftige Mensch*.

Interpretations of allegorical or symbolical figures can at best be suggestive, and hardly ever susceptible of proof. However, it may be said that there are other considerations which seem to support the above view of the Parcae and the *Weber*.

The words of Lachesis in *Was wir bringen:*

Nun öffnet ihm Natur den reichen Tempel,
Er darf vertraut, ihr Priester, darin walten, etc.,

express Goethe's ethical relation to life in his later years. Man as a rational being learns to understand nature and to coöperate with her. His life now fits into the all-life; instead of antagonizing nature, he can now make use of her to the highest ends, for he comprehends at last that she is but the expression of the one final law, under which alone the race can achieve the fulfilment of its destiny. Thus man reaches his highest perfection: on the one hand, he has risen above the accidents of life; on the other, he has learned to utilize its necessities, its natural laws.

The same idea is found in *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre*, I, 17:

"Das Gewebe dieser Welt ist aus Nothwendigkeit und Zufall gebildet; die Vernunft des Menschen stellt sich zwischen beide und weiss sie zu beherrschen; sie behandelt das Nothwendige als den Grund ihres Daseins, das Zufällige weiss sie zu lenken, zu leiten, zu nutzen, und nur indem sie fest und unerschütterlich steht, verdient der Mensch ein Gott der Erde genannt zu werden."

It is the same idea as the one represented in the line

Und der Weber nimmt den Strang.

Man as a rational being weaves out of the necessities and the accidents of life *das Gewebe dieser Welt.*

This conception of the highest form of individual existence under the figure of the weaver recurs again in Goethe's *Vorspiel zur Eröffnung des Weimarschen Theaters, 19. September 1807*, where *die Majestät*, speaking of just such a rational activity of man, says:

Der du an dem Weberstuhle sitzest,
Unterrichtet, mit behenden Gliedern
Fäden durch die Fäden schlingest, alle
Durch den Tactschlag an einander drängest,
Du bist Schöpfer, dass die Gottheit lächeln
Deiner Arbeit muss und deinem Fleisse.
Du beginnest weislich und vollendest
Emsig, und aus deiner Hand empfänget
Jeglicher zufrieden das Gewandstück;
Einen Festtag schaffst du jedem Haushalt.

Thus the unity between the inner and the outer life is established, for

So im Kleinen ewig wie im Grossen
Wirkt Natur, wirkt Menschengeist, und beide
Sind ein Abglanz jenes Urlichts droben,
Das unsichtbar alle Welt erleuchtet.

It is interesting to notice how Goethe introduces here also abruptly, without any apparent motive, the symbol of the weaver, just as in the Faust-passage under consideration. That he should do so, was for him most natural, inasmuch as life represented as a process of weaving was one of his most favorite symbols. A few instances in addition to those already given, may suffice.

*Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre*, VII, 5:

"Es giebt Augenblicke, in welchen die Begebenheiten gleich geflügelten Weberschiffchen vor uns sich hin und wieder bewegen und unaufhaltsam ein Gewebe vollenden, das wir mehr oder weniger selbst gesponnen und angelegt haben."

*Aufsätze zur Litteratur*, No. 182 (1826):

"Das Gewebe unseres Lebens und Willens bildet sich aus gar verschiedenen Fäden, indem sich Nothwendiges und Zufälliges, Willkürliches und rein Gewolltes, jedes von der verschiedensten Art und oft nicht zu unterscheiden, durcheinander schränkt."

*Dichtung und Wahrheit*, XX:

"Das Dämonische bildet eine der moralischen Weltordnung, wo nicht entgegengesetzte, doch sie durchkreuzende Macht, so dass man die eine für den Zettel, die andere für den Einschlag könnte gelten lassen."

*Sprüche in Prosa*, 152:

"Es mögen sich wohl die einen in dem Weltgewebe als Zettel, die anderen als Einschlag betrachten lassen; jene gäben eigentlich die Breite des Gewebes, diese dessen Halt, Festigkeit, vielleicht auch mit Zuthat irgend eines Gebildes. *Die Schere der Parze hingegen bestimmt die Länge*, der sich das übrige alles unterwerfen muss."

*Wilhelm Tischbeins Idyllen*, XIV (1821). Here Goethe closes abruptly with the stanza:

Wirket Stunden leichten Webens,
Lieblich lieblichen begegnend,
Zettel, Einschlag längsten Lebens,
Scheidend, kommend, grüssend, segnend!

For further examples see Hermann Henkel, *Das Goethesche Gleichnis*, Halle, 1886, p. 111 ff.

What we have, then, in our passage is essentially the philosophy of Goethe's later years, as he develops it in his *Metamorphose der Thiere*, a welding together of the main principles of Leibniz's Monadology and Spinoza's Determinism, resulting in an equation that seeks to do justice to the principle of all-unity, Spinoza's *Einheitsgefühl*.

It should be pointed out further that the interpretation given in the fore-going avoids one of the main difficulties of the interpretations of Düntzer, Loeper, Hartung, Schröer, and others. The thread naturally passes finally from Lachesis to Atropos, or in our passage to Klotho, who severs it. Lachesis' words, however, imply that the *Weber* takes it from *her* hands, and the weaving of it occurs before death, and does not denote a process beyond human life. Lachesis must act, she cannot desist, because otherwise there would be no weaver to construct the web of all-life. The development of life, the attainment of its inherent idea, the "one law for the human breast," can be secured only as a result of her action. The last line is an integral part of the stanza, not a superadded thought, as most of the interpretors of the passage would make it.

It may be stated in conclusion that a variant of the stanza (MS "H", folio 12, see the Paralipomena in the Weimar Edition) seems to bear out the interpretation given above. The stanza has in this MS the following form:

Wenn ich nicht weifte,
Wo gäb es Stränge;
Wenn ich nicht müsse,
Wenn ich nicht zählte,
Wer wollte weben.

J. F. Coar.

*Harvard University.*

## *WILH. MÜLLER AND ITALIAN POPULAR POETRY.*

W. MÜLLER, the poet of Schubert's song-cycles, *Die schöne Müllerin* and *Die Winterreise*, and author of the widely-known *Griechenlieder*, was the first to call attention to the treasures of Italian popular poetry.[1] He spent the year 1818 in Italy, and to this sojourn we owe the songs, *Ländliche Lieder*, *Lieder aus dem Meerbusen von Salerno*,[2] and *Ständchen in Ritornellen aus Albano*. Sources of nine of Müller's songs, seven of them from the last-named cycle, are to be found in:

*Egeria.* Raccolta di poesie italiane popolari, cominciata da Guglielmo Müller, dopo la di lui morte terminata e pubblicata da O. L. B. Wolff, dottore e professore. Lipsia: Ernesto Fleischer, 1829. 8vo, xviii+262 pp.

*Egeria* (judged by the standard of to-day) is alike untrustworthy and unscientific. The real songs of the people are mixed in with and up with arias from Goldoni, chap-book histories of brigandage, dialectic paraphrasings of Tasso's *Gerusalemme liberata*, street-ballads and carnival songs.

Müller's sources are without exception in the shorter pieces: one sestine, two quatrains and six ritornelles making up the list;—from the longer canzone and canzonette not a word. Fr. Rückert, who was in Ariccia[3] during Müller's Italian sojourn, contributed several ritornelles to *Egeria*.[4]

1 Cf. Gustav Meyer, *Essays*, vol. ii (1893), p. 118.

2 For sources of these, where such exist, cf. *W. M. and the German Volkslied* (disser.), Chicago, 1899.

3 Cf. *Rom, Römer u. Römerinnen*. Berlin, 1820, i, 52; also Hosäus, *Das Wilh. Müller-Denkmal*, Dessau, 1891, p. 22.

4 For example, *Egeria*, p. 3.

Fiore di ginestra
Vostra madre non rimarita apposta
Per non levar quel fiore dalla finestra.

Rückert, *Die Ritornelle von Ariccia* 97,

(*Der Mutter Blumenstöckchen*)
Blüthe vom Genster!
Heirathen lässt euch Mamma nicht, verlieren
Will sie das Blumenstöckchen nicht vom Fenster.

*Egeria*, p. 4,

Se morto mi vuoi veder, piglia un' acetta;
Fa come fece la bella Giuditta,
Che d'Oloferne ne fece vendetta.

Rückert, *ibid.* 38 (*Alttestamentlich*),

Willst du mich todt, die Axt nimm in die Rechte,
Und mache, wie's die schöne Judith machte,
Als sie sich an dem Holofernes rächte.

and elsewhere.

*Egeria*, p. 3 (*Ritornelli*),

Fiore di pepe,
Se la vostra figlia non mi date,
Io la ruberò, e voi piangerete.

Müller, *Gedichte*, ii, 30,[5]

Mutter, gib mir deine Tochter,
Oder halt' ihr hundert Wächter—
Und sie wird dir doch gestohlen!

*Egeria*, p. 3,

Fiore di pepe,
Tutte le fontanelle si sono seccate;
Povero amore mio! muore di sete.[6]

Blüthe der Pfirschen!
Im Felde sind vertrocknet alle Bronnen,
Und meine arme Liebe muss verdürsten.

Müller, *Ged.*, ii, 24 (*Die heisze Zeit*),

Ach, ach, nun sind vertrocknet alle Quellen!
Wo soll mein Lämmchen seinen Durst denn stillen,
Wenn ihm am Gaum die heiszen Gräser brennen?

Ach, ach, nun sitzt mein Mädchen in der Kammer!
Ich schweif'ums Haus und sehe sie doch nimmer,
Und meine Liebe musz vor Durst verschmachten.

*Egeria*, p. 3,

Fiore di mammoletta,
Cosa m'importa, se siete brutta o bella,
Se niun'mercè da voi il mio cor aspetta?

Müller, *Ged.*, ii, 30,

Ob du schön bist, oder häszlich,
Macht mich froh nicht, noch verdrieszlich;
Denn du bist zu stolz und wählig.

*Egeria*, p. 5,

In mezzo al petto mio è un giardinetto,
Venite, bello mio, a spasso spesso,
Ch'io vi voglio dar un garofaletto.

Müller, *Ged.*, ii, 23 (*Der Garten des Herzens*),

In meines Herzens Mitte blüht ein Gärtchen,
Verschlossen ist es durch ein enges Pförtchen,
Zu dem den Schlüssel führt mein liebes Mädchen.

Es ist April.—Komm, wolle dich nicht schämen
Und pflücke dir heraus die liebsten Blumen;
Sie drängen sich entgegen deinen Händen.

*Egeria*, p. 5,

Lo mio amore mi ha mandato un foglio,
Sigillato con uno spicchio d'aglio,
E dentro v'era scritto: non ti voglio.

Müller, *Ged.*, ii, 24 (*Der Thränenbrief*),

Mein Mädchen hat ein Briefchen mir geschrieben
Wol mit der schwarzen Feder eines Raben,
Und hat mit Zwiebelschalen es versiegelt.

Und wie ich nun das Siegel aufgebrochen,
Da fühlt'ich in den Augen solch ein Stechen,
Das mir die Thränen auf die Wangen flossen.

Ich trocknete die Augen, nun zu lesen;
Doch ist das Trocknen ganz umsonst gewesen—
Denn ach, sie schreibt: „Wir müssen Abschied nehmen."

*Egeria*, p. 5,

Fiore di aneto,
Quando moro, e vado in paradiso,
Se non ti trovo, mi ritorno indietro.

5 Hrsg. v. Max Müller, Leip., 1868.

6 Cf. Rückert, *l. c.*, no. 15 (*Der Schmachtende*).

Müller, *Ged.*, i, 81 (*Die Umkehr*),

Ja, und wenn die Engel einst mich führen
Aus dem Grabe nach dem Paradies,
Seh'ich erst vor seinen goldnen Thüren
Weit und breit mich um nach ihr gewisz.

Wenn sie meine Augen nicht erblicken,
Kehr'ich um und schaue nicht hinein,
Will ins enge, dunkle Grab mich drücken
Und verschlafen alle Freud' und Pein.

*Egeria*, p. 11 (*Versi Quadernari* 1),

Mira che bel sereno, che belle stelle!
Quest' è la notte a rubar le zitelle;
E chi ruba le zitelle non è ladro,
Si chiama un giovanetto innamorato.

Müller, *Ged.*, ii, 29,

Sieh, sieh, wie scheint der Mond so wunderhelle!
Wie ist die Nacht rings um mich her so stille!
Nichts hör'ich als das Klopfen meines Herzens.

Das ist recht eine Nacht für warme Liebe!
Das ist recht eine Nacht zum Mädchenraube!
So möcht'ich fort mit meinem Liebchen ziehen!

Und wer ein Mädchen rauht, der ist kein Räuber,
Nein, heiszt ihn einen wackern Buhler lieber!
Was meinst denn du dazu, mein holdes Bräutchen?

*Egeria*, p. 11 (*Versi Quadernari* 2),

Oh rondinella, che per arto[7] vole,
Eh cala abbasso e scorta[8] due parole,
E cava una penna alle tue ale;
Ti scriverò una lettera al mio amore.

Müller, *Ged.*, i, 43 (*Seefahrers Abschied*),

Die du fliegst in hohen Lüften,
Kleine Schwalbe, komm herab,
Weil ich dir ein Wort im stillen
Unten zu vertrauen hab'!
Sollst mir eine Feder schenken
Aus den schwarzen Flügeln dein,
Will an meine Liebe schreiben:
Herz, es musz geschieden sein.

*Egeria*, p. 13 (*Sestine*),

Bella ragazza, che ti chiami Nina,
Sempre Ninetta ti voglio chiamare.
Coll' acqua che ti lavi ogni mattina,
Ti prego, Nina mia, non la buttare;
Che se la butti, ci nasce una spina,
Ci nasce una rosetta tanto cara.

Müller, *Ged.*, ii, 28 (*Rosensamen*),

Ich ging vorüber heut an deinem Fenster
Und zankte mit dem dichten grünen Ginster,
Der dich vor meinen Blicken ganz versteckte.

Da sah ich, wie aus dem Gesträuch geschwinde
Heraus sich streckten deine weiszen Hände
Und Wasser niedertroff von ihren Fingern.

Wie gern hätt' ich ein Tröpfchen aufgefangen!
Doch alle hat die Erde gleich verschlungen,
Und morgen werden Rosen aus ihr wachsen.

PHILIP ALLEN.
*University of Chicago.*

## *THE LEGEND OF JOSEPH'S BONES IN OLD AND MIDDLE ENGLISH.*

IN the prayer of Judas, *Elene* 725 and following, occur these somewhat puzzling lines.

7 Per alto voli. 8 Ascolta due p.

Swā ꝺū gehȳrdest ꝺone hālgan wer
Moyses on meꝺle, ꝺā ꝺū mihta God
geȳwdest ꝺām eorle on ꝺā æꝺelan tīd,
under beorhhliꝺe, bān Iōsephes,
swā ic ꝺē, etc. *Elene*, 785 f.

This passage has no original in the Bible, where there is no account of God's showing Moses the bones of Joseph in any special manner, or of any prayer such as is implied in *ꝺū gehȳrdest*. Its immediate source for Cynewulf was the Elene legend, as the following clauses from the Latin and Greek versions show: *et sicut exaudisti famulum tuum Moysen, et ostendisti ei ossa patris nostri Ioseph: καὶ ἀνέδειξας τὰ ὀστᾶ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ ἡμῶν Ἰωσὴφ ὄντα ἐν κρυπτῷ.* The latter is especially important, since *under beorhhliðe* clearly has its original in *ἐν κρυπτῷ*.[1] Whether the ultimate origin of the legend was known to the English poet is uncertain, but the extra-biblical story is still worthy of a note.[2]

It may naturally be asked whether there are any other references to the same legend in our older literature, and fortunately the Middle English *Genesis and Exodus* has a notable use of the story regarding the bones of Joseph. It occurs at lines 3179 to 3182, which read as follows:

Almost redi was here fare;
Moyses biꝺogt him ful gare
of ꝺat ꝺe *is* kin haveꝺ sworen,
Iosepes bones sulen ben boren.
Oc ꝺe Nil[3] haved so wide spiled
ꝺat his grave is ꝺor under hiled.
On an gold gad ꝺe name God
is graven, and leid upon ꝺe flod;
Moyses it folwede ꝺider it flet,
and stod ꝺor ꝺe grave under let.
Ꝺor he dolven, and haven sogt
and funden, and haven upbrogt
ꝺe bones ut of ꝺe erꝺe wroken,
summe hole and summe broken.[4]

The Middle English *Genesis and Exodus* is known to be founded upon the *Historia Scholastica* of Petrus Comestor who died in 1189, and this passage has its original in the following sentences of that work:

1 This has apparently escaped notice. It is not mentioned by Glöde (*Cynewulf's Elene und ihre Quelle*, 1897, and. *Anglia* 9, 271), by Zupitza (*Elene*, third ed. 1888), or by Holder (*Inventio Sanctæ Crucis*, 1889).

2 Holder gives the brief reference *Elle Haddebarim Rabba*, sect. Sot. Charabara; *De Vita et Morte Mosis*, Hamb. 1714: and *Gilberti Gaulmini Notarum*, II, ch. 2. This I discovered only after writing the above, and in any case the fuller explanation is necessary.

3 Kolbing in *Englische Studien* 3, 273 ff., proposed this reading, instead of *a-l* in Morris's edition of *Genesis and Exodus*, owing to the Latin original. I am also informed that there is no reference to the *hail* in any Talmudic version of the story.

4 Morris, Early English Text Society 7, 90–91, slightly modified as to punctuation and capitals. No allusion to the legend of Joseph's bones occurs in the version of the Elene story printed in *Legends of the Holy Rood* by Morris, E. E. T. S. 46., or in Napier's *Legend of the Cross*, *Ibid.*, 103.

"Factum est autem ut Nilus, præter solitum, adhuc inundaret terram in qua erat sepulcrum Joseph. Tenebantur autem juramento asportare ossa ejus. Tulit Moyses scriptum in lamina aurea nomen Domini tetragrammata, quæ superposita aquæ supernatavit usque dum veniens staret supra ubi erat sepulcrum. Et effodientes sustulerunt ossa quæ sublata leguntur eis prophetasse forte de difficultate itineris."—Migne, *Petrologia* 198, 1155.

But while the *Genesis and Exodus* furnishes an interesting parallel to the lines in *Elene*, the origin of this extension of the scripture account is still unexplained. A hint of the true explanation comes from S. Baring-Gould's *Legends of the Patriarchs and Prophets*, in which the story is given at length and referred to the *Talmud*. But in Baring-Gould, as in the Middle English poem, the story of the golden rod is emphasized, while there is no mention of this, or of the Nile, in *Elene*. Besides, the use of *under beorhhliðe* in the latter would seem to be peculiarly inappropriate to the Nile story. These differences led me to consult Dr. M. Meilziner, Professor of Talmud in the Hebrew Union College of Cincinnati, as to that practically inaccessible book of Hebrew Literature, and his letters clear up both passages completely. From these it seems that there are two forms of the legend of Joseph's bones in the *Talmud* itself, and a later variation of the story in a work akin to it. The substance of the Talmudic versions is as follows. In both Moses, when unable to find the bones of Joseph, calls together the elders of Israel, and at last gets trace of the lost relics. The two versions here separate however. According to one, Moses was told that the bones were sunk in the bottom of the Nile but, at his prayer that they should be shown him, the coffin rose to the surface of the river. According to the other, Joseph's coffin was hidden away in the royal sepulchre, among the sarcophagi of the kings, and Moses did not know which it was. He prayed, and the coffin of Joseph moved out from among the other sarcophagi by some miraculous power.

There is nothing in the Latin version of the Elene legend to indicate which of these two forms of the story was in the writer's mind. But in the English poem the words *under beorhhliðe*, based on the Greek as we have seen, are significant as probably referring to the sepulchre of the second version. Not only could they scarcely be a part of the Nile story, but there is nothing to preclude such a meaning as 'slope or side of the burial-mound, or sepulche' for *beorhhliðe*, since *beorh* frequently means 'burial-mound'. It is not impossible that Cynewulf himself knew something of the original souce of the story, for some knowledge of Talmudic lore in this early time is also shown by *Beowulf* 107-114, in which Grendel and similar monsters are referred to as descendents of Cain—an unmistakable Talmudic tradition.[5] In any case, the *Talmud* was very early studied by Christian scholars as throwing light upon obscure passages in the scriptures.

While the Talmudic legends sufficiently explain the passage in *Elene*, they throw no light upon the story of the golden rod in the Middle English *Genesis and Exodus*. This part of the story originated, not in the *Talmud* itself, but in the *Pesikta*, a homiletical treatise supposed to have been composed in the seventh century. In this work there is added to the former story,

"and some say that Moses wrote the ineffable name of God on a potsherd which he threw into the Nile, whereupon the coffin floated."

Of the intervening steps from the potsherd to the golden rod (lamina aurea), which floated upon the water, I have no knowledge, but it is easy to believe the one little more than a gradual development from the other.

Oliver Farrar Emerson.
*Western Reserve University.*

## *ON THE TITLE AND SUBTITLE OF MOLIÈRE'S MISANTHROPE.*

It is a question of some interest why Molière gave the title of *Misanthrope* to what a majority of the best critics now regard as his greatest masterpiece.[1] A great probability exists that such was not his original intention. It seems that the poet, while at work on the piece, suffering greatly from the injustice of others, was insensibly led to exaggerate the misanthropical features of his hero, so that finally this title suggested itself to him as the most appropriate.

In the 'privilège' which he obtained in 1666 we find, beside *le Misanthrope*, the additional title: *L'Atrabilaire amoureux*.

5 Bouterwek first pointed this out in *Biblische Dichtungen* I, cxi, and in *Germania* I, 401. Compare also Bugge, Paul and Braune's *Beiträge* 12, 79.

1 "To witness a performance of the *Misanthrope*, says Ed. Thierry, is to be in the presence of the seventeenth century, imperishable in the immortality of the masterpiece of its masterpieces." See *The Molièriste*, 1883, p. 180.

There are some good reasons, based on facts the importance of which has not yet, it seems, been fully appreciated, which make it probable that Molière, at first, intended merely to draw the character of a cross and irritable, though otherwise estimable man in love with a coquette. Such a character could not fail to be interesting in a comedy, and we know that the poet, first and all, endeavored to write good comedy, that is, to be entertaining, or, in his own language, *faire rire les honnêtes gens*. But in the process of writing he added features to this original conception which partly changed the play from a light comedy into a drama of such intensity of feeling and of such contrast between the actual and the ideal, as to make its *dénouement* almost tragical. The piece, nevertheless, remains a comedy owing to the original features which were retained, but the change it underwent is such that Eugène Despois might well call it "the noblest of comic masterpieces," and that a very distinguished and acute German critic[2] grouped it with Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and Goethe's *Tasso* as particularly fit to be ranked among the masterpieces of *Welt-literatur*, because these three dramas reveal so much of the inner life and personality of their authors.

The quality of 'nobility' the piece owed, in part, undoubtedly to the mental suffering the poet experienced during the time of its composition. The note of personal and painful experience that rings through the piece makes it unlike any other of his works. It was noticed by Goethe who was among the first to call attention to the tragical impression it leaves on the mind of the reader, but who, probably for this very reason, said of it: "I am reading it again and again, as one of the pieces I like best in the world." Petit de Julleville has warned us against attributing to Molière motives which he never had. He says very judiciously:

"Fanatical admirers of Molière have pretended to see in him a universal genius. Are there such? For them he represents not only all comedy, but also all human thought, all philosophy, all learning. This exaggeration is the cause why people attribute to Molière philosophical or tragic intentions of which he never thought."

And further:

"We may feel sure that any criticism which aims at attributing to Molière any other purpose than that of painting men, and of 'making respectable people laugh' by the vivacious energy and truthfulness of this painting, runs the risk of losing sight of the true conception of his work, and of misleading our admiration."[3]

We may accept this as exactly true, for there is a difference between "*attributing* to Molière philosophical or tragic *intentions*," and the simply objective statement that in one of his comedies the poet allowed his personal feelings to enter in such a manner as to imbue it with a decidedly tragical quality.

One of the most competent students of Molière, G. Larroumet,[4] says:

"There is in the part of Alcestis something so profoundly true *that the creative power of the poet cannot sufficiently explain it*, accents which came from the heart rather than from the imagination, *a profound melancholy in which the memories of a personal experience became visible*."

In order to appreciate the full force of this remark, it is not only necessary to examine the piece itself, but to look closely into the circumstances which affected the poet while he composed it. It has been said that Molière disappears behind his works, and it is indeed difficult to give an exact account of the genesis of any of his comedies, because he left no record of his work, in extended prefaces or letters, that might enable us in the case of any of his masterpieces to arrive at definite conclusions as to the time of their inception and the successive stages of their composition.

It is, however, not only highly probable, but almost certain that the poet conceived the plan of an improved reworking of his *Dom Garcie de Navarre* soon after the first representation of the piece, February 4th, 1661. This tragi-comedy was in reality little more than a translation of the *Gelosie Fortunate* of Cicognini, who had borrowed the plan from a Spanish original, the author of which is not known. It proved a failure, and Molière never published it, but as he transferred several important scenes of it to his *Misanthrope*, and as the latter treats so largely of the same subject, that is, jealousy, it can scarcely be doubted that the poet, seeing the reason of the failure, immediately planned a new piece in which he would leave out the weak elements of the old one, while retaining certain features of the latter and adding others.

Whether he actually set to work at once on

2 Julian Schmidt, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur seit Lessings Tod*, Vol. iii.

3 Petit de Julleville; *Le Théâtre en France*.

4 Gustave Larroumet; *La Comédie de Molière: L'Auteur et le Milieu*. 4. édition. Paris, 1893.

the piece that now bears the name of the *Misanthrope* may be doubted, and it is perhaps true, as Brossette[5] tells us in a note, that the beginnings of the *Misanthrope* date back to 1664, and to the same day when Boileau recited his second satire in honor of Molière, at the house of Count du Broussin. Brossette states positively that after this reading Molière wrote the first act of his *Misanthrope*.

Without accepting the exact sequence of the facts in this statement, for it is at least highly probable that the poet had already completed the plan of the first act, and possibly written part of it before 1664, we may admit that the date given is approximately correct, though this involves the inference that Molière was at work in that period on *two* of his most important plays, for it was in 1664 that he published the first three acts of his *Tartufe*.

If we closely examine this first act we find that the hero of the play is represented as highly irritable, deeply in love, and deficient in worldly wisdom. The first indication that the poet wants us to see in him a misanthropist is in lines 118–122, which are virtually a reproduction from the *Apophthegmata* of Erasmus.[6] But as Alcestis follows up these lines by expressions of anger at the: *franc scélerat avec qui j'ai procès* (l. 124)—*le traître* (l. 125)—*ce pied—plat* (l. 129), and refers to the success of this "scoundrel" in terms of intense abuse—as one who *Par de sales emplois s'est poussé dans le monde*, (l. 130)—whose success *Fait gronder le mérite et rougir la vertu* (l. 132): we see in this outburst only the natural result of a temporary disappointment. If Alcestis were sure to beat hisopponent in the pending lawsuit he might still abuse him, but he would not wind up his furious remarks by the threat: *De fuir dans un désert l'approche des humains*. He might still exclaim:

> *Nommez le fourbe*, infâme, et scélérat maudit,
> *Tout le monde en convient, et nul ne contredit.*
> Cependant sa grimace est partout bien venue;
> On l'accueille, on lui rit, partout il s'insinue;
> Et, s'il est, par la brigue, un rang à disputer,
> Sur le plus honnête homme on le voit l'emporter—

but this language, savage and abusive though it is, would not be considered by the speaker, nor by any one else, as a sign of misanthropy.

All these utterances show the resentment due to disappointment, and the disgust of an honest man at the indifference and servility of men in general; but as the speaker has not yet lost his lawsuit, and as the venality and low moral condition of the mass of mankind are matters of the most common observation and experience, we cannot take this outburst very seriously. We find Alcestis petulant, irritable, unpractical and slightly ridiculous, but we cannot see in him a misanthropist. He may develop into one, but thus far he has given way too much to impulsive resentment and general ill-humor to make us see in him more than an honest man *with a bad temper*. It should be noticed that his *general* condemnation of the moral cowardice of the world follows the statement of his *personal* grievance. Another quite personal grievance explains his rudeness to Oronte.

The scene of the 'sonnet' speaks in favor of Brossette's statement in so far as Molière evidently thought of Boileau when he wrote it. This is confirmed by a passage in a letter Boileau wrote in 1706 to the Marquis de Mimeure. Referring to a certain quarrel he goes on to say: "I played the true part of the *Misanthrope* in Molière's comedy, or rather, I played my own character, the anger of Alcestis at bad verses having been, *as Molière has confessed to me*, copied from me as a model."
But as Molière had known Boileau before 1664, this alone is not conclusive.

The important fact, in connection with the introduction of the Sonnet scene, is the virulence of the remarks of Alcestis in his conversation with Oronte. Here again the hero appears as an *ill-tempered* man, as an *atrabilaire* and, as the sequel shows, an *atrabilaire amoureux*.

Molière, we admit, had Boileau in mind when he drew this feature of the character and conduct of Alcestis; but while a critic like Boileau might have spoken sarcastically of such a production as Oronte's verses, we can hardly believe that he would, under similar circumstances, *and in Molière's own estimation of the critic's severity*, have used such language as Molière puts in the mouth of his hero after the extremely courteous and almost deferential approaches of Oronte. We are forced to conclude that Alcestis is not merely the fearless critic who impartially judges a literary production, but a man who has a *personal* grudge against the author of this production. It is important to notice this *personal* feeling, very dif-

5 *Œuvres de M. Boileau Despréaux*, Genève, 1716. See also *Molière*, vol. v, in the series *Grands Écrivains*, etc.

6 Erasmi *Apophthegmata*, page 486, edition of 1641: "Timon atheniensis, dictus misanthropos, interrogatus cur omnes homines odio prosequeretur: 'Malos, inquit, merito odi, cæteros ob id odi quod malos non oderint.'"

ferent from the cool sarcasm of an offended critic, and intelligible only in a man *who hates the would-be poet as a rival.* We must not forget that Alcestis cannot be in ignorance as to the lady to whom Oronte has addressed his sonnet. It is none other than *Célimène* whom he himself so intensely loves. The intensity of this personal feeling accounts for the severity of some of his expressions which could not but wound Oronte, and not merely in his vanity, and which were really not called for. Under the veil of a recital of an occurrence he uses expressions like these: *le nom de ridicule et misérable auteur* (line 372); *les démangeaisons d'écrire* (l. 346); *jouer de mauvais personnages* (350); *affectation pure* (387); *ces colifichets dont le bon sens murmure* (403); *faux brillants* (416); *d'aussi méchants sc. vers* (429). He becomes almost ferocious when he recites to him, by way of contrast, the popular ditty, and he repeats this ditty in order to drive home the sting of the insult all the more efficiently. The impression we receive from Alcestis in this scene is that of a jealous rival who delights in wreaking his critical spleen on an unfortunate poet who stands in his way. This feature of jealousy in the play is very distinct, and reminds us of *Dom Garcie* in which jealousy is also a leading feature. It seems to point to Molière's own experience with Armande Béjart who had become his wife in 1662, and with whom he had serious differences in 1664 which finally led to a permanent estrangement. This first act, therefore, shows Alcestis suffering from two serious grievances: one is the danger of losing an important lawsuit; the other his unsuccessful love affair. His good right in the lawsuit seems to be unquestioned, but the iniquity of courts and witnesses is such that he stands but a poor chance of winning, because he will not make personal calls on the judges to win their favor. He sees his friend using the polite forms of social life toward people whom he (Alcestis) dislikes, and particularly toward Oronte; this infuriates him and he goes so far as to say that his hatred of mankind is such that it extends to every one, and that he feels at times sudden promptings to flee into a wilderness in order to avoid the approaches of men (lines 118–144).

To recapitulate: The first act shows Alcestis *cross and irritable:* 1. at the conduct of his friend Philinte who observes the delusive, though accepted and permissible forms of good society; 2. at the suggestion that he must call on the judges to win a just suit at law; 3. at Oronte who has composed an indifferent sonnet to the lady Alcestis also loves. His outcry, that he has promptings to quit society altogether and to flee into a desert, is a mere act of petulancy, for he is too deeply in love to quit the neighborhood of Célimène, the spoiled child of wealth and fashion. We must further notice that Alcestis is young and that his anger on account of disappointment, and his aversion to the insincerity of social usages hardly suffice to drive him from all society in order that he may live as a real misanthropist in a desert. In spite of the expressions of misanthropy in lines 118–122, the character of the hero is simply that of an irritable and impulsive young man in love, or what the original sub-title of the piece indicates, "un atrabilaire amoureux."

This characteristic appears in the subsequent three acts, with barely an indication in the fourth that it may deepen into anything like real misanthropy. Closely analyzed the character of Alcestis is *philanthropical* rather than the reverse. He gets easily angered when he notices the faults of social life, for he is by nature sincere and impatient of fraud; but he appreciates such friends as Eliante; he does not hate Philinte with whom he has quarrel after quarrel, and who remains to the last sincerely devoted to him, and, above all, he deeply loves Célimène, at whose house he calls as one of several habitual guests.

It is not until the fifth act that two events occur which severely strain his self-possession: he learns that the trickery of his opponent has succeeded in making him lose his lawsuit, and he obtains unquestioned proof that Célimène is a coquette of a very reprehensible type. But in spite of this he offers her his hand which she is willing to accept, but not on the condition of living with him in a desert. At this his anger breaks out more strongly than ever. He declares that now all ties are severed between them, and that henceforth he will

> . . sortir d'un gouffre où triomphent les vices,
> Et chercher, sur la terre, un endroit écarté
> Où d'être homme d'honneur on ait la liberté.

But nothing proves more strongly than this conclusion that the title *an ill-tempered man in love* fits the piece rather than the title which it bears. For what has Alcestis lost? If he has the strength of mind to break with Célimène for good, he will have successfully escaped the dangerous trial of a union with a flirt. The

loss of his lawsuit does not ruin him and may be retrieved by an appeal. His true friends are his friends still. He has wealth, rank, youth and energy; life is still before him, and if he will stop and deliberate calmly, he will come to the conclusion that he must blame himself for this great disappointment and suffering. He may try to live in solitude, but the chances are that he will not live there long. His friends will seek him out, and it would be strange if the increase of years should not bring to him the consolations of a practical philosophy which would finally enable him to accommodate himself to the defects and inconveniences of social life, and to enjoy the agreeable features of such a life.

An analysis of the second, third and fourth acts will prove, it is true, that the art of the poet has been successful in presenting a series of trials for Alcestis which gradually embitter his temper and account for his misanthropical fits, especially in the last act. If we finally set him down as an incipient misanthropist, we find the true cause for it in his love for Célimène. To live apart from her—of this there cannot be any doubt—will be a terrible misfortune for him. His pride will probably forbid his renewing the relation. If he cannot overcome his pride; if he cannot get accustomed to live without Célimène; if he must continue in this deplorable condition: the result will be that he must suffer greatly, and in this sense his fate is tragical in a high degree. But before this state of suffering can develop into real misanthropy Alcestis will have to pass through many a further trial. Bearing in mind that we have to deal with a character of *comedy*, we must accept this as necessary. A real misanthropist would have been too serious a subject for a comedy, and Molière was right in delineating his hero as suffering only the natural consequences of the defects in his character and of his own conduct.

In the second act Alcestis appears prominently as a 'cross lover,' as an *atrabilaire amoureux*. He blames the guests of Célimène, and is reproved by her and by Philinte. This makes him all the more savage; he upbraids Célimène for her interest in other admirers, and threatens that he will not leave her company until after they shall have left (lines 734–737). His jealousy, and his impatience of the social habits of Célimène and her guests mark him throughout as impulsive and irritable; his remarks are directed against abuse, and do honor to his heart, but they are singularly ill-timed; we get the impression that he is a man of noble and refined feeling, but also of deficient tact, and that he betrays a dangerous tendency to make himself thoroughly disagreeable at times. We cannot wonder that Célimène hesitates to accept his hand before knowing much more about him, for although she evidently prefers him to the others, she cannot be sure that his peculiarities of temper may not prove fatal drawbacks in wedded life. The art of the poet in all this cannot be praised too highly. He makes us love his hero just enough to keep us interested in him, and at the same time shows him possessed of qualities that make him ridiculous. We see clearly that the faults of Alcestis cause his lack of success with Célimène, and *that this fatally re-acts upon his temper so that success becomes impossible.*

In the third act the lines in which Alcestis speaks of the life at court (1081–1098) increase our interest in him, and they enable us to judge better of his character. But from this dislike of court-life to a complete shunning of all human society the distance is great, and we do not find that the transition from the one to the other is dwelled on in the play as an unavoidable result.

The fourth act contains a scene patterned after a similar scene in *Dom Garcie*, but with an important change to which allusion has already been made.

*Dom Garcie* says to *Done Elvire*, whom he suspects of infidelity on account of a letter which she has written,

> "Mais ce sera sans doute, et j'en serai garant,
> Un billet qu'on envoie à quelque indifférent,
> Ou du moins, *ce qu'il a de tendresse evidente*
> *Sera pour une amie ou pour quelque parente.*"

In the *Misanthrope* it is *Célimène* who tries to turn the suspicion into a harmless channel:

> "Mais *si c'est une femme* à qui va ce billet,
> En quoi vous blesse-t-il, et qu'a-t-il de coupable?"
> (Lines 1344–45.)

The poet used the idea, but made a wonderful change in the form of the conversation. Célimène's answer gives rise to a most lively interchange of reproaches, prayers and refusals; the dramatic interest gains greatly, and a vivid light is thrown on the characteristic peculiarities of both speakers.

This incident is the first serious experience of Alcestis. If his suspicion is just, he will be unspeakably unhappy, and in this condition he may, at least for a time, hate the whole human

race. But he is not sure that his fears are well-founded; he still hopes that he may be convinced of the innocence of his mistress, and therefore he is yet far from being a misanthropist. The circumstance is of importance, for hitherto he has been only in a state of irritation on account of a lawsuit and of the poor success of his love affair in the presence of rivals; while now he is threatened with losing his faith in the honorable character of the lady he loves. If his fears are well founded (so he cannot but reason consistently with his previous conduct and way of thinking), there is then neither faith nor honor among human beings, and an honest man has no other choice than to shun their society altogether. But as yet he is not sure, and, therefore, he continues virtually only as an irritable man in love.

In the fifth act we find that Alcestis has such a deep and earnest love for Célimène that he still offers her his hand, after the flagrant proof of her reckless coquetry. We are therefore surprised that, on her refusal to follow him into a desert, while she is willing to be his on any other terms, the lover should renounce her definitely. Can we, in fact, believe, that he will never return to her? Why should he prefer a life in a desert now that Célimène is willing to accept him? He had not made this a condition for a union with her before, and there is nothing in the play to show that he had any intention to gain her *only on this condition!*

Is it not plain that even in this instance the lover is petulant, head-strong, irritable, angry, rather than a misanthropist pure and simple? In other words: Does not the original subtitle, *Un atrabilaire amoureux* fit him exactly, while the name of 'Misanthropist' can be applied to him only in a qualified sense?

But why, then, did the poet prefer the latter title?

The answer to this question is not easy, but the following facts may furnish a satisfactory explanation. Let us bear in mind that during the composition of the work Molière experienced the greatest sorrow of his life. His love for Armande Béjart was of a kind to remind us of the love of Alcestis for Célimène. In a wonderfully interesting and bright scene of the *Bourgeois Gentilhomme* (Act iii, Sc. ix) it is believed that he left us a portrait of his wife. The sentiment of *Cléonte* was the sentiment of Molière: he had loved his mistress in spite of her defects, nay possibly on account of her defects. But when the mistress had become his wife, she, so much younger than he, made him endure the most violent pangs of jealousy. It is true, as Larroumet has forcibly pointed out,[7] that Molière himself was by no means immaculate, and that his own conduct accounts to a large extent for the treatment he received from his wife: but there can be no doubt as to the reality and severity of his own sufferings. From 1664, when these troubles became acute, until 1666, when the *Misanthrope* was completed, the poet passed through the most critical period of his life. The estrangement from his wife led to a final and complete separation; yet the two appeared on the stage in the presentation of the piece, she as Célimène, he as Alcestis. We may well assume that the feelings with which the poet went through his rôle must have been misanthropical in a high degree.

There cannot be a reasonable doubt that in delineating Alcestis and Célimène the poet's own feelings and experience entered as potent factors, though he was too great an artist to attempt merely a copy of his own and his wife's characters. In reality he was rather engaged in giving greater depth and originality to the idea of a jealous lover which he borrowed from *Dom Garcie*. His own experience proved a powerful factor, but he was also helped by hints taken from others, for instance, the *Grand Cyrus* of Mlle. de Scudéry whose description of Agabates fits Alcestis; and the stories that circulated about the duke of Montausier who had the reputation of being outspoken and honest, but inclined to be rude.

But there were other reasons than the estrangement from his wife which must have greatly embittered the poet while engaged in writing his play.

Ferdinand Brunetière has called attention to the words of Alcestis in lines 123–140 as suggesting the character of *Tartufe*. Both plays, the *Tartufe* and the *Misanthrope*, prove beyond the possibility of a doubt that the poet, at the time of their composition, was deeply incensed against some person or persons of whom *Tartufe* and the *franc scélérat* of whom Alcestis speaks were artistically intensified copies. We know enough of the rivalries at the court of Louis XIV, of the jealousy existing between the two leading theatrical companies, of the attempts of the *troupe* of the

7 Larroumet, *l. c.*, p. 162.

Hôtel de Bourgogne to hurt Molière and his *troupe*, to feel sure that Molière's feelings toward certain persons must have been intensely acrimonious at times. Even Lulli, with whom he shared the honor of contributing to the king's amusement, could not but have roused his indignation, because this Italian received the lion's share of the king's favor and gifts. An immensely eloquent proof of the existence of a party hostile to the poet is the silence observed by the official paper in reference to him. It mentions all that is going on, often the most trivial attempts of others, but it has not a word for Molière. That this silence in respect to him must have deeply wounded and angered him cannot be doubted. A significant passage in his *Misanthrope* furnishes a striking example how the slighted poet aimed his blows at the paper which was liberal enough in dealing out praise to others:

> *D'éloges on regorge*, à la tête on les jette,
> Et mon *valet de chambre* est mis dans la *gazette*
> (III, vii, 1073–74).

The passage is so pointed, especially the words here italicized, that we can scarcely doubt this intention.

We must further conclude that Molière received more than one slight from the courtiers who saw in him little more than a jester whose official title, *tapissier valet de chambre du roy* could not awaken in them any special respect. The poet took his revenge by attacking this party under the general name of *Marquis*, with such unsparing and savage sarcasm as to justify the inference that a personal feeling of resentment entered into this treatment. In his *Misanthrope* Clitandre and Acaste are said to stand for the names of two noblemen who sustained relations to his wife. Molière introduces them as *Marquis*. Both have access to the more intimate society with the king at the *petit coucher*. They are mercilessly exposed in the play, and it might seem that the poet acted from jealousy, but it is even more likely that, finding a hostile party at work against him, he aimed his shafts at the persons who had the king's favor and might be supposed to be responsible for much of the unfavorable influence that was exercised against him.

A good illustration of Molière's uncompromising hatred of these members of the higher nobility is found in the first scene of his *Impromptu de Versailles* (1663):

"vous prenez garde à bien représenter avec moi votre rôle de *marquis*."—"Toujours des *marquis*!"—"Oui, toujours des *marquis*. Que diable voulez-vous qu'on prenne pour un caractère agréable de théâtre? Le marquis aujourd'hui est *le plaisant* de la comédie; et, comme dans toutes les comédies anciennes on voit toujours un *valet bouffon* qui fait rire les auditeurs, de même, dans toutes nos pièces de maintenant, *il faut toujours un marquis ridicule* qui fasse rire la compagnie."

The speech of Acaste in the *Misanthrope* (III, i, 781–804) is extremely suggestive of the poet's own immense contempt for the class of *marquis*. What, for instance, could convey more ridicule than the fatuity with which the speaker exclaims:

> "Pour de l'esprit, j'en ai sans doute; et du bon goût,
> *A juger sans étude et raisonner de tout* (lines 791–2).

With all his well-known kindliness and the cheerful tone of his own philosophy, Molière could be a good hater at times; but the remarkable fact appears that he evidently used himself and his varying moods as *material* for his poetic work. In his *Misanthrope* this is proven both in the character of Alcestis and in that of Philinte. Molière was at times *Alcestis*, but his regular mood was that of *Philinte*. It can scarcely be doubted that the poet utilized the anger and indignation he felt for the benefit of his new piece. He endowed his Alcestis with this indignation and this anger, while, at the same time, putting in the mouth of Philinte the amiable and easy-going philosophy which was the poet's own in his normal condition.

A suspicion arises, and it is, perhaps, more than a suspicion, if we consider the high-strung organization of Molière, that Racine comes in for some, if not for much of the poet's anger, as reflected in the *Misanthrope*. We know how poets exaggerate incidents and trivial characteristics into perfected dramatic events and characters, and we know that the conduct of Racine in respect to Molière must have produced in the latter a natural and deep resentment. Racine had been under obligations to Molière who had treated him generously, In return he deprived him of his best actress, Mlle. Du Parc, who went over to the Hôtel de Bourgogne, in order to appear in Racine's new tragedies. It is significant and important that this occurred at the very time when Molière was still at work on his *Misanthrope*. The conclusion is unavoidable that, for a time at least, Molière must have entertained the hardest possible feelings towards the rising poet. This effect of Racine's treason is too natural to be doubted, especially if we bear in mind that

in the person of Mlle. Du Parc, Molière lost not only his best actress, but also his mistress.

Racine was feared for his keen and merciless wit, and he had the faculty of ingratiating himself easily with influential people, especially the ladies. He thus gained in a very short time the special confidence of the King, a favor which Molière never obtained. This occurred, of course, much later, but Molière would not have been human, if he had not noticed the superiority of Racine's chances with a feeling of bitterness. Racine had all that Molière lacked: physical beauty, youth and other personal attractions. Molière was rather homely. His features would have been called coarse by many, though they seem to have lent themselves readily to very effective comic action. His speech and manners were those of a professional comedian, hence lacking in that special refinement which was the product of court-life. But above all, he was an elderly man, obviously even older in looks than in years, on account of the hard work which he had been compelled to do and was still doing. Feeling himself beaten and betrayed by a young man whom he had befriended, his feelings toward him may well have suggested such lines as:

> Au travers de son masque on voit à plein le *traître;*
> . . . . . .
> *Cependant sa grimace est partout bien venue;*
> *On l'accueille, on lui rit, partout il s'insinue*
> (*Mis.*, lines 125, and 137–138).

In lines 169–72 Alcestis, irritated by the benevolent remarks of Philinte, asks the latter:

> Et s'il faut, par hazard, *qu'un ami vous trahisse*,
> Que, pour avoir vos biens, on dresse un artifice,
> Ou qu'on tâche à semer *de méchants bruits de vous*,
> Verrez-vous tout cela sans vous mettre en courroux?

The words I have italicized deserve attention, and also the last line which puts the question exactly as any judge of human nature would put it.

In the piece itself nothing is said about *the betrayal of a friend*, and as to the spreading of *wicked reports* we learn about that only in the fifth act (lines 1500 ff.). The illustration which Alcestis uses for the benefit of his friend is, therefore, without basis in the play; it clearly points to a personal grievance of the poet, and accords perfectly with the known facts. Molière's enemies were at that very time busy in spreading injurious reports about him, and *the betrayal of a friend* tallies, of course, with the treason of Racine.

I state these facts for no more than they are worth, but I think it follows from a careful estimate of them that the unfortunate event which estranged the two great poets affected the older one seriously while he was writing his play. The ready success of the young poet in ousting the elderly poet from the affection of his mistress was only an earnest of future social and other success. Molière, smarting from the treatment, could not help noticing this, and it may well have aroused in him thoughts of misanthropy.

The *Misanthrope* was probably near its completion when, August fifth, 1665, the king adopted Molière's company as '*la troupe royale*,' thereby publicly siding with the poet against his rivals. The reason for this is generally believed to have been, in part, that the king felt himself hampered and annoyed by the clergy and others, who arrayed morality and the Christian virtues against the poet, and thus, indirectly, against the king, whose licentious morals no longer sought concealment.

It is important, for the purpose of this paper, to notice the date when this action was taken. As the piece was completed early in 1666, and possibly already in the fall of 1665, we can readily see that the principal part of its composition took place during the time of uncertainty for the poet which preceded this action. We have, therefore, to consider by what feelings the poet must have been animated before this decision put an end to his suspense. A simple statement of some of the leading facts during this period of uncertainty may enable us to arrive at a correct conclusion. We limit ourselves, of course, to the period from the probable inception of the play to its completion.

Feb. 4, 1661. *Dom Garcie de Navarre* was played, but proved a failure. The poet did not publish this play, which makes probable the assumption that he intended to improve it, as soon as he had found that it was not successful.

Feb., 1662 (probably on the 14th). He married Armande Béjard, who was young enough to be his daughter. His enemies declared that she was his daughter.

Aug. 12, 1662. La Grange records that members of the Hôtel de Bourgogne theatre call on the queen-mother to obtain increased favors, "the troupe of Molière causing them much jealousy."

Dec. 26, 1662. First appearance of his *École des Femmes*, which had the effect of arous-

ing the greatest indignation among his enemies, producing *a shower of paper bullets of the brain.*

Feb. 9, 1663. De Visé assailed him in the *Nouvelles nouvelles*, charging him with having stolen his material from Straparola.

June, 1663. Molière answers the critics, and assails the *marquis*.

Aug., 1663. De Visé publishes *Zélinde*.

"Some people, assembled in a shop, assail *Elomire* (pseudonym for *Molière*). They charge him with having pilfered the Italian and Spanish writers, also Furetière's *Francion: il lit tous les vieux bouquins.*"

The other charges are, he insults the nobility, mocks at Christianity, etc., etc.

Nov. 17, 1663. Publication of Boursault's *Portrait du Peintre*, a fierce attack on Molière. The *École des Femmes* is savagely criticized, it is qualified as impious, obscene, vulgar, dull and farcical.

Nov., 1663. Molière answered this pamphlet by his *Impromptu de Versailles*.

Dec. 7. 1663. De Visé answers in a *Réponse à l'Impromptu, ou la Vengeance des Marquis*.

Jan. 19, 1664. A son of Montfleury (of the Hôtel de Bourgogne) also answers in *l'Impromptu de l'Hôtel de Condé*.

March 17, 1664. There appears *La Guerre comique, ou Défense de l'École des Femmes*. This is followed by a *Lettre sur les affaires du Théâtre*, published in the *Diversités galantes*, by the author of *Zélinde*.

May, 1664. The first three acts of *Le Tartufe* are finished.

May 17, 1664. The Gazette states: "The King considers the piece inimical to religion."

Shortly after appeared a savage pamphlet, *Le Roi Glorieux au Monde*, which was soon suppressed, as it indirectly hit the king. In it the author, the curé of Saint-Barthélemy, Pierre Roullé, speaks of Molière as *that demon clad in human flesh*, and demands that he should be burned at the stake.

Feb. 15, 1665. First performance of *Don Juan* which rouses a storm of indignation. One of these outbursts (*Observations*, etc.) says: "The author assails the interests of heaven, he teaches infidelity, insults the king, corrupts virtue, offends the queen-mother."

Aug., 1665. The king adopts Molière's troupe as *La tronpe royale*, and allows them a pension.

Dec , 1665. Racine's act of disloyalty to the older poet.

In the foregoing enumeration the difficulties of Molière with his wife are not mentioned. They constitute in themselves, beginning early, and becoming acute in 1664, a sufficient reason for the poet's misanthropical tendencies, but they do not sufficiently account, perhaps, for the change in the title of the play. It is hardly possible that the poet wrote his work without making changes in what he had written before. Additional lines were most probably inserted in the part already written, as the work progressed; expressions modified or strengthened, etc. These matters are outside the possibility of proof, while they must be admitted as highly probable. What is essential for the point here involved is that the incidents of the play, and the essential features of its leading characters, do not explain why the poet gave it its present title. We can understand why he finally decided to give this title the preference over the other, when we consider the gloomy disposition which must have frequently possessed him as he progressed in the composition of the piece.

Molière was forty-four years old when he completed his *Misanthrope*. At this age experiences such as he passed through sink more deeply into the mind, and are more apt to sway the current of serious thought. But no poet stands so much in need of experience as the comic poet. Comedy of the higher sort has never been the work of young men, and Molière's own example proves this. His earlier characters are simply *rôles*, but his Alcestis and Célimène have all the complexity of real men and women. A real misanthropist could be only an abstraction, or the product of mental disease, but Alcestis is thoroughly human, and there is nothing morbid about him, not even his hatred of shams and his impatience with rivals. This hatred is too violent to be called morbid. He feels his own worth rather more strongly than we might expect in a man who criticizes human weakness so severely. He is not simply virtuously indignant at the obsequious courtesy of his friend toward perfect strangers, but he feels *personally slighted* by this indiscriminate homage. He exclaims:

> Je refuse d'un cœur la vaste complaisance
> Qui ne fait de mérite aucune différence;
> *Je veux qu'on me distingue*, et, pour le trancher net,
> *L'ami du genre humain n'est point du tout mon fait.*"
>
> (Lines 61-64.)

The personal note is also quite distinct in his answers to Philinte elsewhere; in his conversation with Oronte, with Célimène, and in his

blunt answer to Arsinoé (lines 1716–22). The typical scene for the intensely personal assertion of Alcestis is the one known as the scene of the chairs, the fifth of the second act. It is impossible to identify the irritable, censorious, angry lover with a misanthropist. He is atrabilious, and the title of *an ill-tempered man in love* fits him exactly, but he is not a misanthropist. His intense interest in the lady he loves, as well as the sarcasm of his speech, due to keen observation and unpleasant personal experience, mark him as a man who cannot but interest us, with whom we might argue, fall out and become reconciled again, but a man whom we cannot help considering worthy of our friendly regard, a type of a fine character who only needs the experience of life to wear off his rough edges.

Alcestis himself has told us that *la raison n'est pas ce qui règle l'amour* (line 248). He knows his faults and admits:

> La raison, pour mon bien, veut que je me retire:
> Je n'ai point sur ma langue un assez grand empire.
> (Lines 1573–74.)

But one does not turn misanthropic because of such defects.

In his reference to court-life, the poet himself seems to unburden himself:

> "Le ciel ne m'a point fait, en me donnant le jour,
> Une âme compatible avec l'air de la cour."
> (1083–84.)

He gives his reason:

> Être franc et sincère est mon plus grand talent;
> Je ne sais point jouer les hommes en parlant;
> Et qui n'a pas le don de cacher ce qu'il pense
> Doit faire en ce pays fort peu de résidence.
> (1087–90.)

He speaks farther on (l. 1095) of the *mille rebuts cruels* which one has to endure at court, and the remark is very significant, but the remedy is too simple to justify misanthropy.

As to the parts in which Alcestis speaks more or less passionately to Célimène, some of them were taken from *Dom Garcie*, and hence had been written a year before he married Armande Béjard. The new play shows that the principal topic of the older has been retained, but it has been deepened and varied. The hero in *Dom Garcie* suffers from imaginary torments, those of Alcestis are real. It nevertheless remains true—and in this is shown the deep insight and the profound art of the poet—that Alcestis suffers only in proportion to the real faults which he has and shows. But it is impossible to admit that a man like him, if we judge of him as he appears throughout the play, should not be able to get rid of these faults eventually. He might then still resent the misery of human nature at court and elsewhere, but he would not allow his indignation to turn into the *vinaigre* of misanthropy.

We must, therefore, conclude that the play answers to the title *Un Atrabilaire Amoureux*, and that Molière changed this title only because of the mental and moral suffering which he underwent during its composition. His artistic sense and tact have prevented him from exaggerating the gloomy features of his hero, and from imbuing the latter with an excess of the feelings which at times possessed the poet, but these feelings account for the fact that a tragical element entered the piece through the contrast between the ideality which exists in the virtues and the views of its hero, and the world in which he lives. This element is mitigated, in accordance with the requirements of comedy, by the faults and foibles of the hero whose misanthropy is only temporary and cannot be regarded as final.

The most pathetic feature of the play is in the condition of the feelings of Alcestis towards Célimène. He loves her too deeply to be otherwise than profoundly unhappy while separated from her. He loves her exactly as the poet loved Armande, and the poet's wretchedness is mirrored in the misfortune of his hero. But as a union with a pronounced flirt may not be the best thing for a lover, our sympathy with his condition is not stronger than is consistent with the legitimate purposes of comedy. The poet has shown himself an incomparable artist in so adjusting the different characters of his play, and the elements in these characters, as to challenge the admiration of every student of the drama.

CHARLES A. EGGERT.

*Chicago, Ill.*

## *DANTE'S INFLUENCE ON ENGLISH POETRY IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.*[1]

> "A great poem is a fountain forever overflowing with the waters of wisdom and delight; and after one person and one age has exhausted all its divine effluence, which their peculiar relations enable them to share, another and yet another succeeds, and new relations are ever developed, the source of an unforeseen and an unconceived delight." Shelley, *A Defence of Poetry*.

IT may be a matter of some surprise for those who have not had their attention called to the

1 *Dante's Influence on Shelley* has already been discussed by the writer in MOD. LANG. NOTES, Vol. xiii (1898), No. 6.

fact, to learn how far back the influence of Dante on English literature extends. Chaucer translated and imitated a number of passages of the *Divine Comedy;* there is frequent mention of the great Florentine by the poets of the Sixteenth Century; while Milton's debt to his predecessor in the religious epic has already been pointed out by the writer.

The great Dante period in England, however, begins with the first decade of the Nineteenth Century. Since that time translation after translation of the *Divine Comedy* has been made; famous essays have been written by Carlyle, Macaulay, Lowell; substantial contributions to scholarship have been made by Lord Vernon, Barlow, Moore, Norton, and others.

The cause of this outburst of interest in Dante is, perhaps, not hard to find. One of the striking characteristics of modern literature is the interest it manifests in the literary products of Mediæval Europe. The treasures of the Middle Ages have been brought to light after the oblivion of centuries. In Germany the *Nibelungenlied*, in France the *Chanson de Roland*, in England the *Beowulf*, have been eagerly studied and, by some at least, ardently admired.

Italy can hardly be said to have a mediæval literature. Modern Italian sprang, Minerva-like, full-grown from the brain of Dante. It is hard to believe that the *Divine Comedy* was written fifty years before *Piers Plowman's Vision*, and only a few years later than the *Nibelungenlied* and the *Roman de la Rose*. Italy, then, had only Dante to offer, and the *Divine Comedy* has not been, in our own century, merely read, as in the case of Chaucer and Milton, but studied in all the multiplicity of its details. In view, then, of the profound interest manifested in Dante, of the popularization of his works by means of translations, lectures and essays, it is not surprising to find his influence on poetry far greater than ever before.

It is no exaggeration to say that scarcely a single great or secondary poet of the century in England is ignorant of the *Divine Comedy*. Dante Gabriel Rossetti, among the minor poets, shows this influence most. The son of a distinguished Dante scholar living in England, he drew inspiration from childhood up. Through his whole career his Dante-worship asserted itself, not only in poetry, but in painting as well. Not only did he translate the *New Life* and a number of lyrical poems of Dante and his contemporaries, but he shows a vast influence of Dante in his pictures, of which a large number were inspired by scenes and incidents from the life and work of the great Florentine. Sir Noel Paton says of his masterpiece—*Dante's Dream*—that "fifty years hence it will be named among the half-dozen supreme pictures of the world."

Leigh Hunt expanded (and thus spoilt) the exquisite episode of Francesca da Rimini, and good old common-place Samuel Rogers, in his *Italy*, alludes to the story of the *Sasso di Dante*,

> "that ancient seat,
> The seat of stone that runs along the wall,
> South of the Church, east of the belfry-tower,"

Where,

> "in the sultry time
> Would Dante sit conversing, amd with those
> Who little thought that in his hand he held
> The balance, and assigned at his good pleasure
> To each his place in the invisible world."

Mrs. Browning in *Casa Guidi Windows* (written in *terza rima*) alludes to the same tradition, only in deeper and tenderer language,

> O passionate
> Poor Dante, who, a banished Florentine,
> Didst sit austere at banquets of the great
> And muse upon this far-off stone of thine,
> And think how oft some passer used to wait
> A moment in the golden day's decline,
> With "good-night, dearest Dante."—Well, good night!
> *I* muse now, Dante, and think, verily,
> Though chapelled in the byeway, out of sight,
> Ravenna's bones would thrill with ecstasy,
> Could'st know thy favorite stone's elected right
> As tryst-place for thy Tuscans to foresee
> Their earliest chartas from.

The minuteness of Mrs. Browning's acquaintance with the *Divine Comedy* is shown by a stanza of *A Child's Grave* at Florence,—

> A Tuscan lily,—only white
> As Dante, in abhorrence
> Of red corruption, wished aright
> The lilies of his Florence.

Where the reference in the last two lines is to the passage in the sixteenth canto of the *Paradise*,

> tanto che il giglio
> Non era ad asta mai posto a ritroso,
> Nè per division fatto vermiglio.[2]

Among the great poets of the century Coleridge, who practically introduced German literature into England,—was likewise one of the first to appreciate the greatness of Dante, and

2 The ancient arms of Florence were a white lily on a red field. After the war with Pistoja in 1251 the Guelfs made their arms a *red* lily on a white field, while the Ghibellines retained the old device.

he was largely instrumental in spreading a knowledge of the Italian poet in England. He gave lectures on him, and it was through a eulogistic mention of his in one of these that the first impulse was given to the popularity of Cary's well-known version of the *Divine Comedy*. Coleridge refers several times to Dante in his prose works. In the *Anima Poetæ* he calls the eighteenth *canzone* of Dante,—"a poem of wild and interesting images intended as an enigma,—and to me an enigma it remains spite of all my efforts;"—and twelve years later he says:—

"I begin to understand the above poem after an interval from 1805, during which no year passed in which I did not peruse, I might say construe, parse and spell it, twelve times at least, such a fascination it had for me, in spite of its obscurity."

It is undoubtedly the truth that no English poet before Coleridge had given to Dante so much careful and persistent study; and in this respect he is the forerunner of many other poets of the succeeding years, Shelley, Browning, Tennyson. The body of Coleridge's poetry is so small that we can hardly expect to find much trace of direct influence on the part of Dante.

Wordsworth in one of his letters says,

"the poetry of Dante and Michel Angelo proves that if there is little majesty and strength in the Italian tongue, the fault is in the authors and not in the language."

He mentions him twice besides in his letters, and praises him highly in his sonnet to Florence,—in which after referring to the *Sasso di Dante*,—

> "A marble stone,
> The laurell'd Dante's favorite seat."

he speaks of him as "the mighty poet" who bore in his breast,

> "A Patriot's heart, warm with undying fire."

Again in the well-known sonnet on the sonnet, after speaking of the use made of this form of poetry by Shakspere, Petrarch, Tasso, Camoëns, he adds,—

> The sonnet glittered a gay myrtle leaf
> Amid the cypress with which Dante crowned
> His visionary brow.

There is a certain perfunctoriness about these references, however, and in general Wordsworth shows but little trace of Dante's influence in his poetry. Nor, indeed, could it well be otherwise. The high-priest of Nature-worship, narrow as he was in many respects, could scarcely take much from the poet who lived in an age when the modern view of Nature was absolutely unknown.[3]

Keats did not read Dante in the original, but seems to have read him to some extent in Cary's translation, a copy of which, with the best passages marked he gave to Miss Brawn.

He was especially filled with admiration for the episode of Francesca da Rimini. In a letter to Fanny Brawn he writes:—

"The fifth Canto of Dante pleases me more and more; it is that one in which he meets Paulo (*sic*) and Francesca. I had passed many days in rather a low state of mind, and in the midst of them I dreamt of being in that region of Hell. The dream was one of the most delightful enjoyments of my life. . . . . I tried a sonnet on it; there are fourteen lines in it, but nothing of what I felt. Oh, that I could dream every night."

The sonnet, written in the back of the copy of Cary, mentioned above, tells how, in sleep, his spirit fled away,

> Not to pure Ida with its snow-cold skies,
> Nor unto Tempe where Jove grieved a day,
> But to that second circle of sad Hell,
> Where in the gust, the whirlwind, and the flaw
> Of rain and hail-stones, lovers need not tell
> Their sorrows,—pale were the sweet lips I saw,
> Pale were the lips I kissed, and fair the form
> I floated with, about that melancholy storm.

As may be inferred from Keats' remarks on Dante given above, he was neither old enough, strong enough in character, nor scholar enough to appreciate the deeper meaning and beauty of the *Divine Comedy*.

It was chiefly as a critic that Matthew Arnold uses Dante. His admiration for him was profound, and he gives constant expression to it throughout his essays. In his essay on a *French Critic on Milton* he couples Dante with the great Greeks, and with Vergil and Milton,—as a "great artist in style." In the *Essay on Translating Homer* he admires Dante's "allusive and compressed manner," and contrasts his "inversion and pregnant conciseness" with the "directness and flowingness" of Homer; while in accordance with his usual custom he keeps reiterating the phrase "grand style," of which Dante is always cited as a great Master. He takes what he calls "eminent specimens" of this "grand style," from Homer, Vergil, and

3 How far from a genuine appreciation of Dante's stupendous genius Wordsworth was, may be seen in his remark, that "Ariosto and Tasso are very absurdly depressed in order to elevate Dante." Few critics of the present day would put these three poets in the same class, as was once the custom.

Milton, and joins thereto the following lines from the *Inferno* (xvi 61),

> Lascio lo fele, e vo pei dolci pomi
> Promessi a me per lo verace Duca;
> Ma fino al centro pria convien ch'io tomi.

In similar manner, in the *Study of Poetry* (published originally as the general introduction to Ward's *English Poets*) he quotes from the supreme poets of the world examples of the "σπουδαιότης, the high and excellent seriousness, which Aristotle assigns as one of the grand virtues of poetry," lines which may serve as a touchstone, by means of which we can test all poetry. "Take," says Mr. Arnold, "that incomparable line and a-half of Dante, Ugolino's tremendous words,"

> Io no piangeva; sì dentro impietrai;
> Piangevan elli; . . .

and the lovely words of Beatrice to Vergil,

> Io son fatta da Dio, sua mercè, tale,
> Che la vostra miseria non mi tange,
> Nè fiamma d'esto incendio non m'assale. . . .

take the simple but perfect line,

> In la sua voluntade è nostra pace.

"These few lines," adds Mr. Arnold, "are enough even of themselves to keep clear and sound our judgments about poetry."

Matthew Arnold must have been deeply influenced in mind, character, views of life, and poetic feeling by his intense admiration of, and thorough acquaintance with Dante's poetry. Yet in his case this influence is so general, so pervasive, that it is difficult to indicate in his poetry any particular passage to which a direct parallel may be found in Dante. Such reminiscences as in the line,—

> The rustle of the eternal rain of love,

and such casual references as are found in the sonnet on the Austerity of Poetry, and the poem on Heine's tomb, are of no particular value in this respect, and the full extent of Dante's influence on the bard of religious questionings can only be estimated by a consideration of his critical judgments and the general attitude of his mind.

Byron's love for Italy is well-known. Again and again her beauty, her unhappiness, her wrongs are referred to in his poetry, and many of his lines, such as

> Italia! oh Italia! thou who hast
> The fatal gift of beauty, which became
> A funeral dower of present woes and past, etc.

have become stock quotations.

His acquaintance with the Italian language and literature began while at school at Harrow, and was continued later at Cambridge, although it was not until 1809 that he learned to speak the language. In 1813 he writes in his diary,—"I hope to settle in Italy or the East and drink deep of the literature and language of both." He became acquainted with Dante's *Inferno* early; in a letter dated 1806, he writes,—"or rather let me invoke the shade of Dante to inspire me, for none but the author of the *Inferno* could properly preside over such an attempt."

In the three books of the *Corsair* (1814) he takes as mottoes passages from the story of Francesca da Rimini in the *Inferno*. It would seem that up to this date, he knew neither the *Purgatorio* nor the *Paradiso;* which being far more difficult and less popular than the *Inferno*, would naturally be learned later.

Byron speaks very highly of Dante, both in his letters, conversations, and poetry. He often compared his own life to that of Dante. There is a vast difference, however, between the romantic melancholy of Childe Harold's exile from his native shores, and the bitter sorrows of the exiled Florentine. On one occasion, we are told by Moore, Byron indignantly repudiated the criticism of Schlegel that Dante was hard-hearted.

"Gentle feelings? And Francesca da Rimini, and the father's feelings in Ugolino? and Beatrice and La Pia? Why there is gentleness in Dante beyond all gentleness when he is tender. And Dante's heaven is all love and glory and majesty."

Again he says,

"I don't wonder at the enthusiasm of the Italians about Dante. He is the poet of liberty. Persecution, exile, the dread of a foreign grave, could not shake his principles. There is no Italian gentleman, scarcely any well-educated girl, that has not all the finer passages at the finger's end; particularly the Ravennese. The Guiccioli, for instance, can almost repeat any part of the *Divine Comedy*."

And yet I doubt whether Byron had anything like so deep and genuine an enthusiasm for Dante as Shelley had. In several passages he seems not to regard him more highly as a poet than Tasso, Ariosto, or even Boccaccio. Thus in *Childe Harold*, speaking of Tasso, he says,

> "Great as thou art yet paralleled by those
> Thy countrymen, before thee born to shine,
> The bards of hell and chivalry: first rose
> The Tuscan father's comedy divine;
> Then not unequal to the Florentine,
> The southern Scott, etc.

Again describing the church of Santa Croce, the Westminster Abbey of Florence, he breaks out,—

But where repose the all Etruscan three
Dante and Petrarch and scarce less than they,
The bard of prose, creative spirit, he
Of the hundred tales of love.

Like so many other English poets,—Chaucer, Milton, Grey, Shelley,—Byron tried his hand at translating Dante. Of the two famous episodes of the *Inferno*, the Ugolino had been translated no less than three times,—by Chaucer, by Gray, and by Shelley (or rather Medwin). Byron was the first to translate the passage containing the story of Francesca da Rimini, those lines which Walter Savage Landor called the most perfect in the whole range of poetry. This translation was done in March, 1820, in the original metre, *terza rima*, "third rhyme" as Byron calls it, adding "I have done it into cramp English, line for line and rhyme for rhyme."

References to Dante are not infrequent throughout the body of Byron's poetry. In the *Age of Bronze*, Verona is spoken of with its Amphitheatre,—

Where Romans sate,
And Dante's exile sheltered by thy gate.

In the *Childe Harold* the references are quite numerous. Thus as we have already seen Dante's great poem is called

The Tuscan father's comedy divine,

and a little further on in the same Canto he apostrophizes the Poet's native city,—

"Ungrateful Florence! Dante sleeps afar,
Like Scipio, buried by the uprising sea:
Thy factions, in this worse than civil war
Proscribed the bard, whose name forevermore
Their children's children would in vain adore
With the remorse of ages."

The description of the waterfall of Velino contains undoubted allusion to the mighty fall of the Phlegethon over the tremendous precipice which separates the seventh from the eighth circle of the *Inferno*,—

The hell of waters! Where they howl and hiss,
And boil in endless torture; while the sweat
Of their great agony, wrung out from this
Their Phlegethon, etc.

So, too, the metaphor drawn from the broken pieces of a mirror,

Even as a broken mirror, which the glass
In every fragment multiplies; and makes
A thousand images of one that was,
The same, and still the more, the more it breaks,—

is like the illustration used by Vergil to prove that in respect to the love of God, "Giving doth not improverish nor withholding enrich,"

E quanta gente più lassù s'intende,
Più v'è da bene amare, e più vi s'ama,
E come specchio l'uno all'altro rende.
Purg. xv, 73 ff.

Even in *Don Juan*, that extraordinary work of genius at odds with the world, in which life and death, love and sorrow, nature and man, are fused with consummate skill with satire, cynicism, profanity and immorality, we find a number of references to Dante. In Canto ii, the boat of starving shipwrecked people approaches the shore,—

Like Charon's bark of spectres dull and pale.

In Canto iv he tells us,—

I pass each day where Dante's bones are laid:
A little cupola, more neat than solemn.

So, too, in the scene in the Harem, Dudu whose shriek has aroused all the denizens of the dormitory, tells how she had dreamed of walking in a wood,—

A "wood obscure," like that where Dante found
Himself in at the age when all grow good;

The allusion in the last line is, of course, to the

Mezzo del cammin di nostra vita,

with which the *Inferno* begins. The same reference is repeated in the tenth Canto,

But getting nigh grim Dante's "obscure wood,"
That hateful equinox, etc.

The famous inscription over the gate to hell, is quoted in part in Canto xvi, where the door,

Opened with a most infernal creak,
Like that of hell,—"Lasciate ogni speranza
Vo ich 'entrate." The hinge seemed to speak,
Dreadful as Dante's rhima (*sic*) or this stanza.

As may be seen from the above quotations there is but little of the solemnity, or pathos, or "high seriousness" of Dante in the use made by Byron of the *Divine Comedy*. Nor could it be otherwise. The whole temper, style and genius of Byron was more akin to that of Ariosto than to that of Dante. In the *Don Juan* the Romanticism of the day is treated with the same irony as that with which Chivalry is treated in the *Orlando Furioso*.

With Byron, however, this irony often degenerates into bitter and savage jibes at all things holy and sacred. Even the story of Ugolino, with its terrible pathos, is flippantly used as a cynical excuse for cannibalism on the part of the shipwrecked sailors,—

And if Pedrillo's head should shocking be,
Remember Ugolino condescends
To eat the head of his arch-enemy,
The moment after he politely ends
His tale; if foes be food in hell, at sea
'Tis surely fair to dine upon a friend,
When shipwreck's short allowance grows too scanty,
Without being much more horrible than Dante.

In similar manner Beatrice, whose apotheosis by Dante, is according to Shelley, "the most glorious imagination of modern poetry," is sneeringly coupled with Petrarch's Laura and

Milton's Eve to prove the truth of the cynical proposition,

> That love and marriage rarely can combine.

Byron was wont to declare that he was more attached to Ravenna than to any other place except Greece. He lived there more than two years. Undoubtedly his connection with the countess of Guiccioli had a great deal to do with this attachment. In this, the city of Dante's last days and death, this

> Happier Ravenna on *whose* hoary shore,
> Fortress of falling Empire! honored sleeps
> The immortal exile,—

the influence of the Italian on the English poet made itself especially felt,—an influence which Rogers alludes to in his lines on Ravenna,

> that Place
> Of old renown, once in the Adrian sea,
> Ravenna! where from Dante's sacred tomb
> He had so oft, as many a verse declares,
> Drawn inspiration."

It was here that the *Prophecy of Dante* was composed in 1819. It was dedicated to the Countess Guiccioli, who describes the origin of its composition:—

"He came in January, 1819, arriving at Ravenna on the day of the festival of corpus domini. Being deprived at this time of his books, his horses, and all that occupied him at Venice, I begged him to gratify me by writing something on the subject of Dante, and with his usual good nature and rapidity he composed his *Prophecy*."

The poem is in *terza rima* and consists of four cantos. He had planned more, but never finished them. The cantos are short, approximating in the number of lines to those of Dante's *Divine Comedy*. In sending it to Mr. Murray, he called it the best thing he had ever done,—"if not unintelligible." In the Preface we are told that

"the reader is requested to suppose that Dante addresses him in the interval between the conclusion of the *Divine Comedy* and his death, and shortly before the latter event, foretelling the fortunes of Italy in general in the ensuing centuries."

In the first canto Dante alludes to his own poem, just finished, speaks of his wrongs, his exile, his loneliness, and his yearning to return to Florence, the

> bello ovile, ov'io dormii agnello.

In the prophecy proper there are allusions to the wars, calamities, discoveries of Italy, to her triumph in poetry and painting and sculpture,—allusions to the sack of Rome, the voyage of Columbus and Cabot, to Petrarch, Tasso, Ariosto and Michel Angelo.

While a strong and impressive poem, the *Prophecy of Dante* is not much like the great poet in whose name it is written either in general temper or language. The long sentences, the number of adjectives and the long drawn-out metaphors are unlike the noble simplicity, the unparalleled conciseness of Dante, his unique use of verb and noun as almost the only means with which to produce his effect. So, too, the whole atmosphere of the poem is romantic. Byron makes Dante dwell on his wrongs, and his bitterness and melancholy, his hopes of revenge, seem more like the character of Childe Harold than the stern, proud-hearted exile, with his reserve in speaking of his own sufferings, which when they do appear seem to burst forth irresistibly for a moment's space of time, then are crowded back. The *Weltschmerz* of nineteenth century romanticism has no place in the heart of Dante Alighieri.

Byron sometimes makes Dante utter things which he never could have said. Thus the line,

> There where the furthest suns and stars have birth,

could scarcely have been written by one whose knowledge of the universe was confined within the narrow limits of the Ptolemaic system. So, too, Dante in his ignorance of Greek could not have made the references, attributed to him by Byron, to the pebbles of Demosthenes and the torments of Prometheus.

In looking over the previous discussion the reader will perceive that it is chiefly as the poet of liberty, the forerunner of a united Italy, the patriot, whose principles neither "persecution, exile, nor the dread of a foreign grave could shake," that Byron looks upon Dante. Thus in the *Prophecy*, after praising Columbus, Petrarch, Michel Angelo, he adds,

> More than these illustrations shall be,
> . . . . . .
> The mortal Savior who shall set thee free.

The other phases of Dante's character and his poetry, the deep, religious feeling and mystical spirituality, Byron was not fitted by nature to appreciate; and, consequently, they are absent from his poetry.

A story is told by Edward Fitzgerald to the effect that looking one day with Tennyson at two busts of Dante and Goethe in a shop-window in Regent street, he said, "What is there wanting in Goethe which Dante had?" To which the Poet Laureate answered, "The Divine."

Tennyson's own modest estimate of himself

in comparison with the Florentine poet is expressed in the *Lines to Dante*, written on the occasion of the Dante Centenary, 1865, at the request of the Florentines:

> King, that hast reign'd six hundred years, and grown
> In power, and ever growest, since thine own
> Fair Florence honoring thy nativity,
> Thy Florence now the crown of Italy,
> Hath sought the tribute of a verse from me,
> I, wearing but the garland of a day,
> Cast at thy feet one flower that fades away.

This same sentiment was expressed fifteen years later to Canon Warburton, to whom the poet was talking of the probably short-lived duration of all modern poetical fame. "Who," said he, "will read Alfred Tennyson one hundred years hence? And look at Dante after six hundred years!"[4]

Tennyson is said to have loved to "troll and thunder out" Italian poetry, much of which he knew by heart; and the influence of so acute a critic and so profound an admirer of the *Divine Comedy* as his friend Hallam must have strengthened the poet's admiration for Dante's genius. Without doubt the great Florentine was among the poets spoken of in the Stanza of *In Memoriam*,

> Oh bliss, when all in circle drawn
> About him, heart and ear were fed
> To hear him, as he lay and read
> The Tuscan poets on the lawn.

We may assume on *a priori* grounds that the consummate artist in the use of language and rhythm would find intense satisfaction in the extraordinary powers of Dante in these respects. Indeed, Tennyson's fastidiousness in the use of sounds was so great that even the musical Italian, and that, too, in the hands of Dante, does not escape his criticism. In the *Memoir*, by his son, we find the following passage:

"My father expressed the view that, 'as the English language is much finer than the Italian for variety of sound, so Milton for sound is often finer than Dante.' 'What, for example, can be more monotonous than the first lines of the *Inferno* with their *a-s*?

> Nel mezzo del cammin di nostra vita
> Mi ritrovai per una selva oscura,
> Chè la diritta via era smarita,

and so on.'"

While there seem at first thought to be no points of comparison between the *In Memoriam* and the *Divine Comedy*, yet the fact that each, while being the experience of the poet himself, yet seeks to represent the feelings of the whole human race, may be due not merely to coincidence. Indeed, Tennyson himself seems to point to at least some kind of connection between the two, when he says, of his own poem,

"it is rather the cry of the whole human race than mine. In the poem altogether private grief swells out into thought of and hope for the whole world. It begins with a funeral and ends in praise of a new life. A sort of *Divine Comedy*, cheerful at the close."

In *Locksley Hall* occur the well-known lines,

> Comfort? Comfort scorn'ed of devils! this is true the poet sings,
> That a sorrow's crown of sorrows is remembering happier things,

and in *The Palace of Art*, among the "paintings of wise men" which the poet hung

> The royal dais round,

was one in which

> the world-worn Dante grasp'd his song
> And somewhat grimly smiled.

The four brief lines of Dante, which give concisely the tragic story of Pia de' Tolomei,' (lines which could be expanded to a novel) are said to have suggested *Mariana in the South*. There are several parallels in language and metaphor between Tennyson and Dante which are interesting. Thus in the *Palace of Art*, there is a very evident imitation in the lines,

> Plato the wise and large-browed Verulam
> The first of those who know,

of Dante's designation of Aristotle as

> il maestro di color che sanno, . . .

and the metaphor drawn from driving one's

> . . . heel into the smoulder'd log
> That sent a blast of sparks up the flue

recalls the figure of Dante,

> Come nel percoter dei ciocchi arsi
> Surgono innumerabili faville,
> (*Par.* xviii, 100.)

by means of which he describes the streaming of the soul-lights in the heaven of Jupiter.

Most striking of all these parallels, however, is that between the fine line of Tennyson,

> The one divine far-off event
> To which the whole creation moves,

and those of Dante in which the will of God,

> è quel mare, al qual tutto si move
> Ciò ch'ella crea e che natura face.
> (*Par.* iii, 86.)

No one who has read the strange story told by Ulysses to Dante, in the eighth *bolgia* of Hell, of his voyage into the mysterious waters of the untraveled Atlantic, and his shipwreck near the mysterious mountain that rose sheer from the sea, can fail to recognize the resemblance between this passage and Tennyson's poem.

4 It seems he had quite forgotten the lines quoted above. See the *Memoir* by his son, vol. 2, p. 256.

Homer, according to the line in the *Odyssey* (xi, 135), seems to imply that Ulysses died at home of a natural death. Dante follows another tradition, accepted by Pliny and Solinus, according to which Ulysses undertook a second voyage and founded the city of Lisbon. The details of the voyage and the wretched fate of Ulysses, were probably the invention of the poet. However this may be, the whole temper of Tennyson's poem, the weariness of the old mariner at a life of inactivity, his desire to spend his few remaining years in stirring adventures, his setting sail with his old companions, who, like him, are ready to die in the quest of the unknown world beyond the setting sun, all this is due entirely to Dante. Even in the language there are constant reminiscences of the Italian poet, the "untravell'd world" and "to sail beyond the sunset" of Tennyson, being the "mondo senza gente," and the "diretro al sol" of the *Divine Comedy*.

Of all English poets, none had a broader, deeper, more personal affection for Italy than Robert Browning:

> Open my heart and you will see
> Graved inside of it, "Italy."
> Such lovers old are I and she,
> So it was always, so shall ever be!

Her history, her natural beauty, her art, her literature, the storied monuments of her past, all find expression in his poetry.

We need not be surprised, then, to find that Browning was deeply impressed by the genius of the greatest of the Italian poets. While he does not show the influence of Dante in his poems to so great an extent as Shelley, or even Byron, yet there can be little doubt that he had as full an understanding of him, and as deep and intelligent a love for him as either of these.

There is casual mention of Dante in some of his shorter poems, while in *Fifine at the Fair*, the frequently expressed surprise of the spirits in the *Divine Comedy* at the breathing of Dante is alluded to in the following lines:

> In all Descents to Hell whereof I ever read
> As when a phantom there, made enemy or friend,
> Or merely stranger-shade, is struck, is forced suspend
> His passage: "You that breathe, along with us the ghosts.
> Here, why must it be still a woman that accosts?"

We might expect to find in the *Ring and the Book*, if anywhere in Browning's works, some traces of the influence of Dante. Yet in actual fact, there is but little; a few brief mentions,

> I doubt much if Marino really be
> A better bard than Dante after all;

and a few lines, evidently reminiscential of the *Divine Comedy*, such as,

> Horrible worms made out of sweat and tears.[5]

So, too, the origin of Caponsacchi's family in Fiesole, and their settling late in Florence, near the "Old Mercato," is referred to much in the same language as in the *Paradiso*.

The personal religious element of Dante, his indomitable optimism in the midst of sorrows and wrongs such as fall to the lot of few men, his unfaltering belief that the evils of the life that now is will be compensated for in the life that is to come, appealed strongly to the essentially religious temperament of Browning. In the days of his own bitter sorrow for the death of her who had been the great blessing of his life, he found consolation in the beautiful words of Dante, in which the latter affirms his certainty of seeing Beatrice again in the other world.

In a letter to a lady (who wrote to him when dying, to thank him for the help she had received from *Rabbi Ben Ezra*, and *Abt Vogler*) he wrote as follows:

"Or, not to multiply instances, as when Dante wrote what I will transcribe from my wife's Testament wherein I recorded it fourteen years ago:—'Thus I believe, thus I affirm, thus I am certain it is, that from this life I shall pass to another, better, there, where that lady lives, of whom my soul was enamoured.'"

The strong character of Dante was especially adopted to attract Browning; and it was not merely the poet but the man whom he admired. All through Browning's poetry we see that the themes which he loved to discuss, were those in which strength and force of will and character show themselves.

> I count life just a stuff
> To try the soul's strength on, educe the man.
> Who keeps one end in view makes all things serve.

Even in evil-doing, it is better to be strong than weak, this is the lesson of the *Bust and the Statue*. The stern Florentine, unbending in what he conceived to be right, preferring exile and beggary to a shameful return to his native city, the great poet, the leader of men, the ardent patriot, even the intense hater,

> Dante, who loved well because he hated,
> Hated wickedness that hinders loving,

was the very incarnation of that strength and power of manhood which Browning admired above all things.

That this is no mere fancy is fully shown in the poem on *Sordello*, one of the most difficult

5 Cf. *Inf.* iii, 69.

and obscure, yet one of the most characteristic of Browning's works.

I think there can be little doubt that Browning received the first suggestion of this poem from Dante. Sordello, an Italian troubadour who flourished in the early part of the thirteenth century, would to-day be practically unknown, but for the passages in the *Purgatorio*, and the *De Vulgari Eloquio*. In the latter Dante praises his predecessor in the art of poetry for being one of the first of Italian poets to give up writing in the local dialect.

In the former passage he describes the meeting of Vergil and Sordello in Ante-Purgatory. The latter had looked at first upon the approaching poets with an air of supreme, yet dignified haughtiness,

> In guisa di leon quando si posa;

at the mention of Mantua, however, he bestowed a warm-hearted and open-armed welcome to the

> pregio eterno del loco ond'io fui.

This welcome furnishes Dante with the occasion for a magnificent outburst of indignation at the political state of Italy. These are the hints, taken by Browning, out of which he reconstructed the story of Sordello. Although he studied carefully the times and read over thirty books on the subject, yet the character of his hero is the creation of his own imagination.

In the early part of the poem there is a direct reference to Dante; Sordello is called the forerunner of the latter, a herald-star of song, afterwards overwhelmed by the blaze of the greater genius of his successor,

> For he is thine!
> Sordello, thy fore-runner Florentine!
> A herald-star, I know thou didst absorb,
> Relentless into the consummate orb
> That scared it from its right to roll along
> A sempiternal path with dance and song,
> Fulfilling its allotted period.
> Serenest of the progeny of God—
> Who yet resigns it not.

Yet Browning says he will try to separate the lesser glory of Sordello from the greater of Dante, although he feels doubtful as to his ability to do this.

> Dante, pacer of the shore
> Where glutted hell disgorgeth filthiest gloom,
> Unbitten by its whirring snlphur-spume—
> Or whence the grieved and obscure waters slope
> Into a darkness quieted by hope;
> Plucker of amaranths grown beneath God's eye
> In gracious twilights where his chosen lie,—
> I would do this! If I should falter now!

The characters, the historical background, the town and cities the whole political atmosphere of Browning's poem resembles that of the *Divine Comedy*, Mantua, with its marshy environs, Verona, Milan; the bloody strife between Guelf und Ghibeline; Eccelino da Romano, Azzo of Este, Sordello himself, and his love for Palma,

> Palma, Dante spoke with in the clear
> Amorous silence of the swooning sphere,
> *Cunizza*, as he called her!

Browning treats Sordello as being what the Germans call "eine problematische natur;" a sort of Italian Hamlet of the Middle Ages. As he himself says in his dedication to Mr. Milsand, his "stress lay on the incidents in the development of a soul; little else is worth study."

Just as he took the name and person of Sordello from Dante, so he undoubtedly took the hint of his character from the lines in the *Purgatorio* and *Inferno*, quoted by Mr. Lowell in his essay *Shakspere Once More*, as giving a perfect description of Hamlet's weakness.[6]

After a careful study of this poem, I feel little doubt, in spite of its confessed obscurity, that in it Browning intended to make a contrast between Sordello and Dante. The former, like the latter, was

> foremost in the regal class
> Nature has broadly severed from her mass.

He was an ardent student, full of generous impulses and lofty ambitions. He, even before Dante, revolted against the artificiality and conventionality of the poetry of the Troubadours, and sought inspiration from his own heart;

6 "I find two passages in Dante," says he, "that contain the exactest possible definition of that habit or quality of Hamlet's mind which justifies the tragic turn of the play, and renders it natural and unavoidable from the beginning. The first is from the second canto of the *Inferno:*

> E quale è quei che disvuol ciò che volle,
> E per nuovi pensier cangia proposta,
> Si che del cominciar tutto si tolle;
> Tal mi fec'io in quella oscura costa
> Perchè pensando consumai la impresa
> Che fu nel cominciar cotanto tosta."

Again, in the fifth canto of the *Purgatorio:*

> Che sempre l'uomo in cui pensier rampolla
> Sovra pensier, da sè dilunga il segno,
> Perchè la foga l'un dell'altro insolla.

Dante was a profound metaphysician, and as in the first passage he describes and defines a certain quality of mind, so in the other he tells us its result in the character and life; namely, indecision and failure, the goal *farther* off at the end than at the beginning. It is remarkable how close a resemblance of thought, and even of expression, there is between the former of these quotations and a part of Hamlet's famous soliloquy:

"Thus conscience (that is, consciousness) doth make cowards of us all:
And thus the native hue of resolution
Is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought,
And enterprises of great pith and moment
With this regard their currents turn awry,
And lose the name of action."

That man, said we, tells his own joys and woes
We'll trust him. Would you have your songs entire,
Build on the human heart;

lines which in sentiment are like Dante's reply to Buonagiunta's question,

Io mi son un che, quando
Amor mi spira, noto, ed a quel modo
Che detta dentro, vo significando.
*Purg.* xxiv, 52-54.

Sordello even seemed to have had a dream of writing some day a poem of the general plan of the *Divine Comedy*, an outline of the theme of which he gives in his speech to Salinguerra,

I take the task
And marshall you Life's elemental masque,
Show Men, on evil or on good lay stress,
This light, this shade make prominent, suppress
All ordinary hues that softening blend
Such natures with the level. Apprehend
Which sinner is, which saint, if I allot
Hell, Purgatory, Heaven, a blaze or blot
To those you doubt concerning! I enwomb
Some wretched Friedrich with his red-hot tomb;
Some dubious spirit, Lombard Agilulph
With the black chastening river I engulph!
Some unapproached Matilda I enshrine
With languors of the planet of decline, etc.

Sordello, like Dante, had a true conception of the importance of developing the national language. In his dreams of the great things he should do some day,

Language, that makeshft, grew
Into a bravest of expedients, too.

So, also, in the terrible chaos of civil war which crushed the very life out of hapless Italy, Sordello saw an opportunity of becoming a leader of men, a glorious task for one who could bring harmony and peace out of the conflicting parties. He was born,

With the new century, beside the glow
And effervescence out of barbarism.

He had an earnest desire to serve his country, a clear vision of truth, splendid gifts of mind and soul. Yet all these lofty qualities were rendered vain by the one "mask of leprosy" within him: his vacillation, his weakness of will, his inveterate habit of dreaming instead of doing.

While Dante, fifty years later, founded the Italian language, wrote one of the greatest poems in the world's literature, suffered poverty and exile for the sake of his political doctrines, Sordello did nothing. His life was spent in dreams: he dreamed of forming a new language; he dreamed of becoming a great poet; he dreamed of political power, of becoming the "Monarch of the World." But when the time for action came, all the baseless fabric of these visions faded away, leaving "not a wrack behind."

The Body, the Machine for acting will
Had been at the commencement proved utfit,

and so it came to pass that instead of accomplishing his dreams, instead of becoming the founder of a language, a leader of men, and a great world-poet:

As knight, Bard, Gallant, men were never dumb
In praise of him: while what he should have been,
Could be and was not the one step too mean
For him to take, we suffer at this day
Because of: Eccelin had pushed away
Its chance ere Dante could arrive and take
That step Sordello spurned, for the world's sake:
He did much, but Sordello's chance was gone.

The most beautiful of Browning's allusions to Dante occurs in the *One Word More*. In the *New Life* Dante tells how on the anniversary of Beatrice's death, he sat drawing an angel *sopra certe tavolette*, but was interrupted by the presence of certain men, *a' quali si convenia di fare onore*. Browning cites this as an example of that deep desire of a lover's heart to do something out of the ordinary for the beloved one. Raphael the painter had written a book of sonnets for *la Fornarina;* so Dante the poet, drew an angel for Beatrice.

Dante once prepared to paint an angel:
Whom to please? You whisper 'Beatrice,'
While he mused and traced it and retraced it
(Peradventure with a pen corroded
Still by drops of that hot ink he dipped for,
When, his left hand i' the hair o' the wicked,
Back he held the brow and pricked its stigma,
Bit into the live man's flesh for parchment,
Loosed him, laughed to see the writing rankle,
Let the wretch go festering through Florence)—
Dante, who loved well because he hated,
Hated wickedness that hinders loving,
Dante standing, studying his angel,—
In there broke the folk of his Inferno.
Says he—"certain people of importance"
(Such he gave his daily, dreadful line to)
"Entered and would seize, forsooth, the poet."
Says the poet, "then I stopped my painting."

VI.

You and I would rather see that angel,
Painted by the tenderness of Dante,
Would we not? than read a fresh Inferno.

VIII.

What of Rafael's sonnets, Dante's picture?
This: no artist lives and loves that longs not
Once, and only once, and for one only
(Oh, the prize!) to find his love a language
Fit and fair and simple and sufficient—
Using nature that's an art to others,
Not, this one time, art that's turned his nature.

The conclusion of the poem, and the application of the above to his own love for Mrs. Browning is very beautiful.

XVIII.

This I say of me, but think of you Love!
This to you—yourself my moon of poets!
Oh, but that's the world's side, there's the wonder—
Thus they see you, praise you, think they know you!
There, in turn, I stand with them and praise you!
Out of my own self, I dare to phrase it.
But the best is when I glide from out them,
Cross a step or two of dubious twilight,
Come out on the other side, the novel
Silent, silver lights and darks undreamed of,
Where I hush and bless myself with silence.

XIX.

Oh, their Rafael of the dear Madonnas,
Oh, their Dante of the dread Inferno,
Wrote one song—and in my brain I sing it,
Drew one angel—borne, see, on my bosom.

OSCAR KUHNS.

*Wesleyan University.*

## *TWO NOTELETS ON SHAKESPEARE.*

I.

*Lucrece* 183 f.

"Here pale with fear he doth premeditate
The dangers of his loathsome enterprise,
And in his inward mind he doth debate
What following sorrow may on this arise:
Then looking scornfully, he doth despise
His naked armour of still-slaughter'd lust,
And justly thus controls his thoughts unjust."

One line of this stanza, "His naked armour of still-slaughter'd lust" (text of the Globe edition), is, at first sight, obscure in meaning. Both "naked armour," and "still-slaughter'd" (the hyphen is Malone's) require comment. "Zwischen 'naked'=waffenlos, and 'armour' besteht eine Antithese," is the common-place observation of Delius, who also accepts the questionable hyphen and defines "still-slaughtered" by "stets erwürgt," adding "Er verschmäht die schwache Rüstung seiner Wollust, die stets Niederlagen erleitet." Schmidt sees in the epithet "naked" "a play upon the word," and in "armour" a figurative use. Putting his two assumptions together, one must infer the meaning to be that Tarquin regards himself as armed for lust in being (in the military sense) unarmed, even naked (not only of armour, but also literally). As a soldier he may well be supposed to "despise" an enterprise of violence in which the legitimated means of defence are not to be employed (compare "How he in peace is wounded, not in war," 831).

But Tarquin has turned logician: "in his mind he doth debate," "revolving the sundry dangers of his will's obtaining" (128). In one mood he would fain defend his lawless desire by argument; he would put armour on his ears and on his eyes (compare *Timon* iv, 3,23) and on his heart and mind, and 'not let the virgin's cheek make soft his trenchant sword.' In another mood the counter-argument prevails:

"I have debated, even in my soul,
What wrong, what shame, what sorrow I shall breed."
[498-499].

When in this frame of mind lust is for the moment overcome, it is felled *dead*, slaughtered *still* (adj.); and the contemplation of the heavy curse consequent upon shameless crime momentarily 'tires him more than all the complete armour he might wear' (compare *Richard III*, iv, 4,189). He now sees and "despises" the flimsiness of his argument in favor of lust, his "naked" *argument*, his "naked armour." But soon afterwards, in a recurrence of the first mood, this "naked armour" proves effective, and virtue subdued retires herself from the conflict; her pleadings are dismissed as "an old man's saw" (244), inasmuch as "my part is youth" (278).

II.

Sonnet i, 13–14.

"Pity the world, or else this glutton be,
To eat the world's due, by the grave and thee."

Tyler's note is as follows:

"*The world's due* is the perpetuation of Mr. W. H's beauty. If he fails to leave children behind him, he will co-operate with the grave, destined thus to consume not only his body, but to cut off also all hope of posterity. But it depends on Mr. W. H. himself whether the grave shall exert its full power; and so what the grave consumes Mr. W. H. may be regarded as himself consuming, like a glutton."

This coöperation with the grave in devouring the world's due is thus expressed in Hudson's note: "To eat what is due to the world, by *burying thyself*, that is, by leaving no posterity, seems to be the meaning." Dowden, too, holds to substantially the same interpretation, but is somewhat more logical in distributing the agency:

"Pity the world, or else be a glutton devouring the world's due, by means of the grave (which will swallow your beauty) and of yourself, who refuse to beget offspring."

The figure of gluttony as assumed in these interpretations is supported by Dowden's citation from *All's Well* I, 1, 54: "Virginity . . . . consumes itself to the very paring, and so dies with feeding his own stomach." A further confirmation might have been sought in the coincidence between the same passage in *All's Well*, "Keep it not; you cannot choose but

lose by 't: out with 't! within ten year it will make itself ten, which is a goodly increase," and *Sonnet* vi (for this symbolic use of the number ten, see also xxxii, and xxxviii),

> "That's for thyself to breed another thee,
> Or ten times happier, be it ten for one;
> Ten times thyself were happier than thou art,
> If ten of thine ten times refigur'd thee."

Moreover it might be argued that the figure of gluttony is changed in the next following sonnets into that of the thriftless waste of him who would be "the tomb of his self-love to stop posterity" (iii), "beauty's waste" being beauty "kept unus'd," for "the user so destroys it" (ix).

That commentators are in the main agreed in regarding the compound phrase "by the grave and thee" as a modifier of the verb "eat," in the sense indicated, would require no further notice if one did not find an interest in the variety of the expression of the same sense; this interest is also increased by an agreement among commentators that the lines under consideration require elucidation, although the explanation given is usually represented as being sufficiently obvious. Steevens's conjecture "be thy grave and thee" is indeed exceptional in acknowledging a grammatical difficulty; but before turning to that aspect of the problem, a few more of the notes accordant with those already cited may be added. Delius says, "*this* [glutton] bezieht sich auf das Folgende: ein solcher Schlemmer, dass Du, vermittelst des Grabes and Deiner selbst, das aufzehrst, was der welt zukommt;" and Wyndham's exposition is,

"*Pity the world*, of which you are the present ornament and only earnest of future increase in beauty (9–10), *or else* prevent the confirmation of that earnest, which is due to the world, by *the grave* (=your death) *and thee* (=your refusal to propagate your beauty before dying)."

The grammatical difficulty which Steevens, without success, attempted to remove is a barrier to the acceptance of the usual interpretation of these lines. To allow the grammatical construction to suggest the sense, is, as it is in most cases, probably better than to break the grammar upon the wheel of a preconceived notion of the sense. In this instance the grammatical construction requires "by the grave and thee" to restrict "due." The preposition "by" (which alone occasions the obscurity) is here used with perhaps a remote suggestion of the idiom 'to have children by;' but its meaning, aside from suggestiveness of this sort, is primarily, perhaps, that of instrumentality in establishing and in owing an obligation, with a possible implication of 'at the hands of.' "The world's due (at the hands of, or owed) by the grave and thee," therefore represents briefly what I believe the intended meaning to be. This debt which is due the world is reverted to in the fourth sonnet, with a natural change of the figure which confirms the sense of the earlier lines.

James W. Bright.

## *FRENCH LYRICS.*

*French Lyrics*, selected and edited with an introduction and notes by Arthur Graves Canfield. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1899. 8vo, pp. 382.

There has certainly been a great need and a large place open for a text-book or a selection of French lyric poetry, and Prof. Canfield's book comes to us at an opportune time. The demands on such a text-book, if it is to be successful, are many and difficult. Inasmuch as the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries are the great ages of lyrism in French literature, the introduction would naturally contain a comprehensive, yet quite brief, outline of the development of lyrism in these centuries: the causes, conditions and influences under which lyric poetry was developed, and a statement of the principal questions of versification as they grew and changed from one school to the other. Sixteenth Century lyrism would naturally be well represented. Does Prof. Canfield's *French Lyrics* cover these demands?

It is intended as "an introduction to the reading and study of French lyric poetry," and in a general way to show that France, too, "possesses a wealth of lyric poetry." Of the twenty-two pages of the Introduction, fifteen are devoted to a very general sketch of lyric poetry from its origins to the present day; the remaining seven treat of versification. It is needless to say that such an introduction cannot pretend to give even the general reader much of a notion of what French lyric poetry is, and those who are likely to use the book (the teachers of French in our colleges) will not expect an exhaustive treatise. So many of our modern text-books deal too much with glittering, flowery generalities, instead of giving the student for whose benefit they are

really written some digestible food. There is nothing to object to in this Introduction. It is well written and attractive; but is it what the student wants? There are over three hundred pages of selections and surely these would warrant a thorough presentation of the history of lyrism. Under the list of anthologies there might be added a very helpful one, G. Merlet, *Anthologie classique des Poètes du xixème Siècle* (Lemerre), containing especially fine selections of the more modern poets. As to the notes on versification, they seem entirely too general to be of much use, and appear to be picked up at random without logical sequence. After a page of generalities such as "the rules of French versification have not always been the same" or

"in determining the number of syllables the general rules of syllabic division are followed, and each vowel or diphthong involves a syllable,"

the rules of mute *e* and hiatus are stated; another page of generalities on the alexandrine, followed by a few rules or statements on rime. It is hardly true that the Romanticists especially have cultivated rich rime; the Parnassians have this honor. An explanation of the *ballade*, *rondel*, *rondeau*, *triolet* and *sonnet* follows.

Of the three hundred pages of selections only thirty are devoted to poems before the Nineteenth Century. If the object of the book is to show that France possesses a wealth of lyric verse, to make this more widely known, and to stimulate an interest in French lyrism, the reviewer fears the reader will have a very unfair impression of French lyric poetry before this century. In reading over the names of authors one is surprised to find so many obscure names and not to find some of the finest lyric poets of the younger generation. From the vast number of this century's poets the editor has chosen about fifty; more than a dozen of these can hardly claim a place in so limited a number. Names such as Agoult, Arnault, Arvers, Chateaubriand, Bourget, Boutelleau, Frémine, Lafenestre, Maupassant, Millevoye, Nodier, Tiercelin, do not deserve a place in a book whose purpose is to acquaint the reader with the best *lyric* poets. If Chateaubriand is important in the development of lyrism, Mme de Staël, Sainte-Beuve, Catulle Mendès, Mallarmé, Richepin, and Rollinat are so also; they represent certain tendencies. If you admit Daudet, Maupassant, and Bourget, why omit Lemaitre and France? No anthology that attempts at all to give an idea of this century's lyrism should fail to omit selections from such sane, healthy and exquisite poetry as that of Eugène Manuel, Gabriel Vicaire, Jean Aicard, Louis Ratisbonne, Auguste Dorchain, etc., the cream of the later Nineteenth Century lyrists whose names and poetry are familiar to every French schoolboy. It is true the impression prevailing among the uninitiated is that the beauty of French lyrism lies in its form and nudity (coldness, lack of sympathy, immorality). Those who will resort to this book will already be familiar with Lamartine, Victor Hugo, Musset, de Vigny and Leconte de Lisle; besides we already have selections from these poets. Now if one out of every three of these poets selected have only written one poem worth writing and recording, what an impression this will leave with the reader! He will certainly imagine a great dearth of real lyric poets in this century, of course, outside of the five great poets. There is a wealth of genuine, healthy and exquisite lyrism written within the last thirty years, and this is hardly touched by Prof. Canfield. So few people are acquainted with it and it is difficult to find. The reviewer believes it the duty of such a work as that now before us to bring such poets as Manuel, Ratisbonne, etc., before our American public. Why allot forty pages to Victor Hugo, over thirty to Musset and as many to Lamartine, or nearly one-third of the entire space? Leconte de Lisle is not widely read nor well-known in America, and the average reader finds great difficulty in appreciating his poems without guiding notes. A few of the exquisite, short *Chansons Ecossaises* in the *Poèmes Barbares* would have been relished by the reader, as they are such a contrast to the other poems.

There are some sixty pages of notes: under the name of each author there will be found a few very general remarks on the character of the poet and his works, with the names of some of his works, now and then a few references to criticisms, and finally notes on the text. The usefulness of such lines as the following, and there are fully a dozen similar specimens, seems very doubtful:

"An enormous literary force at the beginning of this century; M. E. Faguet calls him the 'greatest date in French letters since the

Pleiad'. But the instrument of his power was prose. His attempts in verse were poor. Yet he exercised a direct influence towards the renewal of lyric poetry as has been indicated in the introduction." (Cf. Chateaubriand.)

The reviewer would like to have seen all of this general information-space used in the Introduction for a thorough, yet brief, treatise on French lyrism. There are a number of very excellent features to the book, such as the selections from the greater poets, with a few notes and references for further study. The book is admirably gotten up, and is a credit to the publishers. Whether this book will prove useful to the teachersof French, who are willing to offer a course on lyric poetry, remains for each one to decide for himself. For the poetry earlier than the Nineteenth Century it is entirely inadequate; for the lyrism of the first half of the century it is excellent as far as selections go; the later poets and schools can hardly be said to be represented. The usefulness of the book to our colleges and universities is limited, it seems to the reviewer, to a course in Romantic lyrism. For this it is excellent; but more than this cannot be said in its praise. To the general reader Prof. Canfield's *French Lyrics* may be useful; yet there is a certain danger of claiming a wrong impression and of getting an inadequate idea of French lyric poetry because of the defects which have been pointed out.

HUGO P. THIEME.

*University of Michigan.*

## *ÆSOPIC FABLES.*

*The Isopo Laurenziano*, edited with notes and an introduction by MURRAY PEABODY BRUSH (Johns Hopkins dissertation). Columbus: 1899. 8vo, pp. viii+186.

THE first part of Dr. Brush's dissertation consists of a description of twenty-seven manuscripts containing Italian fable collections older than the sixteenth century, with a discussion of their relations to each other and to their respective sources. The presentation of the subject is the best and most nearly complete that has yet been published. The previous writers who have given the most information, Ghivizzani and Hervieux, are neither so full nor so accurate as Dr. Brush; his work rests largely on personal investigations in the libraries of Italy, where are found all but two of the manuscripts described, and it is in part new and original.

The twenty-seven manuscripts "which contain what may be properly called fable collections, or parts thereof" (p. 4) include two (Nos. 9 and 17) which have respectively five and three fables. Among these fables, which are in *terza rima*, two are common to the two manuscripts, in similar but not identical wording. It is very much to be wished that Dr. Brush had published these six different fables, as Ghivizzani proposed to do; they seem to have been influenced by other sources than those of the ordinary collections.[1] The same is true of MS. 22, a copy of the *Libro della Virtù* containing sixteen fables. Dr. Brush judges that for these fables "the author drew on various collections as he saw fit" (p. 42). One might go further, and say that some of the fables come directly from popular tradition. This is probably true of "Come la Cornacchia si vesta dell' altrui Penne," which, as may be seen from the title alone, did not come from any collection of the Phædrus-Romulus family, but from some popular source, like the "Exemplo de la Cornacla com' ela se visti," in the *Libro de li Exempli* published by Ulrich.[2] The latter collection, by the way, with its four fables, seems entitled to admission in the list as well as the *Libro della Virtù;* neither of them is primarily a collection of fables. As to what constitutes a "part of a collection," Dr. Brush makes a nice distinction when he excludes a manuscript containing two fables (cf. note on p. 6), and admits another containing only three. His list of collections is nearer completeness than any previous one. Of his twenty-seven manuscripts, fifteen are mentioned by Ghivizzani, and a few more by Hervieux; three have been cited by no previous writer. We note with pleasure that Dr. Brush proposes to continue his work in this field, and to republish the fifteenth century Accio Zuccho collection, which is contained in one

1 It would be particularly interesting to compare the *Fox and Wolf in Well*, which occurs in both manuscripts, with similar fables, such as the one in the *Roman de Renart*. Dr. Brush is in error (p. 40, note) in thinking Regnier's reference to Verdizotti a blunder; in an edition before me, *Cento Favole Bellissime*, Venetia, 1661, No. 12 is *La Volpe e 'l Lupo;* it is, however, different from either of the two fables of La Fontaine (iii, 5; xi, 6) which treat a similar subject, and also from Phædrus iv, 9. On the *Lion, Fox, Sheep and Wolf*, cf. Górski, *Fabel vom Löwenantheil*, Berlin, 1888, pp. 52-59.

2 First in *Romania*, xiii, 47, then in *Trattati Religiosi*, Bologna, 1891. On this fable and its two forms, cf. Fuchs, *Fabel von der Krähe*, Berlin, 1886; and my article, *A Sonnet ascribed to Chiaro Davanzati*, in *Pub. of the Mod. Lang. Assoc. of Am.*, Vol. xiii, pp. 205-220.

of his manuscripts (No. 19, British Museum) and in several fifteenth century editions.[3]

Leaving aside the manuscripts thus far mentioned, we find that of the twenty-three remaining, fifteen contain the collection called *Isopo Volgarizzato per Uno da Siena* (the numbers are wrongly stated on p. 31; No. 3 is omitted, and No. 23 is wrongly included). It is a translation of the Latin collection formerly known as the *Anonymus Neveleti*, which Dr. Brush and others, following Hervieux, ascribe to Walter of England. This Italian translation was published in an edition of Accio Zuccho at Florence in 1496; again at Florence in 1778 (from Dr. Brush's MS. 26), at Padua in 1811 (MS. 25), at Florence in 1864 (MS. 3); and from these editions it has often been reprinted. A complete list of the editions would be of interest, though of no great value; but it is to be hoped that an investigation will be made of the mutual relations of the manuscripts of this translation; on this subject Dr. Brush says nothing, and as to the age of the translation he merely mentions that some of the manuscripts date from the fourteenth century. Another prose translation of the fables of Walter exists in one manuscript (Cod. Riccardiano 1338, Brush No. 12) of the fourteenth century, published by Ghivizzani at Bologna in 1866; and a translation in verse of the same collection, and belonging to about the same time, was published by Monaci in 1892 (Brush MS. 23, wrongly referred to as No. 24 on p. 33). Thus, with the fifteenth century collections of Zuccho and Del Tuppo, we have five independent Italian translations of Walter; with the exception of the *Apologhi Verseggiati* published by Monaci, they all correspond closely in number and in order of fables to their original.

The *Isopet* of Marie de France is the source of the remaining six manuscripts. Of these, one is now published by Dr. Brush for the first time. Two had already been published, one by Rigoli at Florence in 1818 (Cod. Riccard. 1088; Brush No. 11), the other by Giusti at Lucca in 1864 (Cod. Palatino 92; Brush No. 4); these are fairly well known, and had been in part reprinted by Ghivizzani in 1866 and by L. del Prete at Milan in 1869; yet their source was not suspected until comparatively recently. In 1885 Mall pointed it out for the *Rigoli* collection; and Warnke, in his edition of Marie's fables, 1898, has discussed the relation of *Rigoli* to the *Cod. Palatino* and to their original, and decided that the Italian collections are both derived from an older Italian collection, which was translated directly from the French of Marie. This view Dr. Brush extends so as to include all the six manuscripts. One of these manuscripts is a nineteenth century copy of the *Rigoli* collection. The other five Dr. Brush divides into two families; first, the *Isopo Laurenziano* and the *Palatino i* (Lucca, 1864); second, the *Rigoli* collection, and the two unpublished manuscripts, which he calls *Laurenziano ii* and *Palatino ii*. The reason for the division is made evident by a comparison of texts, and by a table of the order of the fables in the different manuscripts. The fact that the largest of the five, *Laur. ii*, is one of the youngest precludes the possibility that one collection is the parent of the others; yet the correspondences are sufficient to show that there was a common parent in Italian, which is now lost. It appears likely, from some peculiarities in the *Is. Laur.*, that there was an intermediary between it and the original Italian version; and *Palatino i* was probably copied from the same intermediary; while the three manuscripts of the second family may, or may not, have been copied directly from the Italian original, which Dr. Brush places in the first half of the fourteenth century. *Rigoli* and the lost original of the *Is. Laur.* doubtless belong to the second half of the same century; the *Is. Laur.* itself Dr. Brush assigns to the very end of the century. As to the French source of the Italian original, Dr. Brush, following Warnke, has no difficulty in showing that it was a manuscript similar to one now in Paris, called by Warnke Q, which differs distinctly from the other manuscripts of Marie's collection. In the Italian collections there are but three fables which are not in *Marie Q;* two of these (in *Laur. ii*) are from Walter of England; and the third, since it is not found elsewhere than in *Is. Laur.* and *Pal. i* (No. 36), was presumably introduced by the writer of the older *Is. Laur.* It is an amusing fable of a Swallow which ventured to criticise the voice of a Cock, and was killed for its boldness.

To a student of fable literature the greatest value of Dr. Brush's dissertation is in the introduction, with its great mass of statistical

3 Cf. Keidel, *Manual of Æsopic Fable Literature*, Fasc. i, Nos. 23, 25, 36, 47, 61, 85, 100, 105, 117, 124, 131, 157, 158, 164.

and bibliographical information accurately and systematically presented, and its important account of the Italian translation from Marie. To summarize this information has been one of the chief objects of this review, for the most hazy notions are current generally as to the Italian fable collections, and even the sources of information previously available have not become widely known. Furthermore, every student must be grateful for an edition of an unpublished fable collection; yet from this point of view a publication of *Laur. ii* would perhaps have had more value, since this manuscript contains five fables not yet published in Italian, while the *Is. Laur.* contains no fable that was not already accessible in the *Palatino i*. *Is. Laur.* and *Pal. i* contain forty-six fables, which, leaving out the Cock and the Swallow, correspond to forty-five of the first forty-nine fables in *Marie Q*. *Laur. ii* has fifty-seven, of which fifty-two are in the Rigoli collection. An attractive opportunity for work in this field is presented by the unpublished fables scattered about in various manuscripts, and it is to be hoped that these will soon be accessible to students, together with a list of all the mediæval Italian fables, whether occurring in fable collections, singly, or in works like the *Libro della Virtù*. A study and classification of the manuscripts of the *Uno da Siena* collection, a determination of its exact age, and a constitution of its text would also be a task of interest and value. Coming to a later period, a new edition of Del Tuppo would be as welcome as the one of Accio Zuccho which Dr. Brush has promised. Meanwhile, it is a pleasure to emphasize the service which the dissertation before us has rendered to students of Italian literature and of fable literature in general.

Aside from its interest as a collection of fables, the *Is. Laur.* is a valuable addition to the texts available for the study of the language of early Italian prose. It is in pure Tuscan, and very similar in style to other works of the period; the language offers no difficulty except where the text is corrupt. Dr. Brush has introduced punctuation, and has emended the text in a few passages where it was incomprehensible; otherwise he has given an exact reproduction of the manuscript. By a system of underlining he has indicated what portions of the text agree exactly with the French original, what less closely, and what are added in the Italian; in footnotes he gives the readings of the French where they are of interest for the sake of comparison. It appears that the translator has followed fairly closely the ideas, and sometimes the words, of his original; he has added rather more than he has omitted. Except for three fables, Dr. Brush has not compared the readings of the Italian manuscripts. The editions of *Rigoli* and *Pal. i*, while they aim to reproduce the manuscripts, have modified the orthography, and to that extent are not trustworthy for text comparison; a list of readings would in some cases be of great assistance. For instance, the beginning of the third fable appears to have been corrupted till it is illogical, but *Rigoli* correctly reproduces the French original, and *Pal. i* is different from the French, but clearer than *Is. Laur.*; in this case, the common parent of *Pal. i* and *Is. Laur.* doubtless introduced a new reading, which *Pal. i* preserved, while *Is. Laur.* changed it still further.

The value of the edition is increased by facsimiles of two pages of the manuscript. The work is handsomely and carefully printed. There are few misprints; one, which Dr. Brush will be the first to deplore, is *John* Hopkins University (in the title, and on p. 65); p. 28, read *Mauui* for *Mani*; p. 79, something is wrong with the last two columns of the table. The way in which the footnotes are printed—all the notes on a page being run together in one paragraph, without prominent reference-figures—makes them confusing to the eye, and difficult for reference. To the present writer, the profusion of cross-references to different portions of the dissertation seems superfluous; it is readily to be pardoned, however, as indicating the zeal for accuracy which one is glad to find throughout the dissertation. Dr. Brush was fortunate in his opportunities for work, and he has made excellent use of them.

KENNETH MCKENZIE.
*West Virginia University.*

---

## *NEW PHONETIC BOOKS (1897-1899).*

### I.

1. BREYMANN, HERMANN: *Die phonetische Literatur von 1876–1895*. Eine bibliographisch-kritische Übersicht. Leipzig: A. Deichert (Georg Böhme), 1897. 8vo, 170 pp. 3 M. 50.
2. H. MICHAELIS et P. PASSY: *Dictionnaire phonétique de la langue française*. Complément nécessaire de tout dictionnaire français. Avec préface de GASTON PARIS. Hanovre et Berlin: Carl Meyer (Gustave Prior), 1897. 8vo, pp. xvi, 319. 4 M.

BREYMANN'S bibliographical and critical study of the phonetic literature from 1876 to 1895 of-

fers to the student and teacher the same advantages of a short, handy, and reliable book of reference, as his bibliographical and critical study of the literature relative to the reform of Modern Language instruction from 1876 to 1893.[1] It has been composed with equal care and competence, and exhibits the same praiseworthy qualities of objective criticism, while following also a similar plan in the arrangement of the material. Part i. (pp. 1–66) treats of general phonetics; Part ii. (pp. 67–125) of special phonetics: 1. French; 2. the other Romanic languages; 3. German; 4. English; 5. Dutch; 6. Scandinavian; 7. Slavonic; 8. various languages; Part iii. (pp. 126–127) of phonetic periodicals; Part iv. (pp. 128–139) contains a retrospect, that is the author's personal views upon the latest movements and tendencies among the students of phonetics, with an explanation of the plan and purport of the work. All the books, monographs and articles, in the first part, and in each chapter (1–8) of the second part, are arranged in chronological order with regard to the year in which they have been published, but in alphabetic order within every year.

"Auf den *Titel* des betreffenden Werkes folgt, wenn es irgend nötig erscheint, eine genaue *Inhaltsangabe*, an die sich jedes Mal eine in möglichst kurze, bezeichnende Sätze gefasste Zusammenstellung der bisher kund gewordenen fachmännischen *Urteile* über den Wert oder Unwert, die Vorzüge oder die Mängel der in Frage stehenden Schrift schliesst. An die Urteile reihen sich naturgemäss ergänzende, berichtigende oder auf gleichartige Arbeiten, auf zustimmende oder abweichende Meinungsäusserungen hinweisende *Anmerkungen des Verfassers*. Den Beschluss bildet das chronologisch geordnete Verzeichnis der *Belegstellen*, welche den Leser in den Stand setzen sollen, entweder die vorher nur kurz angedeuteten Urteile der Kritik in extenso kennen zu lernen oder zweifelhaft erscheinende Angaben zu kontrollieren."[2]

A good index (pp. 140–170), very extensive, but not too long for its purpose, increases the value of this book of reference.

Errors are unavoidable in such a compilatory work, but Breymann's painstaking labor has been very successful in this respect, and his statements are, on the whole, quite correct and sufficiently complete. I may, perhaps, be allowed to call his attention to the following mistakes or omissions.

1 Hermann Breymann: *Die neusprachliche Reform-Literatur von 1876–1893*. Leipzig: A. Deichert (Georg Böhme), 1895. 155 pp. 3 M. Cf. my review of this work in *Die Neueren Sprachen*, Vol. iv, No. 9 (January, 1897), pp. 551–560.

2 P. 138.

Breymann mentions, pp. 89, 158 and 88, with two insignificant mistakes: A. Rambeau, *Additional Remarks upon Beyer-Passy's Elementarbuch, etc., and Beyer's Ergänzungsheft* in MOD. LANG. NOTES, Vol. viii (1893), cols. 484–486, but not the two rather long articles upon *Phonetics and Reform-Method*, which precede them and are to be found in the same volume of the same periodical.[3] In these two articles I give a full account of Beyer-Passy's *Elementarbuch* and Beyer's *Ergänzungsheft*, as well as of Paul Passy's *Les Sons du français* and the *Maître Phonétique*. The *Additional Remarks* themselves, if separated from the articles to which they form a natural sequel, have, I think, neither much value nor much meaning.

Breymann omits, p. 88, my review of Koschwitz's *Les Parlers parisiens*, first edition, in MOD. LANG. NOTES, Vol. ix (1894), cols. 276–285. My announcement of the second edition of Koschwitz's work appeared after the year in which the *Phonetische Literatur* was published in *Die Neueren Sprachen*, Vol. vi (1898), pp. 68–69.

In Part ii, Chapter 4 (*English*), 1895, p. 116, there is no mention made of Prof. Grandgent's very important treatise upon *English in America* in the second volume (1895) of *Die Neueren Sprachen*: I. (description and explanation) in Heft 8, pp. 443–467; II. (phonetic texts) in Heft 9–10, pp. 520–528, with my remarks, pp. 528–533.

2. This work differs from ordinary pronouncing dictionaries by placing first the spoken form of every word, and giving, in the second place, its form as it appears in the traditional orthography, and by omitting the signification; it differs from the existing phonetic glossaries by being a complete dictionary. It has been, or will be, criticized with much acerbity by scholars who dislike phonetics, and regard this science as something very inferior to other linguistic studies, or as an extravagant pastime, and as worthless for philologists. But I am sure it has been, or will be, received with much favor by most specialists, at all events by all those whom Prof. Koschwitz jokingly calls the "maîtres phonétiques," that is, by all those who are connected in some way or other with the "Association Phonétique Internationale;" and they, doubtless, form the majority of phoneticians at the present time, at least among the students of modern languages. This fact, as

3 Vol. viii, cols. 321–331 and 385–398.

well as the existence of a large number of books whose authors use the same script, either entirely, or with very few variations, in their phonetic transcriptions, amply justifies the employment in the dictionary of the alphabet with its auxiliary signs adopted, after long and fruitful discussions, by the international Phonetic Teachers' Association.

The dictionary, however, does not satisfy the needs of specialists alone. It will be found very useful also by the general student of French who wishes above all to obtain an exact knowledge of modern French pronunciation for practical ends, and for philologists who, without carrying on special studies in that particular line themselves, observe the development of French phonetics with interest, and who desire reliable information about the latest stage of the spoken language among the educated classes of Northern France, or rather of Paris and its neighborhood.

Gaston Paris has honored the phonetic dictionary with a short preface. He calls it an excellent and convenient instrument of research and control, available for foreigners as well as natives, and explains very well, in a few words, the practical and scientific aims of the work, and its usefulness for those who study the living French language scientifically, and those who simply wish to acquire or possess it as well as possible. He justly remarks that many readers will object to several statements made by Michaelis and Paul Passy; but the doubts and protests of sincere criticism cannot but help the advance of science, and it will be very interesting to note the points upon which other scholars are of a different opinion, as well as to find out the causes of such dissent. Fortunately, the stand-point of the authors is a very clear one; their way of treating questions of pronunciation is nearly always consistent; their views are frankly and clearly expressed, and are not liable to be misunderstood; there is no hiding caused by ignorance, bad faith or the desire of appearing ingenious; there is no ambiguity in their statements. The task, therefore, of the critic in regard to the dictionary is not a difficult one if he is an expert himself and desires to discover the truth and nothing but the truth. He can easily examine, control, assail and confute the author's opinions if he thinks them wrong or unsatisfactory.

Cf. *Avant-propos:* "En prenant hardiment pour point de départ la langue parlée, nous croyons travailler à affranchir le public instruit de son respect outré pour la lettre écrite ou imprimée" (p. viii). . . . . "La prononciation représentée dans notre Dictionnaire phonétique est celle de la population cultivée du Nord de la France; choisie, non pas comme préférable en elle-même, mais comme à la fois la plus accessible pour nous et la plus importante pour la plupart de ceux qui étudient le français. Cette prononciation présente un système phonique assez défini pour être susceptible d'une description sommaire" (pp. ix–x).

This summary description of the pronunciation of the educated classes in Northern France has been placed after the dictionary proper: *Coup d'œil sur la prononciation française*, pp. 307–314. I find here, on page 314, the following remark:

"Les consonnes aussi peuvent être longues ou brèves. En syllabe forte fermée par une seule consonne, cette consonne est longue si la voyelle qui précéde est brève, p. e. 'rɛn:,' 'rɛd:,' 'sœl:.' Cette longueur est sous-entendue dans le dictionnaire."

The length of *n*, *d*, *l*, etc. (re*nne*, rai*de*, seu*l*, etc.), has been omitted in the dictionary without any inconvenience. But I think it ought not to be left out in good phonetic texts. For the phenomenon is not so simple and so easily understood as it would appear according to the quoted remark. The consonants *n*, *d*, *l*, etc., in the conditions described by the authors, are lengthened, generally speaking, only before a pause, and are always short before a word beginning with a vowel in the same breath-group. Such and similar conditions, changing continually in natural, fluent speech, and influencing, at different times, in different manners and degrees, sounds, syllables, words, and combinations of words, can be fairly reproduced, or pretty clearly indicated by auxiliary signs, in phonetic texts. But it is in the nature of a dictionary that it represents *isolated* words, and it is very difficult and, I think, impossible to mark, in an alphabetic list, all the various forms that a word may have in the living language, and, besides, all the conditions that cause the different aspect of the same word in connected speech. This difficulty, no doubt, was, and is, well known to Michaelis and Paul Passy, but has not been, and could not be, quite overcome by them in their phonetic dictionary. The language which it represents, because it is a *dictionary*, must necessarily exhibit many features of artificial abstraction that can be, and ought to be, avoided in good phonetic texts. Nevertheless, I think the work offers a great many real and invaluable advantages for the study of the living language,

if it is used in the right way and in the right spirit: it ought to be studied principally in connection with phonetic texts, and, frequently, in connection with such texts in double transcription as are to be found in some issues of the *Maître Phonétique*, and at the beginning of the first part of Jean Passy and A. Rambeau's *Chrestomathie Française*.

There is another great difficulty with which the authors had to struggle while working out their dictionary. By selecting the pronunciation of the educated classes in Northern France they certainly obtained, as a basis of their observations and researches, a phonetic system which appears definite enough in its general and most important features, and quite uniform in a summary description. But they were very well aware that there are a great many variations to be noted, even in Northern France, in the pronunciation of individuals as well as of large portions of the cultivated population. Cf. *Avant-propos*, p. x;

" . . . il n'existe sans doute pas deux personnes dont la prononciation soit absolument identique. En rapportant, sans les discuter, les variantes de prononciation dont nous avons constaté l'existence dans une portion notable de la population cultivée de la France du Nord, nous avons voulu préparer un classement méthodique des différences de prononciation existant en français, classement qui est tout à fait impossible dans l'état actuel de nos connaissances. Quelque incomplet que soit notre travail à ce point de vue, nous avons cru utile de réunir dans une liste (pages 315–317) les principales classes de divergences observées, tant de celles qui sont indiquées dans le Dictionnaire à leur place alphabétique, que de celles qui sont laissées de côté."

The pronunciation of one of the authors, that of Paul Passy, a Parisian by birth and residence, seemed to be the safest norm, and the most suitable starting-point, for the classification of all the variations noted in the book, either in the dictionary itself and in the list of the principal classes of differences of pronunciation (pp. 315–317, in the Appendix), or in the list alone. The authors compared Paul Passy's pronunciation, in the first place, with that of persons whose linguistic habits they knew thoroughly, and could study carefully, without any difficulty, in daily intercourse: Jean Passy, Paul Passy's brother, and Miss G. Paul and Miss A. Halter, students of the École des Hautes-Études at Paris. They then recorded all the diverging forms observed in this work of systematic comparison. Finally, they collected a pretty large number of forms the existence of which seemed to be well warranted in the pronunciation of several other natives of Northern France. However, forms that differed too much from the standard adopted as normal were left out of account (*Avant-propos*, p. x).

The list, in the Appendix, pp. 315–317 (*Liste des principales classes de divergences de prononciation, rapportées à la prononciation de Paul Passy comme norme*), is highly interesting. The first part contains ten classes of variations *indicated in the dictionary* and found, as it would seem, in the pronunciation of Paul Passy's brother and friends and, certainly, also in that of other persons in his nearest environment; for instance, suppression of j after ɛ, wa (a, ɑ, misprint?) 'ze pɛ' instead of 'zə pɛ:j,' *je paye*, 'il abwa' instead of 'il abwa:j,' *il aboie*. Only the fifth class is expressly designated as a neologism of Eastern France, and is undoubtedly opposed to the linguistic habits of the majority of educated Parisians. It is lengthening of every vowel followed by a final vocalic plosive: 'va:g' instead of 'vag', *vague*, 'ku:d' instead of 'kud', *coude*, 'rɔ:b' instead of 'rɔb', *robe*, '—a:bl' instead of '—abl', *—able*, '—i:bl' instead of '—ibl', *—ible*, '—y:d' instead of '—yd', *—ude*. This usage apparently prevails in the East, but I do not think that it is a peculiarity confined to Eastern France.

In the second part of the list there are twenty-one classes of variations *left out in the dictionary*. They do not relate only to individual or local pronunciation in the North of France, but concern, in many cases, the pronunciation of French Switzerland, French Belgium, and the South of France. This is, evidently, at variance with the original plan and method of the work as expounded by the authors in the introduction, p. x (see above). I surely have no objection to, and am very much pleased with, the valuable information contained in the second part of the list. But I think it would have been more consistent if Michaelis and Paul Passy had considered and frankly declared, from the beginning, cultivated Parisian speech, pure and simple, as the standard of their dictionary, and then treated perfectly alike all the important phonetic variations in the speech of educated people in Southern as well as Northern France, and in the French districts of Belgium and Switzerland. Indeed, we easily perceive that the authors have acted according to this principle, if we closely examine their method. The real standard of the dictionary is not Northern

French in general, but Parisian French, that is, the language spoken in the capital and its nearest neighborhood. It is based upon the individual pronunciation of one of the authors, a Parisian himself, compared with that of Jean Passy, Miss G. Paul and Miss A. Halter, who, likewise, are all Parisians. No doubt, the standard would have been altered considerably, if the authors had consulted, as secondary authorities, with, or instead of the three Parisians, some individuals belonging to the educated classes, but living far from the capital in distant *départements* of Northern France. Moreover, the pronunciation used in good society, outside of Paris, everywhere in France, North and South, in French Belgium and in French Switzerland, is nothing but Parisian pronunciation, transmitted through school instruction and social intercourse, more or less perfectly imitated, and modified in a lesser or higher degree by the influence of the popular dialects of the different regions. In this sense, the French spoken in certain parts of Northern France, Picardy, Normandy, and, to be sure, Brittany, is by no means nearer to the standard really observed in the dictionary than the language spoken in many places outside of Northern France, even beyond the political frontier, for instance at Geneva, where the population enjoys, and has been enjoying for generations, an excellent and very effective school instruction.

P. 316. Variation 1: Nivellement de toutes les différences de durée [Midi].—As a general statement, it is a very good remark.

Variation 6: ɔ pour o final: 'sɔ' (*sot*), 'mɔ' (*mot*), pour 'so', 'mo'. [Archaïsme: Suisse, Lorraine].—I would add Belgium.

Variation 7: "e pour ɛ final: 'bale' (*balai*), 'vale' (*valet*), 'mɔve' (*mauvais*) pour 'balɛ', 'valɛ', 'mɔvɛ' [Néologisme: Paris].—Close e instead of open ɛ, at the end of words, may be a neologism for Paris, but is the usual, old-fashioned pronunciation in the South.

P. 317. Variation 14: Dévocalisation des liquides m, l, r et des semi-voyelles j, ɥ, w après les consonnes soufflées: 'prism' (*prisme*), 'pœpl' (*peuple*), 'katr' (*quatre*), 'pje' (*pied*), 'kɥi' (*cuit*), 'twa' (*toi*)."—The liquids l and r are often devocalized also after voiced consonants: *tab*le, *capab*le, *fab*le, *meub*le, *seig*le, *cib*le; *cuiv*re, *sab*re, *plaiud*re. The complete devocalization of the liquids takes place only at the end of words.

Variation 16: Suppression des liquides finales: 'pris' (*prisme*), 'poep' (*peuple*), 'kat' (*quatre*), 'lit' (*litre*) pour 'prism,' 'poepl,' 'katr,' 'litr.'—The liquids l and r, at the end of words, often disappear entirely also after voiced consonants (cf. Variation 14): *tab*le, etc.; *cuiv*re, etc.

Variation 18: Consonne nasale prononcée . . . . . à la fin des mots après voyelle nasalisée: 'pɛ̃ñ' pour 'pɛ̃' (*pain*). [Archaïsme: Midi.]—'pɛ̃ɳ,' not 'pɛ̃ñ,' misprint.

A. Rambeau.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### *SCHILLER AND GOETHE.*

To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes,

Sirs: The correspondence[1] between Schiller and Goethe, being both a mine of literary information and a source of inspiration to the reader, is educational as well as instructive in the highest degree, but its voluminousness debars it from being used in the class-room. It was, therefore, a felicitous idea to edit a small volume of selections. From the nine hundred and ninety-nine letters of which the entire correspondence consists, Dr. Robertson has selected eighty-six. It is safe to say that his choice is a very judicious one, inasmuch as it leaves out all that is devoid of general interest, without ceasing to be representative of the spirit and character of the original collection. Perhaps the only letters that will be missed are those bearing on epic and dramatic poetry, of which only the first, namely that of April 19, 1797, has been given.

The author's Introduction to the text abounds in reliable information and is much to the point; the Notes are scholarly and leave no obscurity, no allusion in the text unexplained. Dr. Robertson's book deserves a cordial welcome as a valuable contribution to the means of instruction in German classical literature.

H. C. O. Huss.

*Princeton University.*

1 *Selections from the Correspondence between Schiller and Goethe*, edited with Introduction and Notes by John G. Robertson, M. A., B. Sc., Ph. D., Lector in the University of Strassburg. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1898.

## *THE OLD ENGLISH āgniden.*

To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes,

Sirs:—One of the puzzles of glossography is the Erfurt gloss *detriturigine agnidinne*. The lemma is a strange noun, and the Old English explanation is a nonce word. It is well, therefore, that Mr. Sweet marked as questionable the entry in his dictionary *āgniden(n)* f. rubbing. Now, it is noteworthy that the Harl. MS. 3376 offers this reading of the gloss: *detritu rugine agnidene* (WW. 220, 24). Since *a* and *u* are so often confounded, *u*, moreover, not seldom appears for *uu*, just as *g* does duty for *ig*, the Latin lemma may easily be read *detrita ruuigine=detrita rubigine*. Then, I suggest, *agnidene* stands for *agnidēne=agnidenre* and was meant to translate *detrita* only. The reference is, if I mistake not, to *Orosius* vii, 25, 9–10 *a quo arrogantissime exceptus, ita ut per aliquot milia passuum purpuratus ante uehiculum eius cucurrisse referatur, uerumtamen hac contumelia quasi cote ad uirtutem usus est, per quam detrita regii fastus robigine aciem mentis expediit.* This same passage is probably also the source of the Epinal gloss *adrogantissime uulanclicae=* Corpus *wlonclice*, though the *adrogantissime* of vii, 35, 22 might be equally well claimed for it.

Otto B. Schlutter.

*Hartford, Conn.*

## BRIEF MENTION.

A work of great interest to students of French dialects has just come from the publishing house of H. Welter in Paris. It is a *Glossaire des parlers du Bas-Maine*, edited by Georges Dottin, Professeur-adjoint à l'Université de Rennes. Prof. Dottin is already known as a Celtic scholar and as the author of a learned thesis on *les Désinences verbales en R en sanscrit, en italique et en celtique;* he has in preparation a short grammar of Old French. The *Glossaire* was begun in 1866 by the recently organized Société d'archéologie, sciences, arts et belles-lettres de la Mayenne, in competition for a prize of fifteen hundred francs, offered by the Ministry of Public Instruction for the best dictionary of a French dialect. The leading spirit in the enterprise was Jules Le Fizelier. In 1869, when the prize was awarded, the collection of the Société was far from complete; and in 1883 Le Fizelier died, leaving the glossary unfinished. Two years later the Commission historique et archéologique, which had taken the place of the older Société, resumed the work for a while. Finally, in 1894, after an interval of many years, the material, together with five other large collections, was put into the hands of M. Dottin. The new editor, who brought to his task not only untiring industry and the soundest philological training, but also a personal knowledge of the dialect group in question, carried the undertaking in five years to a successful issue. The result is a handsome volume of eight hundred and thirty pages, easy to consult, and strictly scientific in method. The phonetic notation is that of Rousselot. Two texts—a real dialogue and an interesting *conte* called *la Bête de Milvain*—illustrate the speech of two localities. About a hundred pages are devoted to a thorough study of the pronunciation and grammar.

Wordsworthians who are not so fortunate as to have access to the 1798 edition of *Lyrical Ballads* will always turn with pleasure to Prof. Dowden's reprint of 1890, which with its yellowed paper and old-faced type is a very counterfeit presentment of the original; but serious students of the epoch-making little volume will welcome this new reprint,[1] enriched as it is by what M. Émile Legouis calls Mr. Hutchinson's "perhaps unrivalled knowledge of all matters relating to Wordsworth's life and poetry."

The text is in no sense a facsimile, but the introduction contains the history of the composition, publication, and reception of *Lyrical Ballads*, together with a sketch of Wordsworth's poetical and political development down to 1798. In the notes are found not only the textual variations of succeeding editions, but a store of critical and illustrative matter the more interesting for its brisk, entertaining style. Three poems written in 1798, though not published until later, are found in an appendix, and a full bibliographical note increases the value of the volume.

1 *Lyrical Ballads* / By William Wordsworth / and S. T. Coleridge / 1798 / edited with certain poems of 1798 / and an introduction / by Thomas Hutchinson. London, Duckworth & Co., 1898.

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

**Baltimore, November, 1899.**

## *CONCERNING SIDNEY LANIER.*

SIDNEY LANIER lived from 1842 until 1881, thirty-nine years,—one less than Poe. He published several volumes: a novel, *Tiger-Lilies*, 1867; a guide to *Florida*, 1876 and, revised, 1881; Boys' editions of *Froissart*, 1878; *King Arthur*, 1880; and the *Mabinogion*, 1881; lectures on *The Science of English Verse*, 1880; and a volume containing eleven *Poems*, 1877.

Another volume, *The Boys' Percy*, 1882, which had been prepared for the press, was issued after his death, along with two others made ready by his wife and his friends: lectures on *The English Novel*, 1883 and, revised, 1897, and *Poems of Sidney Lanier*, 1884, second edition 1891. A number of hitherto unpublished articles were also printed in the magazines.

By 1888 some fifty notices and appreciations of Lanier's life and writings had appeared, and in 1895 Prof. Morgan Calloway, of the University of Texas, compiled for his *Select Poems of Lanier*, a bibliography of one hundred and fifty criticisms and tributes. By that time also a dozen or more detached pieces of prose and poetry by Lanier had been issued.

Since then other original, biographical, appreciative, and critical material has appeared.

### ORIGINAL.

What is, perhaps, the most important contribution of the period is still fresh from the press: a volume of collected prose pieces bearing the title of the professorial chair which the poet hoped to have created for him at Johns Hopkins,—*Music and Poetry*.[1]

The book is well named and, although it includes only a small proportion of hitherto unpublished matter, it presents, in attractive and permanent form, a number of pieces of interest for their own sake and for their bearing on Lanier as a man, a poet, and a critic who was constructing a philosophy of formal and substantial beauty in literature and art. Several of the papers are fragmentary, others are unnecessarily detailed, most are poetic and philosophic rather than scientific. But all are penetrative and appreciative, and, for the most part, sound, in spite of their continual dependence upon constructive imagination. In expression they are full of incidental graces.

The earlier portion of the volume, devoted to Music, reviews a number of classical works, deals with certain fundamental requirements in composers, and discusses the nature and function of music in modern life together with present-day means of presenting it to the public. Several of these five papers are examples of Lanier's habit of doing modest tasks thoroughly well. *Two Descirptive Orchestral Works* and *The Maryland Musical Festival* are simply newspaper reports of concerts, with appreciations of the works rendered, and comments upon their composers. But they are so evidently the work of one who loved music and who knew its history and technic, that they are well worth preservation. *The Physics of Music*, in the form of a circumstantial demonstration of the falseness and absurdity of a review by a popular musical critic, is, in reality, one of the most successful of Lanier's attempts, by word and deed, to show the essential wrongness of the "limitation of the artist to ignorant work," the

> "persevering asservation that the artist, be he painter, musician, or other, would be no whit better for an intelligent understanding of those wonderful and beautiful phenomena which occur when his dreams take physical form."

It was once a hope of the poet's to become a lecturer on "The Physics of Music" in a conservatory of music.

Of the other papers on music, *The Orchestra of To-day*[2] is a most successful

> "plain and untechnical account, for non-musical readers, of the nature of orchestral instruments and the work of their players."

The philosophic discussion, *From Bacon to Beethoven*,[3] reaches, by an interesting course of reasoning, the conclusion that "music is the characteristic art form of the modern time," and may, perhaps, become "the church of the

1 New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1898. Reviewed in *The Critic*, April, 1899, pp. 365 f.

2 Reprinted from *Scribner's Monthly* for April, 1880.

3 First published anonymously in *Lippincott's Magazine*, for May, 1888.

future wherein all creeds will unite like the tones in a chord." It is interesting to compare this last suggestion with Emerson's statement, in his *Essay on Worship*, that

"The religion which is to guide and fulfil the the present and coming ages, whatever else it be, must be intellectual. The scientific mind must have a faith which is science."

Half way between the Music and the Poetry in the volume, stands *The Centenial Cantata*, an interesting and valuable chapter, being Lanier's letter to the *New York Tribune*, in May, 1876, when his *Cantata* was subjected to such widespread criticism. The paper gives a detailed explanation of the poem as

"a faithful attempt to embody the status of poetry with regard to the most advanced musical thought of the time, made upon carefully envolved laws and with artistic purpose."

In the second portion of the volume, *Paul H. Hayne's Poetry*,[4] is a personal and critical estimate of that poet's *Lyrics and Legends* of 1872. After taking exception to Hayne's praise and practice of certain poetic methods of William Morris's, and after pointing out numerous faults of tone and frequent lapses into the commonplace and diffuse, Lanier administers generous praise, finding the poems characteristically full of grace, rythm, and melody, and possessed of true feeling. This tribute of Lanier's to Hayne, recalls a similar service done by Hayne to Timrod, whose poems he edited and published in 1873, shortly before Hayne himself was aided to a New England publisher by the kindly offices of Oliver Wendell Holmes. Lanier's review is inreresting, too, in the light of Hayne's poems upon Lanier, and of his later publication of some of Lanier's correspondence.[5]

The essay on *Nature-Metaphors*[6] is a companion piece to *From Bacon to Beethoven*. It aims to show that the great use of the nature metaphor in modern, as contrasted with older literatures, is an evidence of man's growing realization of the unity of his spirit with the realities behind the phenomena of nature. In similar mood is a fragment from an unfinished lecture on *The Relations of Poetry and Science*,[7] giving, from the *Acta Sanctorum*, the somewhat unfamiliar 'Legend of Saint Leonor' of Brittany. This was presented as an illustration of the poetically conceived and expressed central thought of the lecture:

"The scientific man is merely the minister of poetry. He is cutting down the Western woods of Time; presently poetry will come and make a city and gardens."

The most considerable essay on the volume is *Chaucer and Shakspere*,[8] the introduction to an unfinished text-book for the study of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, in connection with Chaucer's *Knight's Tale; Hamlet*, with *The Pardoner's Tale*, and *The Tempest* with *The Clerk's Tale;* these pieces being chosen as "representative of three great Phases or Periods through which every healthy man's growth naturally passes." A justification of the choice of plays by a study of their moral views, the dates of their composition, and their artistic structure, occupies the first two parts ot the paper.

*A Midsummer Night's Dream* is said to embody the mental attitude of youth, the "Dream Period" of life. *Hamlet* has that realization of human problems which comes with manhood, life's "Real Period." In *The Tempest* man is master of the universe; he has emerged from struggle into triumph, into his "Ideal Period." The plays are further held to be representative of three corresponding periods in the life of Shakspere. His "Dream Period," about 1590 to 1602, produced the Comedies and the Historical Plays, except Henry VIII. His "Real Period," about 1602 to 1608, produced the Tragedies. And his "Ideal Period," about 1608 to 1613, produced the "Forgiveness and Reconciliation Plays," including Henry VIII.

By way of certain favorite theories of verse tones and rhythms, the author then formulates a "Regular System" of verse, which uses rimed and end-stop lines with strong and single endings, as contrasted with an "Irregular System," employing many unrimed run-on lines with weak and double endings (he does not consider the cæsura in the 'System'). The plays studied are shown to develop in usage

4 Originally published in *The Southern Magazine*, in 1874.

5 *A Poet's Letters to a Friend* in *The Critic*, for February 13 and 20, 1886.

6 Reprinted from the *Southern Magazine*, for February, 1872.

7 Reprinted from *The Independent*, in 1885.

8 Partly published in *The Independent*, in September, 1891.

from the "Regular" toward the "Irregular System," that is, toward increased freedom and power. The "Rhythmic Accent Test" from *The Science of English Verse*, and tests of speech figure and play construction are suggested as indicating the same development. (This statement concerning play construction is questionable.) These being the premises, the reasoning leads to the conclusion that "a great artist, in growing, grows as a whole, and not by parts nor into monstrosities; as he grows 1, in his years (historically), he grows 2, in his grasp of the facts of Life (morally), and 3, in his grasp of the facts of Art (in Shakspere's case, 'metrically' though this is a poor term)."

The plays having been thus distinguished, then are shown to be also inter-related in their views of man in his relations to Nature, to his Fellow-man, and to Art, the inter-relation exisitng

"of course by no intent, but solely through the wholeness of Shakspere's life. Given a play to write, he wrote it from the deepest of his *then* state of mind. Thus every play not only beats like the bosom of a human being, but beats with the rate of rhythm belonging to the stage of growth at which it was written."

Thus Lanier expressed his faith in constructive methods of Shakspere biography, not unlike those employed by Professor Brandes in his recent volumes.

The relations between the plays discussed and the three chosen portions of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, were to be brought out fully in the notes to the text. The third part of the introduction merely indicates the historic and logical relation between *The Knight's Tale* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, and the none too definite connection in plot between *The Pardoner's Tale* and *Hamlet*, and *The Clerk's Tale* and *The Tempest*.

Almost none of the facts of this paper are new to scholars. But Lanier's mind was always a solvent which gave back the material with which it was saturated, crystalized in new and attractive forms. Instead of writing, as too many scholars do, in a way that makes them unreadable by modest students, Lanier gathered and prepared his material for students, as too few teachers do, in a way that commands the respect of scholars.

The remaining three of the seven papers upon Poetry are, apparently, printed now for the first time. They are at least not mentioned in Dr. Calloway's bibliography. No hint of the history of any of the essays is given in the volume itself.

*A Forgotten English Poet* is the title of a lecture or review concerning Bartholomew Griffin's book of sonnets to *Fidessa* (1596), preserved in a unique copy in the Bodleian library, and made accessable, in limited editions, by Dr. Phillip Bliss, and Dr. Grosart. Nothing is known of the poet's history, but Lanier's studies of his sixty-two sonnets,—he quotes eight of them as examples—show them to be excellent in thought and structure. They range from lively and humorous trifling, to simple, direct, and sincere expressions of sympathy with nature, or of strong and deep feeling, and are by no means unworthy of the comparison made with sonnets of Sidney, Daniel, and Drummond. Had Lanier, however, been a trifle less hard upon the

"pottering antiquarians in whom all sense of pure beauty has long ago decayed, only to be replaced by a heartless desire to find what some one else has not found, without reference to any intrinsic value in the fact discovered,"

he might have classed Griffin's sonnet *Care-Charmer Sleep*, not as so strikingly original, but merely as one of the many imitations of Daniel's famous sleep-sonnet *To Delia*.

*John Barbour's Bruce* consists of some five hundred lines concering King Robert, well selected from Barbour's more than thirteen thousand, and presented with a picturesque interlinear translation, a brief introduction, and a few notes for young readers. The whole is conceived and executed in the spirit which prompted Lanier's edition of world stories for the young.[9]

The introduction to the paper, *The Death of Byrhtnoth* (The Battle of Maldon), *A Study in Anglo-Saxon Poetry*, written in 1878-79, consists of a vigorous arraingnment of our times for weakening the native idiom by neglecting the robust mother tongue. Half a dozen pages of historical preface are added by one whose name has been always intimately associated with kindly deeds and words for the poet and his work. The body of the paper consist of a prose translation of two hundred

9 His editions of *Froissart*;, *King Arthur*, *Mabinogion*, and *Percy*, for boys.

of the three hundred and twenty-five lines of the poem, one-half (ll. 1–104) for the sake of showing the rhythm, and the other portion (ll. 105–184, 312–325) to exhibit the peculiar idioms and the use and grouping of words and clauses. The translations are very literal, being nearly always word for word, in the order of the original. They are more vigorous and picturesque than either the abstract of the piece by ten Brink,[10] or the complete translation by Garnett,[11] and admirably adapted, as Lanier designed them to be, to introduce the general reader to Anglo-Saxon thought and expression. One can scarcely refrain from quoting the splendid rendering of the familiar speech of Byrhtnoth (*Byrhtnoð maþelode, bord hafenode* ll. 42 ff.), and that one of old Byrhtwold (l 312 ff.) which begins "Soul be the scornfuller, heart be the bolder, front be the firmer, the fewer we grow."

On the whole, it will be evident that the volume *Music and Poetry* does not embody 'contributions to learning,' in the technical sense of the term. It offers, rather, estimates of classic works and their producers, discussions concerning music, poetry, nature, and science, in their relation to one another and to the life of man, and means for making them more easily accessible and intelligible to the people at large. No new views of Lanier's life and work are suggested by the volume, but it confirms the previous conception that in him the world lost a wise and useful prose writer, an essayist as well as a poet. It is to be hoped that other of his prose pieces, such as *Moral Purpose in Art*, and his numerous papers concerning the South, may also be collected.[12] *Scribner's Magazine* has announced the early publication of a series of his musical impressions.

BIOGRAPHY.

New and important biographical material was brought forward when, in 1894, Mr. Wm. R. Thayer, long an admirer of Lanier's, published, with appreciative comment, a series of some twenty letters written by the poet between 1875 and 1880, to Mr. W. Gibson Peacock,[13] the then Editor of the Philadelphia *Evening Bulletin*.

"A series of letters in which Lanier tells his own story, and which furnishes the public, for the first time, with intimate glimpses of him during the most important years of his life."

The letters are of interest and value in many ways. They reveal the growth of such poems as *The Symphony*, the *Centennial Cantata*, *Clover*, *Beethoven*, *Wagner*, and *Hard Times in Elfland*, from the time the poet was "taken with them," until their publication. They relate the early and rapid popularity of *Corn*, and tell how the *Psalm of the West* brought a return of $300, *The Waving of the Corn* of but $15, *Evening Song* of only $10. They recount the collection and employment of the material embodied in *Florida*, the *Sketches of India*, in the numerous essays and the twenty-four popular lectures on Shakspere, in *The Boys Froissart*, *The Science of English Verse*, and *The English Novel*.

They contain also many intimate details of the physical, financial, and critical "opposition" the poet encountered when he entered the conflict of the world, "armed only with some dozens of steel pens."

There is whimsical, as well as melancholy, interest in the fact that as George Eliot needed the continent while England was necessary for Mr. Lewes, just so the health of Mrs. Lanier required Northern rigor, while that of her husband demanded Southern warmth.

The story is brightened by some of the warm and enthusiastic friendships the poet continually stimulated; those, for example, with Charlotte Cushman and Bayard Taylor. And that wife and children, nature and music brought more joy to Lanier than to many is a trite saying. The letters, too, are strangely full of charming brightness, cheery humor, and high spirits. Their language is so strikingly like the diction of the poems, that the real naturalness of the latter is proved as forcibly as when Dr. Weir Mitchell proved the naturalness of Shakspere's conversations by

10 *English Literature*, Book I, Ch., VIII.; pp 93 ff. of Kennedy's 1883, English translation.

11. Boston, 1889.

12 Since the completion of this article Charles Scribner's Sons have issued some of these papers in a volume entitled *Retrospects and Prospects*. By Sidney Lanier, 1899. They have also issued, since the completion of this article, *Letters of Sidney Lanier, 1866–1884*, and *Bob: the Story of Our Mocking-Bird*. By Sidney Lanier, 1899.

13 *Atlantic Monthly* 74: 14–28, 181–193, July, August, 1894. Apparently too late for use by Dr. Calloway, although included in his bibliography.

citing certain of Queen Elizabeth's familiar letters.

Clifford Lanier has also told, though with little charm in the telling, some new facts in the life of his brother.

The most interesting of his "Reminiscences of Sidney Lanier"[14] relate to the ancestry, parentage, birthplace, surroundings, and games, of the boy; to the youth's love of nature, and music, and books; and to the budding poet as student, tutor, and author of early and unpreserved poetic efforts.

Here again are evidenced the amiable characteristics of the poet, his love of humor, his enjoyment of sensations, his realization of life, and his intensity of spirit.

As biographical contributions might be classed poetical tributes such as Father Tabb's *To Lanier's Flute*,[15] Miss Rich's *Quatrain*,[16] and Dr. O'Malley's *Sonnet*.[17]

One might group, also, as prose tributes, a recent lecture by Bishop Vincent,[18] and papers by Professor Calloway,[19] Miss Goodwin,[20] and Dr. Ward.[21]

The honor of writing the first sketch of Lanier which comes near to deserve the title of a biography, belongs to Professor W. M. Baskervill of Vanderbilt University.

His knowledge and insight make the *Sidney Lanier* in his *Southern Winter's Series*[22] a really splendid study. The poet has not been saved from sentimental and ignorant champions. Here is a friend who is sympathetic, wise, and manly. In style the study is so clear, natural, easy, and charming, that it recalls Mr. Whistler's dictum: "The work of the master reeks not of the sweat of the brow and suggests no effort."

14 *The Chautauquan* 21: 403–409, July 18, 1895.

15 *The Independent*, February 7, 1895.

16 *The Dial*, 22: 43, January 16, 1897.

17 *The Catholic World*, 64: 789. March, 1897.

18 See *The Chautauquan*, August 12, 1895. *A Layman's Study of Lanier.* Unpublished.

19 *The Poetry of Sidney Lanier. Methodist Review, South.* November–December, 1895: 147–157.

20 *Two Singers of Sunrise. Poet-Lore*, 9: 407–410, July, 1897.

21 *Four Poems of Sidney Lanier's. The Independent*, 49: 933, July 22, 1897.

22 October–December, 1896, Numbers 4, 5, 6. Barbee and Smith, Nashville, Tenn., 161 pp.

Professor Baskervill employs practically everything of real biographical value hitherto published, selecting from Dr. Ward's *Memorial*, Dr. Calloway's *Introduction*, Clifford Lanier's *Reminiscences*, the poet's letters to Hayne, and those published by Mr. Thayer. He gathers other facts from Lanier's prose and poetry.

New material of value is drawn from the note-books of the poet in youth and manhood, from sketches for unwritten verses, and from some completed, but hitherto unpublished, poems. Letters written by the poet,—one of especial interest as showing many uncompleted plans for prose and poetry—letters written by the poet's wife and brother, and reminiscences of friends are employed for the first time. It is interesting to be able to add to the comments on the poet's appearance by Mr. Hamerick, published by Dr. Ward, and by the poet himself, published by Mr. Thayer, the words of Mr. Stedman and of Mrs. Lanier.

The poet's life is epitomized in a paragraph:

"The artist in him was cabined, cribbed, confined and bound in a life which offered no stimulus to the cultivation of his gift, and but scanty appreciation or sympathy with it."

### Criticism.

Prof. Baskervill begins his criticism,—which is not an attempt at a final estimate—by stating that the foundation of Lanier's equipment was music. That it was a part of his nature, experience, and habit, expressing itself in his prose, poetry, and conversation is a conclusion drawn from the poet's letters, from unpublished fragments, and from the estimates of musical critics.

In conjunction with this musical nature, a philosophic and scientific attitude of mind was made evident by habits of application, scholarly research, scientific inquiry, and inventive faculty. As evidence in support of this statement, Lanier's letters, his lectures, and his prose writings are adduced.

In brief, *The Science of English Verse* is said to have had for its origin, conviction and reasoning which led to the belief that each art has its peculiar science to aid it in its function for the good of man. Prof. Baskervill feels that the poet's latest compositions went far toward exemplifying the value of his theories

of verse, and this, too, in spite of Mr. Stedman's feeling that the theories counseled the impossible.

*The English Novel*[23] is also considered to be an expression of the scientific side of the poet's mind. Prof. Baskervill deduces, from an abstract of the volume, its reasoning that our time shows a growth in the personality of man, coincident with the development of physical science, music, and the novel; and, also, that older forms of expression being inadequate, resulting necessity developed the free and elaborate form of the modern novel. It is, by the way, not quite to the credit of Lanier's critics that discussions of this volume have always been based upon Lanier's announcement of his purpose in the first lecture, and that no one seems to have noticed the manner in which the poet afterward changed his plan when obliged to curtail his work by more than one-third.

Prof. Baskervill employs unpublished fragments and the letters to Hayne to show that Lanier felt the influence of science upon poetry to be toward increasing confidence in its substance and toward improving its form.

In religion Lanier, "was neither the agnostic nor the religionist." Art offered him a method of adoring . . . "without the strictures of a creed, . . and without the vacuity of doubt." His belief in the unity of artistic beauty and moral beauty has been familiar since Dr. Ward's *Memorial*. The poet never hesitated to inculate moral lessons by his writing.

An interesting view of the poet as a critic closes Prof. Baskervill's discussion of the prose. More remarkable for penetration and apt characterization than for range of sympathy and unerring judgment, Lanier was often, as in his appreciation of Morris, Shelley, Milton, Tennyson, and Emerson, illuminative, interpretative, and felicitous. Sometimes, as in his estimate of Swinburne, he was less happy. Temperament led him to blame Thackeray and to praise George Eliot both unduly. His trenchant comment on Walt Whitman is generously and discriminatingly praised by Prof. Baskervill.

23 The revised edition of 1897 still continues such misprints as 1820, instead of 1819 for George Eliot's birth year, and Miss Henschel for Miss Hennell, George Eliot's friend.

"A man who, with pulmonary disease upon him, could still keep in his saddle as a soldier, could feel but little sympathy with one who, with a superb physique, preferred to serve in the hospital,—honorable though that service might be for the feebly-bodied."

It is a contrast, strange from several points of view, that Lanier's poetry drew so little from the civil war while Whitman's drew so much.

In the poems Prof. Baskervill, applying, for the first time in their study, the historical method, discerns evidences of three stages of development.

Up to 1874 music was Lanier's most natural mode of expression and the poems written before that year usually lack ease and spontaneity. They are often rigid, labored, and overwrought. Even the best of them are constrained.

After the poet removed to Baltimore (in December, 1873) he rapidly attained greater mastery in conception and expression. The poems still evidence effort and the imitation of other poets. But they also grow genuine, original, and individual. They are simpler and more spontaneous, fuller of fancy and imagination. They begin to insist on the poet's favorite themes of duty and sympathy.

The third period produced Lanier's most distinctive poems. Written according to the poet's own theories of verse, they have melody, strength, and personal flavor. They give the most complete expression to his ideas of poetry, art, and life, of nature and man, of right and wrong, of faith and worship. Their merit is yet unequal, their peculiarities are still marked, but

"nevertheless distinctive, and they are poetry, surely the rarest product of English and American literature during the last quarter of a century."

It will be seen that Prof. Baskervill has grown in faith since he wrote of Lanier in 1895.[24]

"Limited, then, as I believe he is, in regard to simplicity, to spontaneity, to individuality, to passion and to perfection, he cannot be called indisputably a great poet, though he does possess decided originality and a real poet's endowments."

The division thus into periods of Lanier's

24 *Dial*, 18: 299 f. May 16, 1895.

poetic development is full of interest and suggestion. It is almost as full of inaccuracy.

The poems which are said to represent the first period, that of constraint, were, it is true, all written in one of the earliest years, 1868. But those selected to represent the second period, that of emancipation, and the third, that of freedom, were produced during exactly the same years, those from 1874 to 1880. And the most,—indeed the only—regular pieces of the last period were produced not before the formulation of Lanier's characteristic theories in *The Science of English Verse*, but after it.

As a matter of fact, as many poems in Lanier's peculiar manner were written in the earlier (1874–1876), as in the latter (1878–1880) years. *Corn* (1874), *The Symphony* (1875), *The Waving of the Corn* (1876), and *The Psalm of the West* (1876), are quite characteristic as *The Marshes of Glynn* (1878), *The Song of the Future* (1878), *Owl Against Robin* (1880), and *Sunrise* (1880). *Clover* (1876) and *The Crystal* (1880), both characteristic, might have been written side by side.

One is forced to hold towards Prof. Baskervill's periods, the attitude of Plato's Socrates: "The wise and doubtful."[25]

The best of brief articles on Lanier, is Prof. Richard Burton's compact critical summary in Mr. Warner's recent compendium of *The World's Best Literature*.[26]

Prof. Burton makes immediate confession of faith in the widening of Lanier's influence into the general realization of his value as

> "the most important native singer the Southern United States has produced, and one of the most distinctive and lovely of American singers wherever born."

A short narrative of the poet's early life, of his ideals of art, and of his consecration to it, is followed by a concise account of his literary career, comments on his prose work, and brief critical estimates of *The Science of English Verse* and *The English Novel*.

Of the poetry the technical values are first exploited: its glow and color, exuberance of imagination and rhythmical sweep; its artistic effect in words, metres, and rimes; its alliteration and tone color; its display of new powers of word use and of new possibilities of metrical and stanzaic arrangement; its union of music and poetry into real songs.

The essential traits of the poetry are felt to be due to the poet's ethical earnestness and subtle spirituality, his fine culture and sane imagination, his zest for facts and moderness of conception, his breadth and independence of thought. All made him an intellectual forerunner, an advanced thinker on vital themes of human life.

These characteristics, when expressed in short and simple pieces, breathe worship, soul triumph over flesh, knightly devotion to woman-kind, and ideal relations of word and deed. The larger, more broadly conceived pieces decry the narrow standards of trade, exalt Americanism, and glorify the Christ. The poet's expressed attitude toward nature is that of a passionate lover, a pantheist feeling God in everything, a loving observer transmuting his material with ideality. His poetic life is felt to culminate in *Sunrise* and *The Marshes of Glynn*.

The limitations of the poetry are seen to be the occasional sacrifice of clearness to the full tide of utterance, the surplusage of fancy running into the arabesque, and the extreme use of the poet's theories of the inter-relations of music and poetry.

The conclusion expresses the now general feeling that longer life would have brought to the poet a richer and more self-expressive message, but that, as it is, he is to be recognized as a poet of distinction in quality and accomplishment, and a remarkable illustration of the union of high character and artistic production in harmony therewith.[27]

It is Th. Bentzon,—Madame Blanc—who, having failed to find a poet for his sponsor, first presents Lanier to French and to Continental literary society. She has based upon material gathered while in America, a study

25 The nameless "reviewer" in *The Critic* (31: 45, July 24, 1897) who writes around instead of about Prof. Baskervill's book, is the instrument of retributive justice against him for "reviewing" Prof. Calloway's book in the same way. (*The Dial*, 18: 299 f. May 16, 1895.)

26 New York, 1897. Volume 15, pp. 8891 ff.

27 Selected to follow the essay, as most characteristic of the poet's work, are: *A Ballad of Trees and the Master*, *The Song of the Chattahoochee*, *Tampa Robins*, part of *The Marshes of Glynn*, *From the Flats*, *A Song of the Future* and *The Stirrup Cup*.

of Lanier in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*,[28] which contains much of interest and profit to "the American public, still less influenced by artistic literature than was France twenty years ago." The value of the essay is in its freshness of manner and its point of view.

Its testimony concerning Lanier's theories of poetry is merely hearsay evidence. But that concerning his practice of the art is direct and forcible. To Mme Blanc the poems are

"a succession of melodies, melodies suggestive, delicate, exquisitely colored, and, too, with certain mannerisms which uphold the comparison which has been made between Lanier and Beethoven. They allure, they fascinate; indeed, I do not believe that any one has ever made better choice of words which call up visions of nature, which are in themselves music, color, perfume."

"M. Stéphane Mallarmé has surely had a precursor in America, and so has Verlaine, and all those who write in verse symphonies, variations, romances without words, melodies, scales. Sidney Lanier was one of the first inventors of this art of rhythm and syllable, which partakes of the two arts at once."

Mme Blanc's words upon Lanier as a critic, turn aside from the usual, after praising his delicacy, penetration, and clearness. Then she well says, concerning the poet's oft-quoted comment upon Poe's lack of knowledge,

"Lanier forgot that, for a great poet, intuition alone suffices. If Poe did not, as he did, care for exact and scientific truth,—nor for any truth indeed, preferring, as he said himself, pleasure—he at least divined what he did not know, and life instructed him far better than books . . . such richness of imagination is lacking to Lanier; that is why he so devoted himself to learning."

Being herself a critic, Mme Blanc is discriminating as well as generous. She is also frank, *Tiger Lillies* was "too prematurely written and is bad on the whole." *The Psalm of the West* is an "interminable chant for which Lanier forced his voice, elevating it to epic pitch, but falling at the same time down to the tedious." But *The Marshes of Glynn* and *The Song of the Chattahoochee* are as good as the others are bad. They are translated in part by Mme Blanc as some of the other poems are in their entirety. *Sunrise*, which is given in translation, shows

"unequal inspiration, without doubt, unconnected variations upon a wavering theme, and has here and there a trace of incoherence; but what amplitude! What precision also, often, in the images! How one recognizes the attentive and scrupulous observer of nature! And this, without speaking of that which one cannot render; the intrinsic beauty of words, which the most skilled setters of jewels of this sort,—and we still have them, of the first order,—might well envy."

In general, Lanier appears rather the Cavalier than the Roundhead. He is one whose creed is a "Christian pantheism," detached from theology, and undogmatic. Mme Blanc returns more than once to praise his choice of words. As a Frenchwoman, she finds his expressions of love abnormally subtle and delicate. As a French critic she sees a fault in his didactic purpose.

Concluding, she writes,

"Sidney Lanier attains often to the height of the great American poets, and, like Walt Whitman, he is much more the poet in the absolute sense of vision, divination, and invention, than are some stars which are reputed to be of the first rank. The difference is that their genius burned with a fixed and unstrained brilliance, while his gave only intermittent light. At the moment when he flies highest, one might say, an arrow suddenly arrests his movement and causes him to fall wounded. It is, indeed, just like the disease which attacked him. One knows what a struggle it fought against the power of his spirit, and nothing is so pathetic as this fall of Icarus. But there remains a diamond shower of beautiful verses, of images grandiose and gracious, of happy expressions which compose the most exquisite of anthologies."

In fine, Lanier is

"the discoverer who dies in reaching new regions. Others, after him, will explore the land of which he had only a glimpse. They will escape the perils of discovery and substitute, perhaps, their glory for his, as Americus did for Columbus."

And thus Mme Blanc closes her study of Sidney Lanier, as William Sharp closed a recent essay upon Maurice Maeterlink, also a poet who caused the critics wonder and received excessive praise and blame, because he also was a pioneer.

Prof. Baskervill has aimed to study the development of Lanier's work, Prof. Burton to estimate it as a whole, Mme Blanc to fit it into its place in literature.

28 Volume 145, pp. 307-341, January 1898. The article is abstracted, not badly, in *The Literary Digest*, 16: 12, March, 19, 1898.

THE FUTURE.

As much as the recent publications concerning Lanier have contributed to increase interest, knowledge, and appreciation in the study of his work, many interesting and useful things yet remain to be done.

A real comparison of Lanier, for example, with those American poets he has been so often said to excel, would yield sound and significant results. His celestial "harp that sounds when an all-love sings" is not unlike Longfellow's Æolian lyre rising "from earth unto the fixed stars." Both Longfellow and Bryant belong, along with Lanier, to the multitude of poets who have likened their ladies' eyes to "springs." While the sun appeared to Lanier to "await at the ponderous gate of the West," Bryant perceived how he "hides his light at the doors of the West." Whittier, as well as Lanier, spoke of life as a palimpsest writing. Lanier pictured the tides flooding "the uttermost creeks and the low lying lanes." Lowell saw them "flooding back with a ripply cheer into every bare inlet and creek and bay." Lanier has been compared frequently with Poe and sometimes with Whitman. It would be well to compare him also with Timrod and Hayne.

Whoever makes out, as Dr. Holmes did for Emerson, a list of Lanier's reading, and traces the literary influences upon his work, will do a good service. When Lanier writes how "lips draw back with recent pressure pale, to round and redden for another kiss," one must remember how Shakspere pictured the lips of *Venus and Adonis* "making them red and pale with fresh variety." Before Lanier wrote "Thus clamored his mind to his mind," Keats had written "But to her heart her heart was voluble." Shelley called the stars a cloud of bees before Lanier imaged the sun as a "star-fed Bee." Prosper Mérimée wrote his acquerie before Lanier projected his. The "course of things" appeared "shaped like an ox" as long before Lanier's *Clover* as Goethe's *Werther*, as Norse mythology, and as the *Book of Numbers*. Lenau's "Sedge Songs" are not the only interesting parallel in German literature to some of Lanier's ideas and expressions. Others are to be found in Grillparzer, Schlegel, Fichte, Schiller, and, even, Walther von der Vogelweide. Had not Lanier acknowledged his debt to Omar Khayyam, *The Stirrip Cup* might do it for him. Chaucer, Spenser, Crashaw, Donne, Lovelace, Marlowe, Milton, Pope, Rossetti, George Eliot, and Matthew Arnold, all expressed thoughts which apparently influenced Lanier.

Such, and many other, detailed studies of Lanier are yet to be made. The time is also growing ripe for some large constructive study which shall preserve, group, and employ the numerous and valuable details already accumulated.

CLYDE FURST.

*Columbia University.*

---

## *THE DIMENSIONS OF MALEBOLGE.*

MR. PAGET TOYNBEE, in his valuable *Dictionary of Proper Names and Notable Matters in the Works of Dante* recently issued,[1] gives the following measurements of the divisions of the eighth circle:—breadth of each Bolgia, one-half mile; circumference of Bolgia 10 eleven miles, of Bolgia 9 twenty-two miles, of Bolgia 8 thirty-three miles, of Bolgia 7 forty-four, of Bolgia 6 fifty-five, of Bolgia 5 sixty-six, of Bolgia 4 seventy-seven, of Bolgia 3 eighty-eight, of Bolgia 2 ninety-nine, of Bolgia 1 one hundred and ten; the diameter of Malebolge at its upper rim thirty-five miles. These dimensions Mr. Toynbee has apparently derived from Vernon's computations,[2] who deduces them from the brief statements given by Dante, *Inf.* xxix, 9, and xxx, 86–87. In the first Vergil states that Bolgia 9 is twenty-two miles in circumference.[3] In the second Maestro Adamo affirms that Bolgia 10 is eleven miles in circumference, and has a breadth of half a mile.[4] Assuming that these measurements hold good for all the remaining Bolge, the dimensions given by Vernon and Toynbee may be readily deduced.

But the problem is far from being so simple as it seems at first. A brief mathematical computation suffices to show the incompatibility of the two assumptions. For, if we have two

1 Cf. p. 356.

2 *Readings on the Inferno*, Vol. i, pp. xlvii-xlviii.

3 "miglia ventiduo la valle volge."

4 "Con tutto ch'ella volge undici miglia,
E men d'un mezzo di traverso non ci ha."

concentric circles whose difference in circumference is eleven miles, the difference in length of their respective radii must be, not .5, but 1.75+miles; and this difference would be increased by the slope of the whole circle toward the centre. Or conversely, two circles whose radii differ in length by .5 miles will show a difference in circumference of only 3.149 miles, instead of eleven. The only escape from this dilemma, retaining Vernon's theory, is to assume that the *argini* separating the Bolge have the remarkable breadth of (1.75–.50=) 1.25 miles, and are consequently much wider than the Bolge themselves.

An examination of the passages in which Dante speaks of the transition from one Bolgia to another shows that this assumption is not susceptible of exact proof. Of these the most important is the description in Canto xxiii, describing his and Vergil's escape from the Malebranche of Bolgia 5. The two poets, after beholding from the inner bank of Bolgia 5 the quarrel of the demons, turn away, but are soon[5] pursued. Vergil then (*di subito*) seizes Dante, and, apparently from the spot where they were standing, descends hastily the steep bank of the sixth Bolgia.[6] This would seem to imply that the summit of the Argine dividing Bolge 5 and 6 consisted of a narrow ridge; and the steepness of the sides shows that it could not be much wider at the bottom. I obtain a similar inference from the description in the following canto[7] of the passage from Bolgia 6 to 7. Here, after the laborious climb to the top of the Argine, Dante sits down to rest and is reproved by Vergil. Then, immediately on rising,—"su per lo scoglio prendemmo la via." For passages of like import compare xviii, 100–102; xix, 7–9, 128–133; xxvi, 13–18; xxvii, 133–35; xxix, 37–39, 52–53. From all these indications I infer, although Dante nowhere gives an exact description, that the "argini" are merely narrow dikes of rock, with almost perpendicular sides, which intersect but do not interrupt the "scogli" or bridges.[8] If this inference hold good, then the assumption that each Bolgia at the bottom has a breadth of half a mile must be given up.

Scartazzini[9] assumes from Maestro Adamo's words[10] that the circumference of the Bolge increases in an arithmetical progression;—so Bolgia 10, eleven miles in circumference, Bolgia 9, twenty-two, Bolgia 8, forty-four, etc. This would give to Malebolge a total circumference of 5632 miles, with a radius of 854.4, and a diameter of 1708.8 miles. These startling figures are seen at once to be erroneous when we recall that the time consumed in crossing it is only six to nine hours.[11] Vernon's assumption, on the contrary, is entirely harmonious with the length of the journey, but, as I have pointed out, is not consistent with itself.

The purpose of this article is merely to call the attention of Dante scholars to a somewhat obscure point in the architecture of the *Inferno*, and to the danger of hasty deduction. Can we assume from the dimensions of Bolge 9 and 10 given in xxix, 8–9, and xxx, 86–87, any definite ratio in regard to the measurements of the other Bolge? It seems a somewhat bold assumption, incapable of direct proof; although, as we have seen, Vernon's deduction of a total diameter of 110 miles is perfectly consistent with the time-references. At any rate, the inference that each Bolgia has a breadth of half a mile must be given up. On the other hand, it is possible to deduce certain consistent and definite dimensions for Bolge 9 and 10 and Circle 9 from the statements given. Thus, as Bolgia 9 has a circumference of 22, and Bolgia 10 of 11 miles, the width of Bolgia 9 must be 1.75 miles. Bolgia 10, it is expressly stated, has a width of .5 miles; its total radius, for a circumference of 11, must be 1.75 miles. Then the "pozzo" (=Circle 9 of the *Inferno*) must have a radius of (1.75–.50=) 1.25 miles, and a diameter of 2.5 miles. From these figures we obtain for the circumference of the "cerchio minore, il punto dell'universo," 7.85 miles.

WILLIAM P. SHEPARD.
*Hamilton College.*

5 xxiii, 34–36.

6
E già dal colle della ripa dura
Supin si diede alla pendente roccia
Che l'un dei lati all'altra bolgia tura,
43–45.

7 xxiv, 22–42, 61–63.

8 Note especially the wording in xviii, 100–102:
Già eravam dove lo stretto calle
Con l'argine secondo s'incrocicchia
E fa di quello ad un altr' arco spalle.

## *AN ESTIMATE OF BÉRANGER BY GOETHE.*

### I.

### GOETHE'S ACQUAINTANCE WITH BÉRANGER.

GOETHE, who had always manifested an intense interest in what was going on in France,

9 *Div. Com.*, ed. min., p. 246. 10 xxx, 86–87.
11 Cf. Moore, *Time-References in the Div. Com.*

continued to keep abreast of the events of that country during the last years of his long life. The politics, art and science of France constantly preoccupied him. Above all he pursued with the keenest and liveliest sympathy, the birth, growth and unfolding of the new literature and its struggle with Classicism. The leisure moments snatched from the study of geology, mineralogy, physics, popular Slavic poetry, Chinese literature and what not, he devoted to a close consideration of the French writers. True, he is deeply interested in the contemporary productions of other nations, of England and Italy particularly; however, he is attracted only by a comparatively small number of poets, like Burns, Byron, Scott and Manzoni, who had already acquired a wide reputation. For the younger German writers of the day he has little or no encouragement. To Eckermann he frequently speaks of them even in a disparaging tone. "There is no use helping the young German poets; it will not profit them anyhow." In France, on the other hand, it is the whole movement as such, literary, artistic, scientific, that he steadily pursued. Not one book of any account appears there which we do not find the old Goethe reading and meditating upon. Rising Romanticism with its kindred side-currents, the young phalanx of the Globe, the literary struggle between Classicists and Romanticists, present to him a most interesting spectacle, fully as attractive as the scientific tilt between Cuvier and Geoffrey St.-Hilaire. He looks upon all those young men with approval and manifest sympathy, and would fain see at work in them his own spirit, the influence of his own thought.

Béranger, more than any other poet, attracts Goethe's attention. So highly does he speak of him that some German critics have taken exception to his almost unqualified praise. A strong sympathy draws Goethe towards Béranger. Its manifestations are but fragmentary, mere snatches of conversation, suggestions of the moment, remarks thrown out at haphazard; yet they afford some light on Béranger's character and genius, being, as they are, expressions of Goethe's deep and broad life-experience, of his clear and free thought.

Just when Goethe's acquaintance with Béranger begins cannot be ascertained. It seems even as if he did not learn of him as early as he might have done. At least no mention of him could be traced preceding the year 1823; Goethe's diary leading down to 1822 does not even contain his name. And still, Béranger had achieved fame long before that. In 1813 his witty satire, *le Roi d'Ivetot*, first spread his name beyond the *caveau*. In 1815 appeared his first volume containing songs of love and merriment. The year 1821 brought his second volume which already reveals the entire Béranger; only the humanitarian and cosmopolitan leaning of 1848 are wanting. There we find, besides his love-songs, some of a political, Voltairian and patriotic tendency respectively; and also some of a purely lyric character, the *Chansons Intimes*, songs that go to make up the Béranger of the anthologies. Even then the chansonnier's name is spread broadcast over the land and beyond its boundaries. The government of Louis XVIII, the courts and press, gratuitously advertise his songs throughout Europe, and Béranger, borne by the sympathies of the nation, gaily quits his poor attic-room to spend his three months' term in the comfortable cell of the Sainte-Pélagie. In spite of all that, nothing whatever, in his letters or diary, shows that Goethe, who was interested in everything, knew ought of these occurrences. And although in 1823 he "commented upon and paraphrased some of Béranger's songs, with great originality and good humor,"[1] in 1825, the third volume of songs, exhibiting much the same spirit as the first, appears without any echo in his talks with Eckermann. That was the year Goethe was celebrating, in a splendid jubilee, the fiftieth anniversary of his arrival in Weimar.

It is in 1827 that Goethe is found energetically pursuing the development of French literature. He repeatedly speaks to Eckermann about Béranger; again and again he returns to him down to the last year of his long life. He praises him in his letters to his most intimate friends;[2] he sends them the famous songs;[3] his French vis-

1 *Goethe's Gespräche.* Leipzig, Biedermann, 1889, and *Conversations of Goethe with Eckermann and Soret*, John Oxenford. Unless otherwise designated, the quotations in this essay are taken from the *Gespräche.*

2 *Briefwechsel zwischen Goethe und Zelter*, Berlin, 1834. Goethe an Zelter, March 3, 1827.

3 *Ibid.* Zelter an Goethe, March 14, 1827.

itors he questions most eagerly about Béranger, and likewise his German friends who return from their tour to Paris. "Béranger's inimitable songs are daily in Goethe's thoughts."

In Eckermann, Béranger had found an enthusiastic and devoted friend; to him he is always "the excellent Béranger." Goethe's sympathetic remarks are refracted through the prism of Eckermann's sympathy; they both read him, and manifested for him a most lively interest; they had an intimate knowledge of his songs, with all that love for him that enlightens judgment and imparts to it due tolerance.

## II.

### Béranger's Political Songs.

Goethe repeatedly takes occasion to express his preference for Béranger's love-songs rather than for his political songs, "the pure everlasting truths of nature being superior to mere party sentiment." For poems written in the interest of party, for war songs, and even patriotic songs, the latter necessarily implying hatred, and a desire for the destruction of a foreign nation, even though the ruin constitute a loss to humanity, Goethe never had any great sympathy. During and after the German wars of liberation, he was frequently charged with indifference regarding the fate of his country, with egotism and lack of patriotism.

"Because they cannot touch my talent, they aim at my character. . . . . And, between ourselves, I did not hate the Frenchmen, although I thanked God that we were free from them. How could I, to whom culture and barbarism are alone of importance, hate a nation which is among the most cultivated on earth and to which I myself owe so great a part of my own culture? . . . . Besides, there is a point where national hatred disappears altogether, and one stands to a certain extent above nations, and feels the weal and woe of a neighboring people as keenly as if his own people were concerned."

At times, though, Goethe admits the importance of political songs. War songs, he says, suit Körner perfectly well. He concedes that the latter with Arndt and Rückert had exercised some influence. But he does not dwell on any intrinsic literary value that they might possess. For the political songs of Béranger alone he finds words of approval and even of admiration.

On May 4, 1827, a grand dinner was given at Goethe's, in honor of his guests Ampère and Stapfer. Ampère expatiates on Mérimée, Alfred de Vigny, and other young French writers. Goethe, however, speaks first and last of Béranger. Although his political songs, he says, are inferior to his love songs, Béranger has proved by the former the benefactor of his country. In him, the French had found the very organ of their national misfortunes. It was he who uplifted their courage by the memories of the glorious deeds of the emperor, whose great qualities he adored without, however, desiring a continuance of his despotic sway.

Only shortly before that, between a discourse on what he designates as Peter the Great's blunder in building the new capital, St. Petersburg, in an unhealthy region, and the communication that the fish sent him had arrived in good condition, Goethe had advised his friend Zelter to read Béranger, adding:

"In him you will see in the most evident manner what talent, or rather genius, may achieve, provided it appear at a pregnant moment, and stand up for its convictions regardless of any consequence. Have we ourselves not commenced in much the same manner?"[4]

In 1828 appeared Béranger's fourth volume, in every respect a worthy successor of the preceding ones. That the French government entertained a high opinion of its value and efficacy, was promptly demonstrated by its giving the author hospitality in its prisons for nine months, and imposing upon him a fine of ten thousand francs. In the face of this event, Goethe's change of opinion towards Béranger, "the benefactor of his nation," is remarkable. For, clearly it was not Béranger who had changed, as in this volume he appears the same he had been when Goethe had passed such favorable judgment upon him. But the term of his imprisonment had now been trebled, and the fine imposed upon him multiplied by twenty. Evidently, his merits, if anything, must have increased in proportion. But Goethe, at that moment, is in another mood. True, as then, we find him at table, but this is no grand dinner; no French men of letters are there to talk to him of beautiful Paris, no gaiety, no animated conversation. Instead, he is talking

4 *Briefwechsel zwischen Goethe und Zelter:* Goethe an Zelter, March 3, 1827.

of revolutionary Greece, and old Goethe hates revolutions. Kapodistrias, he points out, is not at all the right man. To organize a revolutionized country the strong hand of a soldier is needed. Take for instance Napoleon. Of course, this name,—anything did,—suggests the French literature of the day: Cousin, the philosopher, Villemain, the critic, and Guizot, the historian, that illustrious trio of liberalism at the Sorbonne, who, under the more constitutional Martignac ministry, just then initiated, had been restored to their chairs. Béranger's relentless warfare, when a more liberal era seemed to be ushered in, could not but offend Goethe.

"It serves him right," he says, speaking of the penalty imposed upon Béranger; "his last poems are, indeed, subversive of all order and public decency; he has fully deserved the punishment by his offences against king, state and peaceful citizenship. His early poems, on the contrary, are cheerful, harmless, and quite appropriate to create a circle of gay and happy people, which indeed, is the best that can be said of songs."

Now, Béranger's first collision with the narrow and illiberal government, directed by the clergy, dates back to 1821, the period of the high-tide of the reaction, and since there had been no truce. Among the convulsions of 1813 Goethe had published his *Westöstlicher Divan*, and then he was sixty-four. Our chansonnier had, when but forty-eight, wantonly forsaken the muse of love and pleasure, his true muse. That Goethe could not possibly forgive. Verily, nine months and ten thousand francs were hardly commensurable with such a formidable offense.

About one year later we find Goethe busy in classifying the treasures he had just received from David. The medallions of the young poets of France are displayed upon his table; also the works of Sainte-Beuve, Ballanche, Victor Hugo, Balzac, Alfred de Vigny, Jules Janin and others. France has sent her respectful homage to the great German poet. Goethe overflows with joy.

"David has procured me by his presents most happy days. The whole week the young poets have been keeping me busy, and by the fresh impressions I receive from them they afford me new life."

He then speaks of Émile Deschamps, Mérimée and, in particular, of the excesses of some of the Romanticists. The Romantic poets, he remarks, are too subjective; in all their works we detect the Parisian; and when Eckermann asks if that were also the case with Béranger, he affirms it. But, he adds, his personality is so great that it is well worth while to represent it. And although not a friend of political songs he would gladly put up with such as Béranger wrote. First of all, his subjects are of paramount importance: his affectionate admiration for Napoleon and his glorious exploits, his hatred of the domination of the "Pfaffen," and of the darkness threatened by the Jesuits. How can our sympathies be withheld from such things? Nor is he merely the exponent of a party. Because of the wide national interests Béranger stands for, he is the great spokesman of the people. He had, to be sure, at different critical periods, hearkened to the aspirations, desires and needs of the nation. That has, however, only confirmed him in himself, since he learned that his own soul was in harmony with that of the people; but he was never misled into saying anything but what already was living in his own heart. Thus Goethe vindicates completely Béranger's conduct as well as the motives thereof. He approves of his Napoleonic cult, of his fight against the clergy, of his stand for the rights of the nation against the government. And still one year later we find Goethe adhering to his judgment. He criticises, on that occasion, a German poet,[5] whose reputation was due solely to the animosities he expressed as the organ of his party, and in whom hatred supplied the place of genius. By way of contrast he points to Béranger; he, Goethe says, never served any party. He feels too much at one with himself for the world to be able to give or take ought from him. This is Goethe's last utterance on Béranger, about one year before his death. Béranger, then, Goethe holds, was of thoroughly independent character. Far from catering to public sentiment, he expressed and influenced it, his genius being strong enough by dint of its own inner support. And even as a poet of political songs, his fame owed but little, if anything, to party spirit, and everything to their intrinsic poetic worth.

5 Supposed by Düntzer to be Wolfgang Menzel.

That was the time of the Restoration with its reaction in state and church, as well as in taste and manners, against both the excesses of the revolution and its enduring results. Because the bulk of the people were then, rank and file, for freedom, Béranger, their foremost standard-bearer, was vilified by some critics as a time-serving demagogue. With more moderation, but greater subtlety and weight of opinion, Sainte-Beuve discovered in vanity the true motive of Béranger's stolid independence. Had not Béranger refused the censorship offered to him under the Hundred Days, resented the advances of the Bourbons, declined the portfolio extended to him by the Citizen-King, as well as the fauteuil in the Academy, maintained, by his refusal to accept his election into the republican assembly of 1848, his stout independence even against the sovereign people? The springs of his actions were, then, Sainte-Beuve declares, vanity pure and simple, and a desire to pose before the public. However, when an attitude struck in order to mislead the people into thinking one an honest man, is consistently adhered to in spite of the most powerful temptations and in spite of an utter lack of material rewards; and when, in addition to all that, it is not in one instance gainsaid by any dishonest act in both public or private life, then must we, indeed, admit that attitude to be but the sincere expression of deep-seated, solid conviction, and do justice to the admirable sameness and firmness of Béranger.

## III.

### The Indecency in Béranger's Songs.

By the adepts of absolute monarchy, which in its essence is the embodiment and glorification of egotism, and by those of theocratic rule, for which hypocrisy is the fundamental law of society, Béranger, decried as the pupil of Voltaire, has always been held up to the naïve and credulous as the bogey of indecency and immorality. There is, indeed, a great deal of unconventionality in Béranger's songs.

From time to time Goethe expresses his sentiment upon this delicate question. To start with, we may point out that he recognizes that Béranger, as a satirical poet, must needs deal with the perversions and vices of his time.

"Béranger always reminds me of Horace and Hafis, both of whom also stood above their times, satirically and playfully dealing with the depravity of morals. Béranger bears the same relation to his surroundings. . . . It is the very perversion of the time that has revealed Béranger's better nature."

Goethe, furthermore, brings out the moral influence of Béranger's songs. They render men cheerful and happy. "His songs have every year made millions of joyous people." His *chansons* have elevated the masses.

"They are perfectly understood even by the working classes; and being so high above the level of the commonplace, they accustom the masses to higher and nobler thoughts. And of what more can any poet boast?"

To that let us add Béranger's ennobling appeals to the patriotism of the nation, his plea for contentment, his contempt of the poor man's jealousy of the rich and powerful, and the very simplicity and uprightness of his own life. Goethe did not live to witness Béranger's sympathies for the low and down-trodden and the nation's struggle for freedom. And lastly Béranger's songs in which, rising above the love for country, he dreams of universal peace and a brotherhood of the peoples, would have brought him close to Goethe's heart, and more than atoned for the unconventionality of his early productions.

Criticism of Béranger's lightness of tone is not wanting, however. Now it is the patrician in Goethe that protests:

"Béranger, being of low station, does not loathe licentiousness and coarseness sufficiently; he treats them still with a certain sympathy."

On another occasion, Béranger's songs have to stand a comparison with a Chinese novel, the result being a most disastrous one for the song-writer. Goethe thinks very highly of the morality of the Chinamen.

"With them everything is purer and more moral than with us. What a strange contrast to this Chinese novel is furnished by Béranger's songs. The subjects of most of these are of an immoral nature, and but for the high art which renders them supportable, nay even attractive, I should very much loathe them."

Let us remember, however, that the masses of the people are influenced not by literary poetry, but by the songs they sing. Compared with the ordinary creations of the *caveau*, Bé-

ranger's licentious songs, however, mark a great progress, and it is only regrettable that they have not succeeded in dislodging them altogether from their strongholds. What is really needed for the populace of Paris is another popular poet of the genius of Béranger.

The part played by licentiousness in Goethe's work is too well-known to be dwelt upon here. It may, however, be of some interest to note the old Goethe's own opinion of that feature, and his comparison on that score of one of his earliest productions with Béranger's songs. As a matter of fact, the young Goethe, the Goethe of the storm and stress period, had, in point of freedom of thought and expression, by far outstripped the young Béranger. Goethe's creations of that time, composed largely in the spirit of the lighter French literature of the Eighteenth Century, are not even redeemed by the wit and elegance characteristic of that style of literature; their humor is coarse and clumsy. Most of them were destroyed by Goethe himself; but one fragment, in his posthumous writings, most suggestively entitled *Hanswurst's Hochzeit*, and dating back to 1775, discloses to us a Goethe who shows tastes that cannot, in his case, be excused by "a low station." But one year before his end he feelingly talks about that literary escapade to the ever-admiring Eckermann.

He regrets he could not finish that work, and the good Eckermann laments that it so exceeds all bounds that even the fragments cannot be reproduced.

"Goethe then read to me the cast of personages which filled nearly three pages, and were about a hundred in number. There were all the imaginable nicknames, at times of the coarsest and jolliest kind, so that one was kept in continuous laughter. Many referred to bodily deformities and depicted a person so well that he was brought life-like before the mind's eye; others indicated the most various indecencies and vices, presupposing a deep insight into the depths of the immoral world."

It was not possible to finish the piece, said Goethe.

"In Germany, society is too narrow to allow of the production of such things. On the broader ground of Paris, such eccentricities may be ventured upon; there one can be a Béranger, which is entirely impossible in Frankfort or Weimar. . . . Just fancy Béranger, instead of being born in Paris, and brought up in the metropolis of the world, the son of a tailor[6] in Jena or Weimar."

And again, "what an isolated and poor life we (the German poets) are leading after all!" Constantly the image of Paris, the world-city he had never seen, looms up in his mind, and something like a sad regret is heard, like a sigh coming from very, very far. His description of Paris, the superiority of its social culture to anything that has ever existed, must be read in full, in order to appreciate Goethe's deep-rooted sympathy for French civilization. The man who with evident satisfaction said to Eckermann:

"Es ist doch eigen, ich habe doch so mancherlei gemacht, und doch ist keines von allen meinen Gedichten das im lutherischen Gesangbuch stehen könnte,"

could not very well be too severe with the witty and frolicsome Béranger, and it clearly appears from what precedes that Goethe's occasional fits of harshness with the licentiousness of the *chansonnier* do not in any way impair his earlier verdict as to the fundamental morality of the *chansons*. Despite casual criticisms, Goethe, at heart, sympathizes with that very freedom which he condemns in the Parisian poet; and, in one of his confidential moods, as was seen, laying bare the innermost recesses of his soul, he confesses to his familiar that, had it not been for the narrowness of German provincial life, his own development might have presented features not unlike those of the French *chansonnier*.

## IV.

### Béranger's Poetic Genius.

From the very start, Béranger's genius had appealed to Goethe and met with an admiration which he freely and unstintingly expressed whenever the opportunity presented itself.

Above all, Goethe dwells with predilection upon Béranger's originality as a poet. To him the original personality of Béranger stands out foremost among the poets of the day.

"In him is all the substance of an important personality. Béranger is a nature most happily endowed, firmly grounded in himself, developed purely from himself, and quite in harmony with himself. He has never asked: What would

6 His grandson, in reality.

suit the times? What produces an effect? What pleases? What are others doing?—in order that he might do the like. He has worked simply from the core of his own nature, without troubling himself as to what the public, or what this or that party expects."

It is the sincerity of the poet's inspiration that Goethe admired so much; it was of himself he said,

"I have never affected anything which I have not experienced, and which has not urged me to production. I have only composed love-songs when I have loved. How could I write songs of hatred without hating."

In point of art, those songs are pronounced perfection itself. Indecent subjects shock Goethe: Béranger's art renders them attractive. Political songs he does not like, but he admires those of Béranger.

"These songs are perfect, and are to be considered as the best in their kind, especially when we have in our mind the merriment of the refrains, without which they would be almost too serious, too witty and too epigrammatic."

"Béranger has never been to a Classical school or university; and yet his songs are so full of mature cultivation, so full of wit and the most refined irony, and there is such artistic perfection and masterly handling of the language, that he is the admiration, not only of France, but of all civilized Europe."

And then he proceeds to show that it was only in an environment as favorable as that presented by the superior culture of Paris, that Béranger could develop so much perfection. And he concludes thus:

"We Germans are but of yesterday. We have indeed been properly cultivated for a century; but a few centuries more must elapse before so much mind and elevated culture will become universal amongst our people that they will appreciate beauty, like the Greeks; that they will be inspired by a beautiful song, and that it will be said of them 'it is long since they were barbarians.'"

What is genius? The creation of vital force, enduring and incessantly productive beyond our own life. That is Goethe's definition.

"Whether one show himself a man of genius in science, like Oken and Humboldt, or in war and statesmanship, like Frederick, Peter the Great, and Napoleon, or whether one compose a song like Béranger, it all comes to the same thing; the only point is, whether the thought, the discovery, the deed, is living, and can live on."

Béranger's songs will live in the hearts of the people, and Napoleon's glory itself lives on in those songs.

At times the artist in Goethe bursts into unrestrained praise:

"With him there is nothing snatched out of the air, nothing of merely imagined or imaginary interest; he never shoots at random; but, on the contrary, has always the most decided, the most important subject. . . . And how masterly is his treatment on all occasions! How he turns about and rounds off every subject in his own mind before he expresses it! And then, when all is matured, what wit, spirit, irony, and persiflage, and what heartiness, naïveté, and grace, are displayed at every step!"

True, there is nothing vague, misty, nebulous in Béranger's songs, and but little melancholy and sentimentality. They who find poetry only in the stars, clouds, ancient castles and graveyards, in the remote, old, mysterious, imperceptible and unintelligible, have, of course, never found any poetic sentiment in Béranger. Being, moreover, most naturally, always confronted with the great body of Romantic poetry, Béranger's definiteness and clearness of thought, often considered to be unpoetical qualities, are the more conspicuous. Few poets and critics there are in France of the Nineteenth Century, who do not more or less proceed from, or were not at some one time under the influence of the modes of thinking or feeling and of the exaggerations of the Romantic school. Accordingly, they find Béranger extremely prosaic. Goethe's Romantic period, however, had long been over; he belonged to neither of the contending political and literary parties; his Classicism was broad and tolerant, his sympathies manifold and various. He was in a position to judge fairly and grasp the characteristic features of Béranger:

"Seemingly, events that are transitory ought to be preferable as subjects of poetry, because something fleeting, moving, must be very welcome to the poet. But as we can not prescribe his subjects to the poet, it depends solely upon him to give the highest poetic expression to what is permanent. Perhaps no one has better succeeded in this than Mr. Béranger."[7]

However much Béranger's poetic glory might have been carped at in France, and in spite of a few sporadic protestations on the part of

7 *Werke*, Kürschner, Bd. 32 (*Nachgelassene Werke*. Sechster Band, S. 178–184).

some German critics, Goethe's judgment has, on the whole, persisted in Germany. To quote only two men, a critic and a poet:

"Of all French poets, whether Classic or Romantic, Béranger alone is understood by the Germans as easily and directly as is a German poet. Germans sing his songs as enthusiastically as do the French themselves. Béranger attracts us because to us he represents in the purest manner the French mind. Brought up in the study of Molière, La Fontaine, and Voltaire, also well acquainted with Rabelais, he had not allowed himself to be misled by the models of Horace."[8]

It was reported to Heine on his sick-bed that some poetaster had said that Béranger was no poet. The great lyrist, who abhorred French Classical poetry, replied: "Pas un poète, Béranger! Eh, mon petit monsieur, c'est la lyre la plus sonore des temps modernes!"[9] The modest *chansonnier* himself, however, did not presume to play that exalted instrument; the *mirliton* was all he claimed. But on that humble reed-flute he excelled. And from it streamed forth melodies of contentment, joy, love and liberty, such as rejoiced and rejuvenated the heart of the old Goethe.

J. B. SEGALL.

*Cornell University.*

## *MARTIN OPITZ AND WILHELM MÜLLER.*

MÜLLER'S drinking songs were popular as early as 1824, for it was on a September night of that year, at the supper table in the large hall of the *Brockenhaus*, that Heine and "two long rows of students, mostly from Halle," sang them, after the unsavory meat and potatoes had been cleared from the board, when the wine had displaced the beer, while the air of the room grew heavy with the steam from the punch bowls.[1] None of these songs has been more often sung, perhaps, than *Geselligkeit* (*Ich bin nicht gern allein / Mit meinem Glase Wein*), set to the graceful melody of Friedrich Schneider;[2] and its freshness would seem to be as yet undimmed.

8 Julian Schmidt, *Geschichte der franz. Litteratur seit Ludwig xvi.* 1874, Erster Bd., p. 472.

9 Dr. Louis P. Betz, *Heine in Frankreich.* Zürich, 1895, p. 138.

1 Cf. *Harzreise: Sämtl. Werke*, ed. Elster, III, 58-62.

2 A well-known composer of the old school, a cantor, like Bach, but also Ducal Capellmeister (in Dessau), and the head of what was then called a musical school, now a conservatorium. (F. Max Müller, *Auld Lang Syne*, N. Y., 1898, p. 8 f.). Cf. Wilh. Müller's song dedicated to Schneider: *Gedichte von W. M.*, Leipzig, 1868, I, 120.

Its prototype is Opitz's well-known *Lebenslust* (*Ich empfinde fast ein Grauen*), which it resembles in theme, metre, treatment, and, in one stanza at least, literally. Müller was conversant with Opitz's poem, for it was printed in *Des Knaben Wunderhorn*[3] I, 1806, p. 57 (under the title *Ueberdruss der Gelahrtheit*), and it heads the edition of Opitz which Müller edited for Brockhaus.[4]

The distinct verbal resemblance between the two poems occurs in their closing stanzas.

Opitz:

Lass' ich schon nicht viel zu erben,
El, so hab' ich edlen Wein,
Will mit Andern lustig sein,
Wenn ich gleich allein muss sterben.

Müller:

Muss ich einst allein auch sterben
Lass' ich doch nicht viel zu erben,
Will mein Leben lang den Becher
Schwingen in dem Kreis der Zecher.

The theme of Opitz's two opening stanzas is summed up in the second stanza of Müller: Let him who will, search for wisdom in books, the poet will seek consolation in wine.

Opitz:

Ich empfinde fast ein Grauen,
Dass ich, Plato, für und für
Bin gesessen über dir.
. . . . . .
Wozu dienet das Studiren,
Als zu lauter Ungemach?

Müller:

Mag allein der tiefe Weise
Brüten, bis er wird zum Greise,
So zu leben und zu lieben,
Wie's die Schule vorgeschrieben.

Likewise Opitz's fourth stanza comes to expression in Müller's first: Let the miser go hungry to bed, the poet will live joyously while he may.

Opitz:

Jener mag der Heller schonen,
Der bei seinem Gold und Schätzen
Tolle sich zu kränken pflegt,
Und nicht satt zu Bette legt:
Ich will, weil ich kann, mich letzen!

3 Which Müller knew. Cf. his *Vermischte Schriften*, Leipzig, 1830, IV, 103. Also A. Müller, *Moderne Reliquien*, Berlin, 1845, I, 120 f.; *Journal of Germanic Philology*, II, 285 ff.

4 *Bibliothek deutscher Dichter des* 17. *Jahrhunderts*, I, Leipzig, 1822.

Müller:

Mag allein der Geizhals fasten
Neben dem gefüllten Kasten:
Ich bin nicht gern allein
Mit meinem Glase Wein.

A final correspondence between the two songs lies in the boy whom in each case the poet despatches on his errand.

Opitz:

Hola, Junge, geh' und frage.

Müller:

Knäblein, klag' im Mondenscheine.

The thief (stanza 1), the monk (st. 3), and the dyspeptic (st. 5), are a further development of the theme occurring only in Müller; as is *die Holde* (st. 4), whoever she may be: the allusion not being clear from the context.

The refrain with which each stanza of Müller begins and closes:

Ich bin nicht gern allein
Mit meinem Glase Wein

may well be a reminiscence of the similar lines contained in the closing stanza of the widely-sung Volkslied, *Die Gedanken sind frei:*

Ich bin nicht alleine
Bei meinem Glas Weine—

which verses, although they were omitted from the song as printed in the first edition of the *Wunderhorn*,[5] occur in practically every version of the *Volkslied* which has since been published.[6]

PHILIP S. ALLEN.

*University of Chicago.*

## *ENGLISH LITERATURE.*

*A History of English Romanticism in the Eighteenth Century.* By HENRY A. BEERS. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1899. 8vo, pp. v, 455.

*The French Revolution and the English Poets. A Study in Historical Criticism.* By ALBERT ELMER HANCOCK, Ph.D. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1899. 8vo, pp. xvi, 195.

WITH the appearance of each new book on English romanticism we seem to drift farther and farther away from an adequate definition of the term, if not from a clearer conception of the literary features of the movement. The two best and most recent books on the "Romantic Movement" in England begin with an enumeration of the many attempts at, and of the almost insuperable difficulties attending, a sufficiently comprehensive definition.

"Any attempt," says Phelps,[1] "to make a definition of romanticism that will be at once specific and adequate is sure to result in failure. It is not simply that the word 'Romantic' has both a popular and a critical sense, each of which differs widely from the other, but that the word is used critically in very different ways."

After devoting almost four pages to difficulties and definitions (chiefly from German and French critics), Phelps, without attempting a specific definition of romanticism, says (p. 4):

"Romantic literature will generally be found to show three qualities: Subjectivity, Love of the Picturesque, and a Reactionary spirit."

Likewise Beers[2] thinks that "to attempt at the outset a rigid definition of the word *romanticism* would be" a hopeless task:

"There are words which connote so much, which take up into themselves so much of the history of the human mind, that any compendious explanation of their meaning—any definition which is not, at the same time, a rather extended description—must serve little other end than to supply a convenient mark of identification .... Nevertheless a rough, working definition may be useful to start with. Romanticism, then, in the sense in which I shall commonly employ the word, means the reproduction in modern art or literature of the life and thought of the Middle Ages."

Now, the definitions and general methods of treatment of the two excellent books above mentioned are too narrow in compass, because they start from the wrong standpoint. A definition which might apply to French or German romanticism would fall far short if applied to the Romantic movement in England. The word *romanticism* "connotes" much more as it is employed in England, than in either France or Germany. For this reason such definitions as those of Heine,[3]

5 iii, 1808, p. 38.

6 For example, Hoffmann u. Richter, *Schlesische Volkslieder*, Leipzig, 1842, p. 307; Mittler, *Deutsche Volkslieder*, second ed., Frankfurt a. M., 1865, p. 660; Erk, *Deutscher Liederhort*, Berlin, 1856, p. 358; Menzel, *Die Gesänge der Völker*, Leipzig, 1866, p. 116; Simrock, *Die Deutschen Volkslieder*, Frankfurt a. M., 1857, no. 360; Mündel, *Elsässische Volkslieder*, Strassburg, 1884, p. 277; Wolfram, *Nassauische Volkslieder*, Berlin, 1894, p. 351; Becker, *Rheinischer Volksliederborn*, Neuwied a. Rh., [1892], p. 42; etc.

1 *The Beginnings of the English Romantic Movement.* By William Lyon Phelps. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1893, p. 1.

2 *English Romanticism*, pp. 1–2.

3 *Die Romantische Schule*, p. 158,

"Was war aber die romantische Schule in Deutschland? Sie war nichts anders als die Wiedererweckung der Poesie des Mittelalters, wie sie sich in dessen Liedern, Bild- und Bauwerken, in Kunst und Leben, manifestiert hatte;"

and of Madame de Staël,[4]

"Le nom de romantique a été introduit nouvellement en Allemagne, pour désigner la poésie . . . . qui est née de la chevalerie et du christianisme,"

are very inadequate when applied to English romanticism of the eighteenth century.

In England the literary revival of the eighteenth century, whose beginnings are described with so much interest and *verve* in Prof. Beers' book, was too intimately associated with the revolution in politics, philosophy. and religion, to be thoroughly comprehended as a purely literary movement. There is not a single phase of the social life of England in the eighteenth century that is not reflected in its literature. Foreign wars and policies, colonial settlements, "South Sea Bubbles," criminal excesses at home, landscape gardening, the beginnings of modern music and painting, the revival of architecture, the revolt against materialism in philosophy and rationalism in religion, all contributed their quotas toward the romantic revival. I think one would be justified in the assertion that in the last half of the century, more than in any previous period, English literature was "the reflection and the reproduction of the life of the people."

But the literary revival was only one of the symptoms of the romantic rash which broke out in England in the eighteenth century. No physician can properly diagnose a complicated disease by studying ever so carefully one or two of a half dozen equally important symptoms. No critical study, however thorough, of the purely literary side of eighteenth century romanticism can be sufficiently comprehensive and satisfactory. The revival in literature which we call "romanticism" (in the narrower sense) is one of the many manifestations of the spirit of universal revolt against seventeenth and early eighteenth century standards of social life. This spirit of unrest did not originate in literature. It did not even make its appearance in æsthetic English literature until long after it had permeated politics, religion, and philosophy. In fact Romanticism broke out in literature when society had become so thoroughly saturated with the spirit of revival that it was impossible to arrest it. What are the first rays of sentimentality which begin to warm up the cold formalism of the poetry of Young, Hervey, Blair, Shenstone, Akenside, and, to some extent, of Gray and Collins, but the reflection of the sentimental outburst in religion under the Wesleys, Whitefield, Doddridge, and others? We know that this "emotionalism" in religion was simply a reaction from the theological rationalism of the seventeenth century, tempered and refined by the mysticism of Law and the idealism of Berkeley and Hume,—so far as the first gushes of emotionalism were tempered and refined. Moreover, if we look closely, examine the history of the period carefully, we shall find that the rise of the sentimental novel, Richardson's *Pamela*, *Clarissa Harlowe*, and the rest, was due more to the sentimental revival in religion and morals, than to any pre-existent *literary* conditions in England or on the Continent.

I believe that a careful consideration of the beginnings of the poetic revival in England in its relations to contemporaneous theology and philosophy will convince any one that the revival of the Spenserian stanza, and of the Miltonic verse and melancholy of *Penseroso*, were not *causes* in themselves. They were merely the concomitants of the newly resurrected spirit of sentimentality which was gradually making its entry into English literature. These forms were employed by the forerunners of the romantic movement because thay had been employed by the greatest poets of sentiment in the past, and because the Heroic Couplet as "perfected" by Pope was too rational and intellectual, too "exact," for the expression of the softer, gentler emotions of the poetic soul. In other words, the revival of Spenser and Milton, of landscape poetry and the Gothic spirit, by the English poets of the second quarter of the eighteenth century, were rather manifestations of the universal spirit of unrest, than exciting causes of a later literary upheaval.

To return to the question of definition, I re-

4 *De l'Allemagne*, Vol. i, Chap. xxx. Cf. Phelps, p. 2.

peat it is wholly inadequate to a clear comprehension of the subject to define (English) romanticism as "the reproduction in modern art or literature of the life and thought of the Middle Ages." Such a definition might apply to the romantic revival in France or Germany, and, as was noticed above, it was at first enunciated as the specific definition of German romanticism. So it seems to me a fundamental defect of what most English and American writers have said on romanticism, that it has been too largely colored by what previous French and German critics have written on the same subject.

Suppose we apply Prof. Beers' version of Heine's definition to English poetry beginning about the year 1800. How much of modern English literature could be claimed for romanticism? The most of Coleridge and Scott, and some of Byron and Moore; while all of Wordsworth, Shelley, Keats, Landor, and a great deal of Byron would be excluded. But Wordsworth, Byron, Shelley, and Keats were much more at variance with the existing order of things, much more revolutionary, much more romantic (in the true and broad sense) than Scott, or even Coleridge.

After all the quibbling with sonorous and inadequate phraseology, one is more and more inclined to see in the expression, "the return to Nature," in its broadest application, the essentials of an adequate definition of romanticism.

"The 'return to Nature,'" says Leslie Stephen,[5] "expresses a sentiment which underlies to some extent both the sentimental and the romantic movements, and which was more distinctly embodied in writers of a higher order. To return to nature is, in one sense, to find a new expression for emotions which have been repressed by existing conventions; or, in another, to return to some simpler social order which had not yet suffered from those conventions. The artificiality attributed to the eighteenth century seems to mean that men were content to regulate their thoughts and lives by rules not traceable to first principles, but dependent upon a set of special and exceptional conditions; and, again, that in the imaginative sphere the accepted symbols did not express the deepest and most permanent emotions, but were an arbitrary compromise between traditional assumptions and the new philosophical tenets."

Prof. Herford, in a clear and concise description of romanticism,[6] says, among other things, in reply to the question:

"What was Romanticism? Primarily it was an extraordinary development of imaginative sensibility. At countless points the universe of sense and thought acquired a new potency of response and appeal to man, a new capacity of ministering to, and mingling with his richest and intensest life. Glory of lake and mountain, grace of childhood, dignity of the untaught peasant, wonder of fairy, mystery of the Gothic aisle, radiance,—all these springs of the poet's inspiration and the artist's joy began to flow, not at once but in prolonged unordered succession.

The word Romance, hackneyed and vulgarized as it is, expresses less inadequately than any other the kind of charm which these heterogeneous sources of poetry exercised in common. They were all, to begin with *strange;* ways of escape from the pressure of the ordinary, modes of deliverance from the dead weight of routine. But the romance of which poetry is begotten can never be merely strange. It has a subtler fascination, which rests partly upon wonder, but partly also upon recognition. For its peculiar quality lies in this, that in apparently detaching us from the real world, it seems to restore us to reality at a higher point, to emancipate us from the 'prison of the actual,' by giving us spiritual rights in a universe of the mind, exempt from the limitations of matter, and time, and space, but appealing at countless points to the instinct for that which endures and subsists. To rekindle the soul of the past, or to reveal a soul where no eye had yet discerned it; to call up Helen or Isolde, or to invest lake and mountain with 'the light that never was on sea or shore'; to make the natural appear supernatural, as Wordsworth and Coleridge put it, or the supernatural natural,—were but different avenues to the world of Romance . . . . Romanticism, beyond all other literary movements, is impregnated with speculative elements: its poets are teachers and prophets, ardent reformers, philosophic reactionaries, innovators in religion, or in criticism, or in history. '*Le romantisme,*' as M. Lanson says, '*(et c'est là sa grandeur) est tout traversé de frissons métaphysiques;*' and metaphysic, on its part, was penetrated with the instincts of romanticism."

This analytic definition of Prof. Herford is certainly more comprehensive than any that has been given so far; and the discussion shows

5 *English thought in the Eighteenth Century*, Vol. ii, p. 437.

6 *The Age of Wordsworth. Introduction*, pp. xiv-xv. By C. H. Herford, Litt. D. London: George Bell and Sons, 1897.

that the author appreciates the breadth and depth of the romantic movement.

Hancock[7] labors under difficulties similar to those of Phelps and Beers: he misapplies the term "Romantic Movement." He attempts to define it as a literary movement, but he seems to feel at the same time that his definition is inadequate.

"The Romantic Movement," he says (p. 43), "is the term applied to a certain historic commotion in the world of literature; it ran a course, if one must give dates, of three score years and ten, and its middle point was the first year of the nineteenth century. It was only one phase of a general commotion; there were correspondent and sympathetic movements in social, political, religious, and philosophical fields. The literary agitation began, as Prof. Phelps' admirable and comprehensive study has shown, amid the regular and decorous chants of the pseudo-classic poets, as a feeble echo of the strains and themes of Shakspere, Spenser, Milton, and a Gothic past. . . . The term Romantic was applied to the new writers; largely because the prosaic men of the previous age disliked anything that savored of romance, and many of the new poets wrote upon themes which offended common sense and conventionality. The Romantic Movement, however, is an unfortunate phrase. No satisfactory definition can be given which will include all the facts."

When Hancock states further (p. 45–6):

"The Romantic Movement was an unconscious revolt against these (that is of the eighteenth century) literary standards. . . . The Romantic Movement was a protest against the tyranny of the type,"

he seems to feel that he has expressed only a half truth; that it was not the revolt of the *literary* standard of one century against that of the other, but rather the revolt of the social standards of one century against the social standards of the preceding. Literature was only the expression of the different phases of this complex social life. Therefore, he hastens to modify the assertion:

"It was a declaration of the rights of the individual to be normal or abnormal. Romanticism declared that the best in life was not found among state centres of civilization, but on the frontiers, where there was less convention, less order, less artifice, where the human spirit might range as wit and fancy willed."

The social revolt of the later eighteenth century manifested itself chiefly in three different, but intimately associated ways, all of which seem to me to emanate from the strong desire to return to Nature. In the first place there was a political manifestation: a revolt against the tyranny and oppression of preceding ages; a longing for simiplicity, naturalness in government. This was accompanied by a revival of national spirit, which was in turn the leading incentive toward the study of the models of the past. This study was of necessity partly literary. Secondly, the revolt was philosophical: a revolt against materialism and rationalism, resulting in idealism and emotionalism. Thirdly, the revolt was purely literary: a revolt against the formalism and lifelessness of the age of Pope. The reaction expressed itself in a return to nature in the narrower, more literal sense. Poets began to go to nature for their inspiration. The description of natural scenery became a ruling passion in poetry. Man and his moods were projected upon the canvas of nature, where a panacea for mental and moral ills was thought to inhere.

Considered from the narrower, purely literary standpoint, Prof. Beers' *English Romanticism in the Eighteenth Century* is a valuable contribution to the history of English literature. The materials are arranged in eleven chapters, and the literary revolt is traced from its rather indefinite beginnings through the period of Thomas Chatterton. The chapters on "The Spenserians," "The Landscape Poets," "The Miltonic Group," "Percy and the Ballads," and "Thomas Chatterton," are handled in a thorough and masterly manner, and leave little more to be said or desired on the respective subjects. We might, perhaps, have wished that the author were less verbose, did he not evince such knowledge of the whole subject, and were his verbosity not so entertaining.

I have already dwelt at length on the contents of Chap. i, *The Subject Defined*, and time and space will permit only a few observations on Chap. ix, *Ossian*, and the final chapter, *The German Tributary*.

The discussions on MacPherson and his *Ossian*, while written in an entertaining style, and while furnishing an excellent résumé of Ossianic criticism from its beginning to the present time, are very unsatisfactory. The author is

7 *French Revolution and English Poets*, pp. 43 et seq.

here not master of his subject, to the extent that some of the best and most recent criticism has escaped him altogether. What he says, and the conclusions he reaches, are what has been said, and conclusions that have been reached, over and over again during the past one hundred years. After reading the chapter we know little, if any thing, more about Mac Pherson and his mysterious relations to the Ossianic poems than was known in 1805, after *The Report of the Committee of the Highland Society* was published. And we are not quite sure that Prof. Beers does not still consider Mac Pherson a literary cheat and forger.

While I am not prepared to say that Mac Pherson did not tamper with his originals, to the extent of frequently filling up gaps with words and lines, it seems to me that any one who has read Bailey Saunders'[8] life of MacPherson (and it is one of the best, most unbiased, most authoritatively written, biographies that I have read), will conclude that he was any thing but a conscious forger. Saunders has given an insight into the character, into the literary and political ambitions, of MacPherson which enables us to understand and appreciate his mysterious action in reference to the Ossianic poems, and his peculiar attitude of indifference to the hostile criticism of the day.

The following points, the majority of which have been noted in some manner by Ossianic criticism of the last fifty years, and which are, of course, considered in Prof. Beers' chapter on Ossian, are emphasized by Saunders:

1. MacPherson's tastes in literature were from the beginning wholly classical. This is evidenced by all his efforts at original composition. The Romantic vein was unpopular with the literary public of both England and Scotland. It is not at all probable, therefore, that MacPherson was desirous of risking his hopes for literary fame in the unthankful task of collecting and translating Gaelic fragments.

2. His reluctance in undertaking the work of translating the *Fragments*, and more especially their publication in 1760; his disinclination to give up his position as tutor in a wealthy family, and to devote months of his time in searching the Highlands and the Hebrides for other manuscripts and fragments, must be considered as genuine and not feigned.

3. That he did make *bona fide* collections, partly in manuscripts which he found among the inhabitants of the Highlands, Skye, and the Hebrides, partly in writing down with his own hand poems which were recited to him from time to time by the Gaelic peasantry, is beyond all doubt. This is established by so much and such strong testimony in the way of letters, written and oral statements, made for the most part by reliable and disinterested persons, that it is folly to attempt to prove the contrary.

4. The *Fragments* when they first appeared raised scarcely a suspicion of forgery in England. In preparing the translation of the materials collected on his "first journey," Mac Pherson was in continual intercourse with Dr. Hugh Blair, and worked to some extent under his direction. It was Blair's, not MacPherson's, original idea that the fragments were part of a great epic, *Fingal*.

5. MacPherson was neither a Gaelic scholar, nor was he acquainted with antiquities: it was, therefore, quite natural that so profound a scholar as Gray should be disgusted with his ignorant attempts at explaining the origin of the fragments. The popularity of the first published *Fragments* turned his head, and caused him to assume airs and pose before the literary world.

6. MacPherson's method of arranging the Fingal fragments is to be condemned. It was, however, the same method which was followed to some extent by Percy in publishing the *Reliques*. It was also a method suggested and sanctioned by Blair. Beyond a doubt, he added lines (just to what extent will probably never be known)[9] now and then for the purpose of making the fragments appear as a connected whole. He doubtless used the filing process also with his originals whenever he felt it necessary.

7. Nevertheless, there can be no doubt that large parts of both *Fingal* and *Temora* were

8 *The Life and Letters of James MacPherson. Containing a particular Account of his famous Quarrel with Dr. Johnson, and a Sketch of the Origin and Influence of the Ossianic Poems.* By Bailey Saunders. London: 1894.

9 On this point cf. Ludwig Chr. Stern's *Die Ossianischen Heldenlieder*, *Zeitschrift fur vergl. Litteraturgesch.* (n. f.), vol. viii, 51–86 and 143–174.

what they claimed to be: translations (frequently very free) from Gaelic originals.

8 Saunders shows conclusively that Mac Pherson really intended at one time to publish the "originals." He was hindered from carrying out this intention at first by the lack of funds necessary to defray the expenses of such a vast undertaking: the first attempt at publication by subscription in London failed completely. When later the £1000 was subscribed for the purpose, MacPherson's time and energy were entirely employed in writing political pamphlets, and otherwise advancing the interests of the Tory government. He became deeply interested in politics—especially Indian affairs, was elected to Parliament, etc. Moreover, bitter criticism arising from ignorance and prejudice—like that of Dr. Johnson—Mac Person considered beneath his notice. So much of this kind of criticism coupled with his sensitive, haughty disposition finally made him careless of all criticism, therefore he obstinately refused to answer the charges of forgery which were made against him.

9. When Dr. Johnson became so bitterly personal in his criticism, MacPherson, at the instance of his publisher, did exert himself to some extent to silence the old Doctor's unreasonable blusterings. He did most certainly place the originals—or certain originals—of his Ossian in the hands of his London publisher, Thomas Beckett, where they could have been seen and examined by any one interested in the subject. Beckett advertised the fact that the originals were in his possession and, at the same time, repeated the proposal for printing them. This is attested by a letter from Beckett "To the Public" in January, 1775,—not "more *Fingal* and *Temora*, as Prof. Beers states, p than twenty years after" (the publication of 320), but just about the time that "Dr. Johnson was calling loudly for the manuscript." Beckett's letter was as follows:

"To the Public.

Doctor Johnson having asserted in his late publication that the Translator of Ossian's Poems 'never could show the original, nor can it be shown by any other,' I hereby declare that the originals of *Fingal* and other poems of Ossian lay in my shop for many months in the year 1762, for inspection of the curious. The public were not only apprised of their lying there for inspection, but even proposals for publishing the originals of the poems of Ossian were dispersed through the kingdom, and advertised in the newspapers. Upon finding that a number of subscribers sufficient to bear the expenses were not likely to appear, I returned the manuscripts to the proprietor, in whose hands they still remain.

Thomas Beckett.

Adelphi, 19th January, 1775."[10]

It is, therefore, clear that MacPherson made an earnest effort both to produce and to publish the originals of his "*Fingal* and other poems," if any trust may be placed in the signed statement of the agent through whom the attempts were made. If Prof. Beers had been familiar with Saunders' history of James MacPherson's life and the Ossianic poems, his chapter on *Ossian* would, I am sure, have assumed a very different tone, and he would have reached much more definite conclusions on MacPherson and his great work.[11]

Prof. Beers does not give a sufficiently adequate idea of the influence of *Ossian* upon the literature of English romanticism. He thinks that Wordsworth's assertion that *Ossian* failed to

"'amalgamate with the literature of the island' needs some qualification. That it did not enter into English literature in a formative way as Percy's ballads is true enough, and is easy of explanation" (p. 326). Again, he says (pp. 327–8): "The impression was temporary, but it was immediate and powerful,"

and this is not sufficiently strong. B. Schnabel[12] has shown by a careful examination of the influence of *Ossian* in England from 1760 until 1830, that every poet of note during this long period was indebted, to a greater or less extent, to the Celtic bard. Very few years passed by from 1760 to 1819, each of which did not produce one or more metrical versions, dramatizations, or imitations of *Ossian*.

Much new light on "The German Tributary" to the English romantic movement, and upon the literary importance of William Taylor of

10 Cf. *Notes and Queries*, II, iii, 28.

11 Saunders' book is reviewed at length in both the *Athenæum* and the *Academy* for 1895.

12 *Ossian in der schönen Litteratur England's bis 1832*, *Englische Studien* xxiii, 31–73, and 366–401.

Norwich, is to be found in Herzfeld's recent monograph.[13]

Hancock's *French Revolution and the English Poets* is to some extent a continuation of Beers' *English Romanticism in the Eighteenth Century*. That is to say, Hancock's book contains a series of thorough studies of the influence of the French Revolution upon the poetry of four of the greatest of the English romanticists; namely, Shelley, Byron, Wordsworth, and Coleridge. The first two essays, those on Shelley and Byron, are admirably done. No one[14] has before shown so clearly the part which the French Revolution and French philosophy played in the composition of *Queen Mab;* and how Shelley in later years, just as Wordsworth, recoiled from his youthful vagaries.

The essay on Byron is almost better than that on Shelley: it is written in such a sympathetic, appreciative vein. All of us have some vague ideas of Byron's love of freedom, and the conception of freedom in his poems, but Hancock has traced the growth of these ideas, as they appear in Byron's poetry, under the impulse of the Revolution. We see and appreciate this side of Byron's and Shelley's poetry as never before.

The same is true of the studies of Wordsworth and Coleridge, who, being more moderate revolutionists and less permeated with the spirit of the Revolution, are considered after Shelley and Byron, in violation of the chronological order. The author shows in a strikingly clear manner how Wordsworth, under the influence of William Godwin and French philosophy, was slowly "invalidating his early faith in the spirit," and was virtually casting himself upon "the shallows of agnosticism," when his sister Dorothy comes upon the scene of action, and leads the poet back to the haunts of his childhood. Here, in communion with the spirit of nature, and away from the philosophy and the error of the Revolution, away from "the logical debates of the city," he is gradually won back to the faith and "experiences of his youth."

And what lasting good did Wordsworth gain from his passion for the French Revolution? "It humanized him." After his long sojourn in France "the interest in man, in human affairs, became the supreme centre of his thoughts."

Hancock's work contains an introduction on "Historical Criticism" by Prof. Lewis E. Gates, and Part I (chapters i–iii) treats of the *Principles of the French Revolution*. Chapters ii and iii are devoted to a brief explanation of the philosophical systems of Helvetius, Holbach, Rousseau and William Godwin. Chapter i might have been omitted without injury to the unity of the book, since here, and frequently throughout Part I, the author is tediously and uselessly verbose. In fact the reader will be more likely to become interested in, and appreciate the book by commencing with the essay on Shelley. The first chapter of Part II, *The Romantic Movement*, is interesting, but there is entirely too much repetition of the same idea in slightly different words. A brief bibliography would, it seems to me, have added greatly to the value of the book.

Wm. H. Hulme.

*Western Reserve University.*

13 *William Taylor von Norwich. Eine Studie über den Einfluss der neueren deutschen Litteratur in England,* von Georg Herzfeld. Halle: Niemeyer, 1897.

14 Of course the influence of the French Revolution on English literature has frequently received consideration by critics and literary historians,—and notably by Prof. Dowden. But the studies have all been of a general character. Even in his recently published *Princeton Lectures* Prof. Dowden is far from treating the poets of the Revolutionary period in the specific manner of Dr. Hancock's book. And Prof. Dowden has not, it seems to me, in his discussions forestalled, or rendered less valuable, these careful studies of Hancock. On the contrary Hancock's essays are valuable supplements to the broader more general treatment of Prof. Dowden, as well as of that of Brandes in the fifth edition (1897) of his *Der Naturalismus in England.*

## *GERMAN LITERATURE.*

*Euphorion, Zeitschrift für Litteraturgeschichte*, herausgegeben von August Sauer. Fünfter Band, 1898.

Euphorion calls itself a journal for literary history. In point of fact it is a journal for the literary history of Germany since the Reformation, and for this comparatively narrow and yet really inexhaustible field of study, the quarterly has already, in the five years of its existence, made itself a necessity, as well for its articles and its publication of the briefer *in-*

*edita*, as for its critical reviews and its full and well digested bibliography.

No one can afford to neglect *Euphorion*, unless he is prepared to neglect modern German literature also. But no one will care for all that it contains, and no one critic can pronounce an expert's judgment on all the matters that it discusses. We may divide these roughly into studies in literary philosophy or, as one might perhaps better say, psychology; into matters of controversy, which it will be remembered Leo Meyer used to call "der eigentümliche Reiz unserer deutschen Wissenschaft;" and, finally, articles, sometimes essays, sometimes notes, sometimes new materials, bearing on the study of German literature from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century, with the eighteenth naturally predominating.

It is these articles that will be found most interesting and valuable, for there is little edification and surely no pleasure to be derived from Richard M. Meyer's two articles on the forms of the Refrain, "a systematic essay of the greatest possible exactness" the author calls it, leading to the conclusion that "the meaningless refrain is older than the texts and rhymizing did not come from speech, but was attained from without." All this is illustrated from Brentano, Herwegh, and Freiligrath, but, so far as appears, not to much purpose. Hardly more attractive is Emil Stern's essay on *Metaphor and Subjectivity*, whose philosophy may be deep and is certainly obscure.

More amusement, though not much edification, is to be derived from the strife of Niejahr and the Dioscuri, Jellinek and Kraus. The early rounds in this combat were fought in a former volume. The mill is here brought to a close, and the editor calls it a draw. The subject of contention, so far as appears, is *Contradictions in the Middle-High-German Court Epics;* but this has about as much to do with the article as Patroclus with the strife over his corpse, the real controversy being: are the Dioscuri gentlemen, and is Mr. Niejahr a judge? It will be observed that both parties may be right in their contentions, which for us have interest only for the refreshing vigor of their "orthodox blows and knocks."

Coming now to the more valuable and larger part of the volume, and arranging the material chronologically, so far as it is possible to mention it at all, we find first, for the sixteenth century, a very entertaining and scholarly study of the origin and sources of Fischart's *Aller Praktik Grossmutter*, by Adolph Hauffen, who gives much the best account that we have of the old calendars and Prognostics, with their curious and largely oriental superstitions, many of which have continued among the people even to the present day. These were partly political, partly practical, and very largely medical in character. They lent themselves readily to the controversies of the day, and seem to have been abused rather more by the Reformers than by the Romanists. Hauffen finds the sources of Fischart's satire and parody first in Rabelais, then in a similar work of the Franciscan Nas, from whom he annexed whole sections, and from less known Prognostica by Reynmann, Henrichmann, and the unknown author of *The Bleeding-Tablets of Dr. Grill* (1540). He himself found many imitators, some of them of very considerable talent. The whole article is worthy of note and of praise.

Minor contributions to the study of the sixteenth century contained in this volume are notes on the Faust legend by the same author as the Fischart, some new facts on the relations of Frischlin to Graz and Laibach, and a few data supplementing the studies of Jundt and Crüger on the Strassburg scholastic drama. These data are gathered by Erich Schmidt from calendars (1580–1630) in the court library at Darmstadt, of which Professor Schmidt promises a fuller analysis.

The calendars carry us over the threshold of the seventeenth century, which proves a stony field for *Euphorion*. This volume contents itself with some notes on the *Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft* and Opitz by Heinrich Borkowski, who reproduces two letters and a number of interesting poems from the Archives of Schlobitten. This and a brief contribution to the life of Moscherosch by Karl Obser bring us to the eighteenth century, where students of Goethe, Schiller, Wieland, and Lessing, will of course find new material to their purpose. Noteworthy, too, are the literary remains of A. G. Kästner, the Göttingen professor and epigram-

matist. A lengthy study of Moritz's autobiographical *Anton Reiser* concludes that it is strictly historical in its statements, and thus more truly a "confession" than the work of Rousseau, which it imitates. We may notice here, too, a review of Barnstorff's *Youngs Nachtgedanken*, which brings much new material to a judgment of the influence of that English poet on German literature. On the whole, however, the most important contribution of this volume to the study of the eighteenth century is Hassencamp's extracts from the literary remains of Sophie von Laroche, being eighteen letters from Arndt, Humboldt, Moser, Seume, and others, supplementing those of Wieland and Goethe already edited. In conclusion, for the eighteenth century, we may note also a brief review of King Frederick's relations to Rabener, and a study of the sources of Mendelssohn's *Phädon*.

For the nineteenth century the greatest space falls naturally to Heine, in the form of three long reviews (pp. 149, 335, 342) and a sketch of Hermann Wolfrum, who met him and Börne in Paris. We have also new data concerning E. T. A. Hoffmann, a letter of Schlegel to Schleiermacher, four of Hebbel to Schlönbach, a study of the Swabian literary school, and, finally, an inquiry into the origin of Halm's *Brautnacht*, which seems borrowed from Rogers' *Ginevra*, though the story is far older than either.

I have indicated in the foregoing the most important part of the contents of this volume of *Euphorion*. Much might be added, but the variety of material that has been noticed will suffice both to commend the volume and the journal to literary scholars, and to suggest what treasures still await the industrious seeker. It is hard to suppress, in conclusion, the wish that we, in America, had a similar journal for our own literature, or the prospect of interest to maintain it if it were undertaken.

BENJAMIN W. WELLS.

*New York.*

## *FRENCH LITERATURE.*

*Selections from Edmond and Jules de Goncourt*, edited with introduction, bibliography, notes and appendices, by ARNOLD GUYOT CAMERON, A. M., Ph.D. New York: American Book Company, 1899.

THIS volume of "Goncourt Selections" is destined, as the preface states, for educational purposes. Portraits of Edmond and of Jules de Goncourt fittingly open the book. Extracts from twenty-six of their principal works printed in large clear type, together with running annotations in comparatively fine print, cover two hundred and fifty-two octavo pages, preceded by an introduction of forty closely printed pages, a chronological index of the works of the Goncourts, and about four pages of bibliography. Following the Selections are twenty-six pages of appendices and an index to the notes.

This mere statement of the contents of the volume will indicate the vast amount of labor expended. Bourget, in his *Nouveaux Essais de Psychologie Contemporaine*, closes his study of the Goncourts by quoting Edmond's words on the death of his brother: "Jules de Goncourt est mort de travail;" "phrase mélancolique et orgueilleuse," says Bourget, "où se résume tout ce qui rend leur œuvre commune si profondément respectable." Judged by work evidenced, this edition of Goncourt selections must also be profoundly worthy of respect.

Granting that it is desirable to introduce the students of our colleges and universities to these painters of the passing phase of soul-sickness prevalent in our day, who lay bare the "coin maladif" of their own hearts to spread its poison, when these same students, as the notes to these selections imply, are not familiar with such names as La Bruyère, Molière, Bossuet, Montesquieu, Balzac, in short with even the greatest writers of French literature, these Goncourt selections will serve the purpose admirably.

There is undoubtedly too little attempt on the part of language teachers to present vividly a given text as a product, an expression of the life of the time in which it was written, that which forms both its setting, and its best commentary. To so present these extracts from the Goncourts, is the aim, well attained, of the abundant notes, which, as the preface curiously states, "have dealt with non-grammatical points, a fact which would most satisfy the authors." The Goncourts may well be satisfied. The notes, however, are not only helpful to both pupils and teachers in this respect, but excellent suggestions to teachers in regard to methods are found in them. The importance of "the literary values and poetic side of philology" is emphasized, and the comparison of

styles is urged. It would seem as if students who had read enough to be ready for such work, unquestionably of the greatest value, would not need to be told who Diogenes was, or Euripides, or Dante, or Petrarch, or many another to whom from a line to a half-page is devoted in these notes, though it is better to err on the side of fullness than the opposite.

The temptation is great to consider at least the first selection from "En 18 . ." and entitled "Original! Oh!" consisting of a page and a-half of text, as chosen, among other possible reasons, for the purpose of displaying the erudition shown in the five pages of notes appended to it.

It would be impossible in a few words to discuss in full the long Introduction. It is a brilliant discussion of the Goncourts, following the lines clearly indicated in its closing phrase:

"And in the cathedral of the immortality of art, and in the temple of literature, perhaps a powerful pillar, perhaps a sculptured statue of a niche, perhaps a brilliant fresco, as the future shall determine which phase of their work shall survive, the Goncourts will remain, proof of perpetual mental paradox, of intricate skill in their fashioned work, of harmonies in extraordinary colorations, and as having personally been the incarnation of literary liberty, of personal loyalty, and of supreme, superb and soul-consuming love of Letters."

Only a few points in detail may be noted. Section v is an apotheosis of the Goncourts for their style and "word-work," and is supposed to find its illustration in the Appendices, where the endeavor has been made to resolve the style of the Goncourts into its constituent elements. "The constant precession of adjectives, single or several, instead of French post-position" is to be noticed (p. 321). It might be imagined from such a statement as this, that the precession or post-position of adjectives was merely a matter of individual fancy, modifying the style, the rhythm and the harmonious flow of the sentence, and not frequently inseparable from the meaning to be conveyed, or dependent upon the presence or absence of other modifying elements.

Yet, to verify the statement, open at random any volume of the Goncourts and what is the result? On p. 156, vol. iii, of the *Journal*, there are in post-position, *blanche*, *correctionnelle*, *universelle*, *extatique*, *providentielle;* in preposition, *mauvais*, *viles*, *petit*, *grande*. There seems to be here nothing peculiar to the Goncourts in the position of the adjective. On p. 346 of the same volume we find *doux*, *semblable*, *rauque*, *guttural*, *effrayant*, *terribles*, *sanguinolente*, *violentes*, *délirant*, *blanc*, *violette*, *mystérieuse*, all in post-position, and no adjective preceding its noun. Where is the "constant precession of the adjective?" But probably this volume is an exception. On p. 318 of *Portraits Intimes* are found *nationale*, *généraux*, *publique*, *pacifique*, *nouveau*, *solonnelle*, *divin*, *personnelle*, *rationnelle*, *respectable*, *rares*, in post-position; *bonne*, *belle et noble* and *ferme* before their nouns. This likewise does not suggest the above unqualified assertion of constant precession. Let us try once more. Here on p. 217 of *La Femme au xviii. siècle*, are ten adjectives, six in preposition and four only in post-position. But Corneille puts *proche* before the noun when it seems fitting to him. Molière wrote *les secrètes faveurs* before the Goncourts wrote *une secrète compassion*. *L'extrême innocence* probably means what it says and not *l'innocence extrême*. *La craintive princesse* may be justified by Littré's *une craintive espérance*. *Du jeune officier* is beyond question classical, and the position of *affectueuse* before its noun is readily explained by the long participial phrase following. That the "Goncourt style" is peculiar is not to be denied, but this diagnosis of their style is evidently faulty, at least in the unqualified assertion of constant precession of the adjective.

Another great point of "Goncourt style" is the constant presence of the *-té* termination with its euphonic results. It seems subtly, peculiarly, fitting that this feminine ending, gender and vowel, should occur so often in the book consecrated to *la Femme au xviii. siècle*. A list is given of "such -té presences in it" on p. 358. This list contains one hundred and forty-six words in *-té*. As the volume contains five hundred and twenty-three pages, one might be excused for believing that any writer might use as many, without his style being considered "subtly, peculiarly, fitting" to the treatment of Woman. But it may be that there was no thought of exhausting the possible list of such

words in the volume. In the first thirty pages are found *volonté, liberté, vivacité, société, amitié, maternité, dignité, autorité, timidité, mondanité, utilité, austérité, difficulté, nubilité, pitié, vérité, dureté, paternité, vanité, communauté, spécialité, moitié, sévérité, charité, facilité, curiosité, volonté, familiarité, gaieté, amabilité*—thirty words, or an average of one word in *-té* to a page. This seems hardly enough to give the subtly, peculiarly, fitting flavor, or to attribute any euphonic result thereto. Still, it is, perhaps, more than would be found in Sainte-Beuve, for example. In the first twenty-two pages (as nearly as possible an equivalent of the above thirty pages) of vol. ii of *Portraits Littéraires*, are found *universalité, humanité, fertilité, beauté, netteté, maturité, fatuité, prodigalité, moitié, société, facilité, regularité, fragilité, faculté, liberté, postérité, généralité, qualité, propriété, inégalité, nouveauté, sévérité, réalité, amitié, bonté, activité, vérité, gaieté, variété, naïveté, fermeté*—thirty-one words. Shall we say that Sainte-Beuve considered it "subtly, peculiarly, fitting that this feminine ending, gender and vowel," should occur so often in his "Portrait littéraire" of Molière? The secret of Goncourt style is not found here.

Under the head of "Neologisms, with inclusion of some other words, uncommon when first used by the Goncourts," is gathered a conglomerate mass of words, archaisms and barbarisms, as well as neologisms and words, for whose inclusion here it is difficult to see any reason. Does the use of *le δηλοι ορί* (sic) by the Goncourts or any one else make it French? In vol. ii, p. 37, of their *Journal* the Goncourts write:

"La maladie, avant de tuer quelqu'un apporte à son corps de l'inconnu, de l'étranger, du *non lui*, en fait une espèce de nouvel être, dans lequel il faut chercher l'ancien."

*Non lui* is added to the list of new creations for which "great leaps of gratitude should come to most men." The Goncourts make use of the barbarism, *décessaient*, and we have another example of the "victory of scientific as well as artistic procedure." When, in the French language, was it not permissible to use a noun with the preposition *de* adjectively? In vol. i, p. 261, of the *Journal*, the Goncourts write: "Ces âmes d'hommes de lettres-là font tache dans ce libre xviii. siècle." For such work they deserve our "almost affectionate gratitude." *Cochonner* is pointed out in vol. iii, p. 69, of the *Journal*, where the king of Prussia, half drunk, is made to say: "Comment Dieu a-t-il choisi un cochon comme moi pour cochonner avec moi une si grande gloire pour la Prusse." The old word *mangeaille* in one of its old acceptations (cf. Godefroy) is noted in vol. iii, p. 64, of the *Journal:* "On aura le goût déréglé d'une *mangeaille* pour son odeur avancée qui pue." Such word-work is adduced to show the Goncourts to be

"perhaps the best exponents of the nineteenth century wealth and use of words, polished by art-instinct and permeated with a rare love of literature."

It is difficult to conceive what art-instinct or love of literature is evinced by such words in such settings as these.

In spite of all that might be said in detailed criticism, for the use of teachers who do not have access to a French library, or who are not able to buy all the books desirable, or who have not the time to cull for themselves from the sixty volumes of the works of the Goncourts, this volume of selections, full of interest and suggestion must prove of real value.

L. M. Gay.

*University of Wisconsin.*

---

## *GERMAN LITERATURE.*

*Allgemeine Meereskunde* by Johannes Walther, Professor of Geology and Paleontology, University of Jena. Abridged and edited with Notes and Vocabulary, by Susan Adelaide Sterling, M. L., Instructor in German, University of Wisconsin. D. C. Heath & Co., 1899. 8vo, pp. viii+180.

Teachers looking for a text-book in Scientific German will welcome this little volume heartily. It contains interesting reading matter of intrinsic value and great variety. There are nineteen chapters, headed as follows:

1. Zur Geschichte der Meereskunde. 2. Die Tiefe des Meeres. 3. Veränderungen der Meerestiefe. 4. Die Abrasion. 5. Tektonische

Veränderungen der Meeresbecken. 6. Treibeis und Eisberge. 7. Die Farbe des Meeres. 8. Der Salzgehalt. 9. Die Organismen des Meeres. 10. Die Meerespflanzen. 11. Die Fauna der Flachsee. 12. Die Tiere des Plankton. 13. Die Korallenriffe. 14. Die Bewohner der Tiefsee. 15. Die Sedimente der Flachsee. 16. Vulkanische Inseln. 17. Inselleben. 16. Landengen und Meerengen. 19. Geschichte des Meeres.

The material is edited with care and good judgment. The short vocabulary at the end of the book contains only scientific terms, such as the student is not likely to find in the smaller dictionaries; and the notes preceding the vocabulary, are also mostly kept within bounds. To be sure, some of them, as those on *Azoren*, *Madeira*, *Panama* (p. 171) and possibly also that, on *Poseidon* (p. 166 and p. 49), ought not to be necessary; but perhaps they are, at least in the present eclectic period of education, when nobody can tell what has and what has not been taught or learned. Indeed, in a recent edition of *Auf der Sonnenseite*, I find the note "*David*, King David of Israel, of biblical fame;" and in an edition of *Komödie auf der Hochschule*, I read "*Opposition*, Latin. *Dimensionen*, Latin. *Pamphlet*, French. *Sarkasmus*, Latin." No doubt, there is something in what the Manager says in Faust:

> Die Masse könnt ihr nur durch Masse zwingen,
> Ein jeder sucht sich endlich selbst was aus.
> Wer vieles bringt, wird manchem etwas bringen;
> Ein jeder geht zufrieden aus dem Haus.

Only a word or two on some other notes. The reference in line 1, p. 101, should have been given earlier, as *leuchtende* occurs on the preceding page.—P. 163, N. 2, referring to p. 3, l. 6: *bespeak*, though showing the analogy of word-formation, should not be given along with *speak about* and *discuss*, as an equivalent of *besprechen*.—P. 163, Note referring to p. 4, l. 11: The remark on "the passive sense of the participle" is irrelevant, and may mislead the student. It is only accidental that *zusammenhängende* is here to be rendered by *connected*; what becomes of "the passive sense," if we substitute for *connected with it* the phrase *relating to it?* And what about *erscheinende*, p. 15, l. 18, which is referred to this note? Nor is the first part of the note exact, for a present participle used attributively and "modified by words or phrases" need not "always be translated after the noun modified, and before its own modifier:" for example, *der freundlich aussehende alte Mann=the kind-looking old man*.—P. 168, Note referring to p. 72, l. 4: Is *Sind nur darauf angewiesen . . . . zu folgen* best rendered by *have recourse only to following*, etc.? *Auf etwas angewiesen sein* is *to be dependent upon*, hence almost *to be compelled to do thus or so*, as also on p. 114, l. 25; whereas *to have recourse to* does not seem sufficiently to exclude choice or selection. In fact, the author expresses, in each of these passages, the same idea in two different ways, once by means of *angewiesen sein* and again by a phrase with *abhängig* or *Abhängigkeit*. Avoiding, therefore, the repetition of *dependent* or *dependence*, the first passage might be rendered, freely, as follows: *For* (*doch*) *many Plankton organisms, not having any means of spontaneous locomotion in a horizontal direction, cannot but* (or *must*) *follow the current passively, and thus become dependent upon it.* And the second passage, on p. 114: . . . *but which must resort to importation from abroad, and in its economic relations is dependent upon*, etc.

H. C. Bierwirth.

*Harvard College.*

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### *PHOENIX 56.*

To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes,

Sirs:—For once Professor J. M. Hart must have been nodding. I refer to his remarks on *Phœnix* 56, in your May number (col. 317). I object to his emendation, *ne sorgende slæp*, for these reasons:

1. *Sorgian*, in the poetry, is always used of persons.
2. *Sorgende slæp* is not a translation of *curæ insomnes*.
3. *Ph.* 56 is supported by these parallels: *Wand.* 39–40: *þonne sorg and slæp somod æt gædre earmne anhogan oft gebindað*; *Sal.* 311: *sorh bið swærost byrðen, slæp bið deaðe gelicost*; Wulfstan 139, 26: *ne*

*cymð þær sorh ne sar, ne ænig geswinc, ne hungor ne ðurst ne hefelic slæp* (from *Doomsday* (Bede) 255–7: *ne cymð þær sorh ne sar ne geswenced yld, ne þær ænig geswinc æfre gelimpeð, oððe hunger oððe þurst oððe heanlic slæp*); cf. *Chr.* 1661: *slæp ne swar leger*; *Bl. Hom.* 103. 35: *ne sorg ne wop*. Perhaps the assumption that there will be no sleep in heaven is derived from Rev. 21. 23–25; 22. 5, and from such passages of the Fathers as that in which Gregory the Great speaks of the heavenly Jerusalem (Migne 79. 657–8):

"Claritas quippe divina eam illuminat, sol clarificat justitiæ, lux vera illustrat, lux, inquam, inaccssibilis, quæ non clauditur loco, non finitur tempore, non obumbratur tenebris, *non variatur nocte* ... Canticum lætitiæ *sine fine* in ea cantatur."

4. The attitude of the early Church toward sleep is shown by the vigils of the monks, and by such hymns as Prudentius' *Ad Galli Cantum*, which owes something to passages like Rom. 13.11; Thess. 5. 6. I quote three or four stanzas, by way of illustration:

Hic somnus ad tempus datus
est forma mortis perpetis;
peccata ceu nox horrida
cogunt jacere ac stertere.

Sed vox ab alto culmine
Christi docentis præmonet
adesse jam lucem prope
ne mens sopori serviat.

Ne somnus usque ad terminos
vitæ socordis opprimat
pectus sepultum crimine
et lucis oblitum suæ.
. . . . . .

Tu, Christo, somnum dissice,
tu rumpe noctis vincula,
tu solve peccatum vetus
novumque lumen ingere.

The association of night and sleep with sin may thus, in part, be responsible for the poetic banishment of sleep from heaven.

ALBERT S. COOK.

*Yale University.*

## *DR. FURNIVALL'S 75th BIRTHDAY.*

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—In the middle of July a few students and professors of English Literature met together in the rooms of the Bibliographical Society to consider in what manner the approaching 75th Birthday of Dr. Furnivall could most fittingly be celebrated. Prof. Ker was asked to take the chair. It was resolved that the commemoration ought to have both a personal and a public side, that it should take the triple form of (1) a personal present of such a character as Dr. Furnivall will appreciate; (2) a book in his honour; (3) a special fund to ensure the continuance of his life-work by placing the Early English Text Society in a strong financial position. Mr. George Macmillan (St. Martin Street, W. C.) kindly consented to act as Honorary Treasurer to the Fund, and Mr. Alfred W. Pollard of the British Museum, and Mr. Robert Steel, of the Chemical Society, were appointed Honorary Secretaries. At a subsequent meeting, it was announced that the book in Dr. Furnivall's honour would be edited by Prof. Ker of University College, London, Prof. Napier of Oxford, and Prof. Skeat of Cambridge; and a preliminary circular was drawn up for private circulation, pending the formal opening of the campaign in November, Dr. Furnivall's birthday falling in February. In response to this circular, or to the original invitation, hearty support has been promised by many prominent students of English and lovers of the periods of English literature for which Dr. Furnivall has done so much.

The promises already received have been delightfully enthusiastic, and place the success of the movement as a mark of the esteem in which Dr. Furnivall is held by those who are best able to judge his work, altogether beyond doubt.

As regards our three objects, while it is useless to affect secrecy in a matter in which the students of two Continents are asked to join, it would be a pity to deprive ourselves altogether of the grace of unexpectedness; and sympathizers who wish to know full details as to objects one and two must apply to the Secretaries, or to Prof. Bright. About object three

there is no need for reserve. As the preliminary prospectus tells us:

"By means of the Chaucer and early English text societies the *New English Dictionary* has been made possible, and the study of our præ-Elizabethan literature has been put on an entirely new footing. Abundant honour is due to other workers, but it is the merest truth to say that it is the indomitable energy and courage of Dr. Furnivall which have kept these societies alive for more than a century. We believe that we are consulting what would be his wish in proposing that we should aim at securing the continuity of this work, instead of offering him any expensive personal present. Many manuscripts and printed texts are still inaccessible to ordinary students, and, on the other hand, the list of books which the Early English Text Society has in hand, but which cannot be printed off for lack of funds, is as long as ever. We feel that even those who do not care to possess its annual volumes owe a debt to the Society, and we confidently appeal to all lovers of English to raise special funds by which to give it new vigour."

There is really no limit to the amount of money which could be spent usefully in this third object, and it is to help this that hard work and open purses are needed. The affection which Dr. Furnivall has inspired in scores of personal friends has made the achievement of objects one and two, if we could be content with them, ridiculously easy. But to collect a large sum of money to help forward the study of our præ-Elizabethan language and literature, while they are absolutely the common property of England and America, is by no means easy. What students on both sides of the Atlantic have to do is, in the first place, to give out of their own pockets with a generosity which will put their own earnestness in the matter beyond doubt, and then to appeal to their richer friends to take up the movement on a larger scale. Owing to the mixture of the personal element in our movement it is not intended to publish the amounts of individual contributions, and at the moment of writing only very imperfect information is to hand. But to guide intending contributors it may be mentioned that in England, from the inner circle of professional students and teachers, donations have been received varying from one to ten guineas, and from the outer circle of sympathizers other donations varying from five shillings to twenty-six pounds. Subscriptions from America may be sent either direct to George Macmillan Esq., St. Martin Street, Leicester Square, or to the Furnivall Commemoration Fund, London and County Bank, Henrietta St., Covent Garden, or to George P. Brett Esq., The Macmillan Company, 66 Fifth Avenue, New York, by whom they will be forwarded to London. Americans who know Dr. Furnivall will give, because to know him is to like him and to catch some of his enthusiasm. To them no 'appeal' is needed. But a real appeal is needed to those who in improved dictionaries and text-books, and histories of literature, are entering in a hundred ways into the fruits of Dr. Furnivall's work, and it is hoped that in this matter England and America will at last enter into a generous competition to prove which values most highly the language and literature which are our common heritage.

ALFRED W. POLLARD.

*British Museum,*
*London, W. C.*

## OBITUARY.

### *GEORGE ALLISON HENCH.*

ON a tour in the White Mountains, last summer, Professor Hench of the University of Michigan, was thrown from his bicycle and received injuries which resulted in his death but four days later, on the sixteenth of August.

He was born at Centre, Pennsylvania, on the fourth of October, 1866, and received his collegiate education at Dickinson College, entering the Freshman Class in 1881, and at Lafayette College, where he spent the last three years of his course, and was graduated with the degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1885. He then took up the study of Germanic Philology at the Johns Hopkins University, and remained matriculated there for four years; during the summer semester of 1887, however, he attended courses at the University of Berlin. The excellence of his work at Johns Hopkins won for him, in June of the following year, the Fellowship in German; the remainder of the summer he spent at Vienna, collecting, in the Imperial Library, the material for his dissertation. In June 1889 he received the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. After another year of

study in the universities of Heidelberg and Berlin he was appointed instructor in German in the University of Michigan, where he met with rapid promotion. Within a twelvemonth he was made Assistant Professor of Germanic Philology, and in 1896, though then barely thirty years old, he succeeded Professor Thomas as Professor of Germanic Languages and Literatures, and head of the German Department; which position he continued to hold until his untimely death.

As a scholar, Professor Hench won an enviable reputation at the very outset of his career, by his dissertation on the *Monsee Fragments*, 1890, a "diplomatic-critical" edition of the Vienna and Hanover manuscripts of these Old-High-German texts, with their Latin originals, notes on variant readings, etc., and a grammatical treatise; to which were added, later in the same year, an introduction, an exhaustive glossary, and a photo-lithographic facsimile. It was an excellent piece of work, distinguished by extraordinary discernment of minute paleographic details, by acumen and independence of judgment in the discussion of the origin and the history of the manuscripts, and by accurate scholarship and painstaking thoroughness throughout; qualities which marked the author at once as a man of unusual promise. They were alike characteristic of his second work, an edition of one of the most important Old-High-German translations from the Latin, that of the tractate of Isidorus *De Fide Catholica contra Judæos*. It was published in 1893 as volume lxxii of the *Quellen und Forschungen*, under the title *Der Althochdeutsche Isidor, Facsimile-Ausgabe des Pariser Codex nebst critischem Texte der Pariser und Monseer Bruchstücke*, and was provided, like the author's first publication, with an introduction, a grammatical treatise, and a complete vocabulary. It is now the standard edition of that text, and needs only to be reprinted in a less expensive form, without the facsimiles, in order to be in the hands of every student of Old-High-German. Outside of these larger works, Professor Hench has published but little: reviews of Kuno Fischer's *Goethes Tasso* and Zangemeister und Braune's *Bruchstücke der altsächsischen Bibeldichtung aus der Bibliotheca Palatina*, in the MOD. LANG. NOTES, Vols. vi and ix; an article on the Gothic *gup* in Paul und Braune's *Beiträge*, Vol. xxi; and an article on *The Voiced Spirants in Gothic*, in the *Journal of Germanic Philology*, Vol. i. He had planned and partly begun other investigations, among them a critical comparison of the Paris Isidorus with the Monsee Fragments, and an inquiry into the relation of the Gothic alphabet to the runes; but the conscientiousness with which he performed his regular duties as a teacher and as chairman of his department, as well as those imposed upon him by reason of his administrative ability, left him but little leisure for research. Despite a lingering physical infirmity left by a severe illness two years ago, he continued to attend to every detail of his work, teaching in the summer school besides, and, last year, acting as head of the Romance department as well. He was keenly alive to the opportunities which his position afforded for the improvement of the instruction in modern languages in the secondary schools of his state, and the furtherance of educational interests in general, especially the regulation of College admission requirements. He had given much earnest thought to these subjects, and had formed opinions of a decidedly progressive, not to say radical, nature. It was upon his motion that the Modern Language Association, in 1896, appointed the Committee of Twelve on secondary instruction in the Modern Languages, whose admirable report has just appeared; he was a member of the sub-committee on methods, and at the general meeting of the committee a year ago, he strenuously exerted his influence in favor of high ideals and rigid standards in secondary education.

Thus his activity extended over an ever widening sphere. Taken for all in all, he was, in his devotion to scholarly ideals amid the deadening routine of administrative work, in his thoroughness as a teacher, and in the breadth of his sympathies as an educator, a rare embodiment of all that is best in the American type of a university man.

H. K. SCHILLING.

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

**Baltimore, December, 1899.**

## *GREGORIO SILVESTRE AND HIS RESIDENCIA DE AMOR.*

AMONG the Spanish Poets of the latter half of the sixteenth century the name of Gregorio Silvestre deserves an honorable place. He has, however, been strangely neglected by most writers upon Spanish literature,—perhaps for no other reason than that the volume containing his poems is so excessively rare.

Ticknor,[1] it is true, devotes about two pages to him, but most writers content themselves with little more than the mention of his name. For an account of the life of Silvestre we are chiefly indebted to the essay prefixed to the editions of our poet's works by his friend Pedro de Cáceres y Espinosa.[2]

Gregorio Silvestre was born at Lisbon on December 31,[3] 1520, the son of Doctor Joaõ Rodrigues, physician to king Joaõ III of Portugal, and of Doña María de Mesa, a native of the city of Cádiz. The father, we are told, remained in the service of the king of Portugal until 1527, when the Infanta, Doña Isabel, going to Spain to be married to the Emperor Charles V., he accompanied her as her physician, taking with him his son Gregorio, then seven years old. At the age of fourteen Silvestre entered the service of Don Pedro, Count of Feria,[4] whose house was much frequented by the Spanish poets of his time, among them Garci-Sánchez de Badajoz.[5] As Silvestre devoted his time mainly to music, especially to the playing of the organ, "to which he felt himself much inclined," he did not become known as a poet, as his friend tells us, until he was twenty-eight years old. Then he wrote in the old Castilian measures in imitation of Garci-Sánchez, Bartolomé de Torres Naharro and Don Juan Fernández de Heredia, so that it was said that especially his *redondillas* were unsurpassed.

"After the manner of Castillejo, he at first spoke ill of the Italian measures introduced into Spain by Boscan, but seeing that, with the course of time the sonnets, octaves, and tercets were gaining in favour, he likewise took to writing in these forms, and composed many things worthy of praise."

Silvestre was made organist and choir-master of the Cathedral of Granada on October 12,

1 *History of Spanish Literature*, Boston, 1888, Vol. i, p. 544. A brief and accurate notice of our poet is also found in Fitzmaurice-Kelly's *History of Spanish Literature*, New York, 1898, by far the best of the short manuals.

2 The account given by Barbosa Machado, *Biblioteca Lusitana*, Lisbõa, 1747, Vol. ii, p. 419, is little more than an abridgment of this. There is also a sketch of the life of Silvestre, based upon Espinosa, in the *Vida de Garcilaso de la Vega* by Fernández de Navarrete, Madrid, 1850, which also forms part of Vol. xvi of the *Documentos inéditos para la Historia de España*, Madrid, 1850. See now, especially, García Péres, *Catálogo razonado biográfico y bibliográfico de los Autores Portugueses que escribieron en Castellano*, Madrid, 1890, pp. 518 and foll.

3 His biographer really says he was born "between the last two days of the year 1520;—days which are devoted to the two Saints for whom he was thus called." Silvestre appears never to have assumed or used his family name; the name Silvestre becoming the surname of his children, the records of the Cathedral of Granada, for example, showing that the son, Luis Silvestre, was paid the sum of two hundred and fifty *maravedis* for playing the organ during the month of November, 1566.

4 This was in all probability the fourth Count of Feria. Salazar de Mendoza, *Origen de las Dignidades seglares de Castilla y Leon*, Madrid, 1794, p. 306, says:

"El año de mil y quinientos y sesenta y siete el Rey Católico Don Felipe Segundo creó Duque de Feria á Don Gomez Suarez de Figueroa, quinto Conde de la mesma Feria, y Señor de Zafra."

Zafra was the town in which the mother of Silvestre lived before going to Lisbon. The first Count of Feria was D. Lorenzo Suarez de Figueroa; the second, D. Gómez; the third, D. Lorenzo. Cf. Navarrete, *Vida de Garcilaso*, p. 275. At this point my sources fail, and I infer that the fourth Count is the Don Pedro in the text.

5 Concerning Garci-Sánchez de Badajoz, see the exhaustive and scholarly article by Carolina Michaëlis de Vasconcellos in the *Revista Crítica de Historia y Literatura Espanolas, Portuguesas*, etc., Vol. ii (1897), p. 114 and foll. Nearly the whole corpus of his poetry is published in my edition of the *Cancionero des Brit. Museums*, Erlangen, 1895. Nothing positive is known as to the date of this poet's death. It was supposed by some writers that it occurred shortly before 1527,—by others in 1521. If, however, Silvestre knew Garci-Sánchez, as we have just seen, as a frequent visitor to the house of the Count of Feria *after* 1534, Garci-Sánchez must have lived much longer than is generally supposed. The place of residence of the Count of Feria above is not given, but in all probability it was Zafra, for the Figueroas were the lords of that city. How long Silvestre remained in the service of this Duke we do not know, but he was living at Montilla, as we shall see, when appointed organist at Granada in 1541.

1541,[6] and it was in this city that he passed the rest of his quiet and uneventful life.

The salary attached to the position of organist, as the Cathedral archives show, was fifty thousand *maravedis*, afterwards (in 1559), increased to seventy thousand, with house-rent free. This was not a very princely income when we remember that it takes thirty-four *maravedis* to make one *real*. Silvestre died at Granada on October 8, 1569, and was buried in the Convent of the Carmelites. "He died very poor" his biographer says,—a statement which we may believe in view of the facts just noted. His death is said to have been caused by a pestilential fever, of which his eldest son also died about the same time.

Silvestre was married to D. Joanna Cazorla y Palencia, and left several children. According to Péres (*l. c.*, p. 531), who gives a number of extracts from the *Actas Capitulares* of the Cathedral of Granada, a son was baptized on October 8, 1547, and the record is also given of the baptism of another son Luis, on April 28, 1552, also a daughter Paula, baptized February 7, 1567, and another daughter Mayor, on January 1, 1569, the year of the poet's death.

Three days after Silvestre died, that is, on October 11, 1569, we find his wife and children petitioning the Chapter that the eldest son (Luis) might be appointed organist, "since the father, on dying, left them very poor." The Chapter decided "that it did not think it necessary that the son should remain as organist," and agreed to give as alms to his family the sum of twenty ducats, (a ducat=eleven reals). . . . . The wife's petition to the King for the privilege of printing Silvestre's works is dated at Villa Franca, June 12, 1581, but the first edition of Silvestre's poems did not appear till the following year.[7]

But Silvestre, despite his poverty, was not without a Mæcenas, or rather three of them, as his friend tells us. They were D. Alonso Porto-Carrero and his father, the Marques de Villa Nueva, and also the Marques de Villena. He numbered among his friends some of the most illustrious poets of his time: D. Diego de Mendoza, D. Fernando de Acuña, Luis Barahona de Soto and George de Monte Mayor. Of his personal appearance his biographer says:

"The appearance (*pintura* is the word used by Espinosa) of Silvestre's face and body were so strange that he was called a monster of nature,[8] and was noticed wherever he went, although only of medium stature."

Luis Barahona de Soto alludes to the peculiar complexion of our poet in the lines beginning:

Salistes por el mucho fuego adusto.

Careless he was of his personal appearance, his friend says, "as is nearly always the case with those who are occupied with greater things and are forgetful of self."

The best of Silvestre's poetry, as Ticknor says, is written in the older style,—in the 'old rhymes' as the poet called them. . . . .

"His *canciones* are to be ranked with the very best in the language." . . . . "His longer narrative poems—those on Daphne and Apollo and on Pyramus and Thisbe, as well as one he called 'The Residence of Love'—are not without merit, though they are among the less fortunate of his efforts."[9]

On the other hand another one of his critics, Péres, says that if Silvestre does not to-day enjoy the fame he once did it is owing to the

6 The church record says: "Gregorio Silvestre, organist, and inhabitant of Montilla." The latter is a town fifty kilometres from Córdoba. It was the birth-place of the great Captain, Gonzalo de Córdoba, and is now chiefly famous for its wines.

7 Ticknor, *l. c.*, ii, p. 546, says: "there were five editions of Silvestre's works;—four at Granada, 1582, 1588, 1592 and 1599; and one at Lisbon, 1592." Péres, *l. c.*, gives but four editions,—omitting the one at Granada, 1592.

8 This phrase is doubtless here used in its literal meaning. As is well known, Cervantes used the epithet *monstruo de naturaleza* in speaking of Lope de Vega,—and it is generally understood to be complimentary. In Lope's *Hermosa Ester* (*Comedias*, Vol. xv, Madrid, 1621), near the end of Act 1, Ahasuerus says, in admiration of Ester:

"Tanta belleza
Monstruo será de la naturaleza"

9 Silvestre's amatory poems—of which there are quite a number—were directed to a certain Doña Maria, the *dulce y sabrosa Maria*, "cuya calidad no quiso Cáceres referir, segun dice, por razonables respetos." She died a month and a half before Silvestre, who then resolved to glorify Maria in his verse, as Petrarch had glorified Laura; but death put an end to these plans. A few of his love poems have been included by Böhl von Faber in his *Floresta*, and may be found in volume ii of that collection, among them one of the best, it seems to me, that Silvestre has written, beginning:

Quien amando no es amado,
qué merece?
no mas mal del que padece."
*Floresta*, ii, No. 505.

rarity of his works, and adds that the publication of some of his compositions, such as *La Visita de Amor* and *La Residencia de Amor*, would restore him to the place which is his due.

The *Residencia de Amor* is evidently an imitation of the *Infierno de Amor* of Garci-Sánchez de Badajoz, which latter is, in its turn, modeled after Guevara's *Sepulcro de Amor*;[10] the *Vision de Amor* of Juan de Andujar and the *Infierno de los Enamorados* of the Marquis of Santillana are similar poems.

A few extracts from the *Residencia de Amor* will bring this article to a close, and will prove clearly, I hope, the superiority to its models, of this poem of Silvestre's.

fol. 186 v. Ella reboluió los ojos
por verlo, y boluiólos presto,
rica de dulces despojos,
y el buen amador con esto
se pagó de mil enojos.
Sentóse la gran Señora
a juzgar, porque era ora,
en su lugar preminente,
y no como presidente
sino como emperadora.

---

Alçóse un rumor de amores,
hablandose a las orejas,
no sé que, los amadores,
como en enxambre de abejas
al repastar de las flores.
O bien assi, como quando
con la color desquajando
por una quebrada embia
sus aguas la nieue fria
con furia despedaçando.

---

Boluióles el rostro graue
el juez, y aserenó
aquel murmurio suaue
a quien su lindeza abrió,
y el mirar echó la llaue.
Y puso su color tal
la verguença virginal
como el sol en el poniente,
como purpura de oriente
en el vaso de cristal . . . . . .

---

Despues que Venus habló.
el juez con jesto graue
uno y otro proueyó,
quitó a Lachesis la llaue,
y sus prisiones soltó.
Mandó que fuessen saliendo,
y sus demandas poniendo,
los muertos entre los biuos,
los que son de Amor cautiuos,
y estan por él padeciendo.

---

Vieronse salir al punto
quatro enlutados, ya en dias,
trayendo como en trasunto
en los huesos, á *Macias*,[11]
flaco y biuo, aunque difunto.
La piel enxuta y tostada,
sobre su carne arrugada,
abierto el pecho y costado,
retrato, al biuo sacado,
de la vida enamorada.

---

Paróse en medio el passaje,
y al juez le saludó,
mas dió al Amor, vassalaje,
y humillado le habló
en nuestro antiguo lenguaje.
Diziendo con gran dolor:
*loado seas amor*[12]
*por quantas penas padeço*
*pues que tu fuyste el empieço*
*y el acabo de mi error.*

---

Todo el conclaue al momento
de respecto se mouió,
y le hizo acatamiento
a tanto en amor llegó
de aqueste el merecimiento.
Tras él vino a tal sazon
*Juan Rodriguez del Padron*,
desterrado y perseguido,
y boluiendose à Cupido
le leyó esta peticion:

---

*Si te plaze que en mis dias*[13]
*yo fenezca mal logrado*
*tan en breue,*
*plegate que con Macias*
*ser merezca sepultado:*
*y dezir deue*
*do la sepultura sea:*
*una tierra los crió,*
*una muerte los llevó,*
*una gloria los possea.*

---

Era el segundo de aquellos

10 See *Der Spanische Cancionero des Brit. Museums*, Erlangen, 1895. Cf. also the *Purgatorio de Amor* of Ximénez, *Canc. de Castillo*, Vol. ii, No. 964.

11 Concerning Macias see *Grundriss*, Vol. ii, Part 2, pp. 239 and foll. and p. 426, and Paz y Melia, *Obras de Juan Rodriguez del Padron*, Madrid, 1884, pp. 401 and foll.

12 In the *Cancionero de Castillo*, Madrid, 1882, Vol. i, p. 479, these verses are also put into the mouth of Macias by Garci-Sánchez de Badajoz. In the *Cancionero de Baena*, Madrid, 1851, they are ascribed to Alfonso Alvares de Villasandino. The last two verses are entirely different in the latter version.

13 See Paz y Melia, *l. c.*, p. 12, and *Cancionero de Castillo*, Vol i, p. 370. *Zeitschrift für Rom. Phil.*, Vol. xvii, p. 544 and foll.

quatro, que a Macias lleuaron
tan fino amador como ellos,
por quien los hados labraron
sepulchro donde metellos.
Este *Gueuara*[14] es llamado,
nunca supo ser amado,
y asi cabizbaxo andaua,
y estas palabras hablaua
como un hombre despreciado:

*Las aues andan bolando,*[15]
*cantando canciones ledas,*
*las verdes hojas temblando,*
*las aguas dulces sonando,*
*los pauos haziendo ruedas.*
*Yo, sin ventura amador,*
*contemplando mi tristura,*
*deshago por mi dolor*
*la gentil rueda de amor*
*que hize por mi locura.*[16]

We then learn that the third of these four 'true lovers' that were bearing the body of Macias, is Joan de Mena, and the fourth Diego López de Haro. Then the poet continues:

Pero el juez sentenció
que son todas niñerias
que la ocasion leuantó,
y el fino amante es Macias
que con solo amor murió.
En esto vieron salir
dos sin quererse partir,
puestos en una cadena:
*el Vizconde,*[17] y *Cartagena*[18]
y el uno empeçó a dezir:

*Por vos andamos penados,*[19]

*Señora de hermosura,*
*guia de los desdichados,*
*fuente do mana tristura*
*y de do nacen cuydados;*
*carrera de los errados*
*porque en el camino mueran,*
*dolor de los que en ti esperan,*
*si piensan ser remediados.*

Cartagena replies with "Yo soy vos, y vos soys yo," printed in the *Canc. General*, vol. i, no. 146; then follows, "O amor lleno de extremos," also in *Canc. Gen.*, nos. 143 and 154. The next poet to appear is Xuarez or Suarez[20]

"Xuarez tan conocido
como quantos an passado"

Then follow Don George Manrique, Luys de Biuero, the Marquis of Santillana, and then Garci-Sánchez,

'que perdió el juyzio amando,'

who recites his poem beginning:

'Ymagen de hermosura[21]

Omitting the next stanza here, Silvestre's poem continues:

Entre luego agonizando,
mas muriendo de su gana,
con boz medrosa hablando
el sin ventura *Costana.*[22]
Tal le vieron que qualquiera,
si un muerto morir pudiera,
pensara que yua muriendo,
cantando con ronco estruendo
esta cancion lastimera:

*Como el cisne va sintiendo*[23]
*su muerte quando le viene,* etc.

The other unfortunate lovers that appear and

14 Concerning Guevara, see *Cancionero des Brit. Mus.*, p. 8. and *Literaturblatt für Germ. u. Roman. Phil.*, 1897, Nr. 4. I confess there is still some doubt about the identity of this poet, but until further evidence is adduced, we are justified in believing that he was the Fernando de Guevara mentioned in the Chronicle of Don John II, of Castile, and the author of the *pregunta* in the *Cancionero de Stúñiga*, p. 338. He was made Count of Belcastro by Alfonso V., whom he survived. V. *ibid.*, p. 457. Alfonso died at Naples in 1458.

15 Printed in *Cancionero de Castillo*, i, p. 419.

16 C. G. ventura.

17 Concerning the Vizconde de Altamira, v. *Canc. des Brit. Mus.*, p. 15. Menéndez y Pelayo, *Antología*, vol. vi, p. ccxciii. Menéndez says D. Rodrigo Osorio de Moscoso bore this title. I think this is a mistake. Garci-Sánchez in his *Infierno de Amor* speaks of Don Luis Bivero as being the brother of the Vizconde de Altamira, a fact which is also noted by Menéndez (*l. c.*, p. ccxciv) and goes to prove that my statement in the Introduction to the *Canc. des Brit. Mus.* that the title was borne by D. Juan de Bivero is probably correct.

18 For Cartagena v. Menéndez y Pelayo, *l. c*, p. ccc, and *Canc. Brit. Mus.*, p. 11.

19 Printed in *Cancionero de Castillo*, vol. i, no. 90, where it is also ascribed to the Vizconde de Altamira. See a gloss upon it in *Canc. Brit. Mus.*, p. 135.

20 I have not been able to ascertain anything whatever concerning this Ruy Xuares or Suares, although, according to Silvestre, he seems to have been as well known as any of the poets already mentioned. Three poems by him appear in the *Cancionero de Castillo* nos. 136, 137 and 138 (vol. i). There are some verses addressed to him by Hernan García de Madrid, in the *Cancionero des Brit. Mus.*, no. 304 and note. The verses of Xuares quoted by Silvestre are no. 137 in the *Canc. Gen.*

21 Printed in *Cancionero de Castillo*, Vol. i, no. 272.

22 In the opinion of Menéndez y Pelayo, *l. c*, vol. vi, p. cccxxiv, this is not the Pedro Diaz de la Costana to whom I ascribed the poetry appearing under the name Costana in the *Cancionero des Brit. Museums*, p. 4. Menéndez merely denies my statement,—for I do not know that anybody else has ever attempted to identify this poet,—without assigning any reason for his denial, or giving anything new.

23 Printed in the *Canc. de Castillo*, vol. i, no. 134. The first edition of this *Cancionero* contains five poems by Costana; the ed. of 1527 brings six more.

sing verses from their songs are: Juan Fernández de Heredia,[24] Torres Naharro,[25] and Montemayor.[26]

Enough of the *Residencia de Amor* has been quoted to show what an apt pupil Silvestre was of Garci-Sánchez de Badajoz, and a perusal of his other poetical works will show how easily he surpassed his master, and that, while Silvestre was a brilliant representative of the old school of Spanish poets which he championed so valiantly, he achieved no less success in the new Italian measures.

HUGO ALBERT RENNERT.
*University of Pennsylvania.*

---

## *THE SEMASIOLOGY OF ἐπίσταμαι, verstehen, understand, unterstehen, gestehen, unternehmen, undertake*, etc.

IN his interesting article in the May number of MOD. LANG. NOTES, Prof. Francis A. Wood says:—

"In words expressing separation the meaning 'understand' may develop in two ways: 1. 'separate', 'distinguish'; 2. 'separate, take away, take in', 'perceive'. To the first class belong Lat. *cernō*, *distinguō*; to the second *intelligō*, *percipiō*."

This classification seems to me not quite satisfactory. I propose instead:—

1. 'separate', 'unterscheiden', 'distinguish', or 'gather', 'intelligo', 'understand'. 2. 'grasp', 'begreifen', 'perceive'. 3. 'take in', 'devour', 'swollow (gullibly)'.

(1) arises in such situations as the following. Several people have been talking to me (or in my hearing) about a certain matter, and from these various things said I gather (intelligo) that they mean so and so. Or one person has been talking to me, and from the various elements of his talk I gather that he, etc. Or out of the more or less obscure talk of a person, or the mingled conversation of two or more persons, I separate out or distinguish this or that. "He called to us from the other boat and I could here him, but I could not distinguish (make out) what he said." The same is true of sight, as well as of hearing; for example, in *lego lesen*, 'read'. Cf. *κρίνω*, *(dis)cerno*, *distinguo*, *unterscheiden*, *vernehmen*, OE. *tōscādan*, *tōdǣlan*, *tōsyndran*, *čeosan*, *underġietan*, *intelligō*, etc. The verb of separation that is thus used may have got the meaning 'separate out,' or 'gather' in various ways: (*a*) 'stand between,' 'keep apart,' 'separate,' as in *understand*, cf. below; (*b*) 'stand in front of,' 'keep off (from some one else),' 'separate,' as in *verstehen*; (*c*) 'pluck,' 'tear off,' 'separate,' as in *legō*. This last case is the nearest approach we have to (2).

(2) implies the swift flight of words and the rapid succession of ideas, and the figure is that of seizing or grasping what might easily escape one. Thus we say: "He caught the idea at once," "I didn't grasp his meaning," "He talked to me about the matter, but it quite escaped me that he meant that." The words of this kind are almost countless, for example, *seize*, *grasp*, *catch*, *begreifen*, *(er)fassen*, *comprehendō*, *percipiō*, *capiō*, *kapieren*, and the modern slang *catch on*.

(3) implies reception of what is offered one. Some one tells you about a thing, and you "take it all in." Here belong *aufnehmen*, OE. *underfōn*, *empfangen*, *absorb*, *devour*, *swallow* (gullibly).

Further on, Prof. Wood says:—

"To these [his second class] we can add OHG. *fir-stantan*, MHG. *ver-stān -stēn* 'hinder from, intercept;' ('take to oneself') 'understand, perceive, notice,' OE. *for-standan* 'take for granted, perceive, understand.' That these words came to mean 'perceive, understand,' through 'intercept, take to oneself' admits of but little doubt. This entirely explains their origin and use. Thus OE. *understandan* 'take for granted, assume' points plainly to this origin. . . . As for *stān*, *standan*, that in its transitive use [But this is modern.] means 'cause to stand, stop,' and consequently gives in this compound the meaning 'intercept, seize, take.' . . A reference to Gk. *ἐπίσταμαι* [evidently an allusion to Kluge's "Man erinnert an *gestehen* und gr. *ἐπίσταμαι* 'verstehen' neben Wz. *στα* 'stehen'] in explaining *verstehen*, *understand* is futile, since, in any case, the Gk. word developed in meaning differently. That, if from the root *stā-* 'stand,' would give 'stand over, oversee, care for, give attention to,' hence 'perceive, know, understand.'"

[24] A Valencian knight who died in 1549, v. Ximeno, *Escritores del Reyno de Valencia*, vol. i, p. 102. Fuster, *Biblioteca Valenciana*, vol. i, p. 87. *Canc. des Brit. Mus.*, p. 164. Gallardo, *Ensayo*, appendix to vol. ii, p. 73, col. 1.

[25] Gallardo, *Ensayo*, vol. iv, col. 779, and foll. Ticknor, vol. i, p. 265.

[26] Died February 26, 1561, v. Schönherr, *Montemayor's Diana*, Halle, 1886.

In this I do not agree with Prof. Wood. German *verstehen* and English *understand* are cases of class 1, not of class 2, and so is Greek *'επιστασαι*. OE. *understandan* was originally simply 'to stand between,' and so 'to keep apart,' 'to separate,' and it, like Latin *distinguo*, German *unterscheiden*, etc., got the figurative meaning 'distinguish', 'make out', 'understand', 'know how (to)' (and in German, *unterstehen* passed on to 'undertake (to),' 'presume (to)'). But the same is true of German *verstehen*, OE. *forstandan*. These originally meant 'to stand in front of,' 'to keep off (from some one else),' 'to separate,' and hence 'to distinguish,' 'to make out,' 'to understand.' Just so, Greek *'επιστημι 'επισταμαι* originally means, as still shown in *'επιστημι 'εφιστημι*, 'to stand in front of,' 'to oppose,' 'to check,' 'to keep off.' Hence the meaning 'to separate' and metaphorically 'to distinguish,' 'to understand,' 'to know how,' as shown in *'επισταμαι*.

German *gestehen*, now usually *zugestehen* or *eingestehen*, 'acknowledge', 'confess', originally meant 'to stand with.' So *Ich gestehe dir* was 'I am with you (there),' 'I uphold you (in that),' 'I agree with you,' 'I acknowledge the force of what you say.' The word then passed on to 'I grant,' 'I permit,' and in South Germany in *Ich gestehe mir* (*zu*), it got the meaning 'I permit myself,' 'I take the liberty,' 'I presume,' and thus coincided with *unterstehen*, which, from meaning 'to know how to do anything,' came to mean 'to undertake to do it' (Luther), and then, with the added idea of arrogance, 'to presume,' 'to dare,' etc.

Paul says:—

"*unternehmen* erscheint erst seit dem 18. Jahrh. Es ist zweifelhaft ob es zu *unter* A [=Latin *inter*] oder B [=Latin *infra*] gehört; das erstere ist wahrscheinlich wegen franz. *entreprendre*, dem es nachgebildet sein könnte, doch erscheint in der älteren Sprache in gleichem Sinne *sich eines Dinges unternehmen*."

Wood calls attention to OE. *underniman* 'take', 'steal' 'accept (with the mind).' Though there is no need of assuming the influence of French *entreprendre*, I agree with Paul in seeing in *unternehmen*, etc., an *unter=inter*, cf. *intercipio*, *intercept*, etc.,—so far as these words mean 'grasp', whether physically or metaphorically. We have seen in German *unterstehen* that the idea 'understand how to' can pass on to 'undertake to,' 'presume to;' and it is possible that this is the origin of the idea 'undertake' in *unternehmen*, etc., but I think it unlikely. It is much more probable that these words, when used in this sense, represent compounds with *under=infra* or *sub*, and are thus exact counterparts of *suscipio*. In fact, these words are an excellent illustration of the fact that in *under*, two distinct words have blended (cf. Paul's *Wörterbuch*, Behaghel's *Heliandsyntax* p. 152, Kluge's *Wörterbuch*[6]).

| | |
|---|---|
| (1) *intercipio* | (2) *suscipio* |
| (1) *underniman* | (2) *unternehmen* |
| 'grasp', 'understand' | 'undertake'. |

*Under* in the sense of *inter* is still alive in the phrase *under these circumstances*, which some would-be purists have tried to change into *in these circumstances*.

GEORGE HEMPL.

*University of Michigan.*

## *ZU GOETHES HUNDERTFÜNFZIGSTEM GEBURTSTAG.*[1]

FREUDE und Stolz dürfen dem Deutschen heute wohl die Brust schwellen, wenn er gewahrt, wie die Gebildeten aller Nationen dem Genius huldigen, der uns die leuchtende Verkörperung des Besten ist, was unser Volk empfunden und gedacht, gewollt und gekonnt hat; dem Geistesfürsten, der die Bildung des dahingehenden Jahrhunderts bei den civilisierten Völkern bestimmte und wohl noch auf Jahrhunderte hin weiter beherrschen wird. Ich unterschätze die siegreiche Macht deutscher Musik, Philosophie und Wissenschaft keineswegs, aber im Grunde ist es doch die bezaubernde Gewalt Goethes gewesen, die die edelsten Geister Frankreichs, Englands und schliesslich Amerikas in ihren Bann zwang und sie erkennen liess, dass in den Worten dieses Dichters und seiner grossen Zeitgenossen ein Quell des Lebens rauscht, aus dem ihnen Kraft und ewige Jugend zufliesst.

Gewiss darf man sagen, dass Geister wie Goethe der ganzen Menschheit angehören,

1 Rede, gehalten bei der Gedächtnisfeier in San Francisco, den 28sten August, 1899.

dass die nationalen Unterschiede, die unser Jahrhundert so sehr verschärft hat, und von Tag zu Tag mehr zu verschärfen sucht, auf den höchsten Gebieten des Geisteslebens nicht gelten. Aber wir dürfen uns heute Goethes *als Deutsche* freuen, weil alles Herrliche, was er uns und anderen Nationen zu bieten hat, als reifste Frucht dem deutschen Volkscharakter entsprossen ist. Das ist ja das Grosse unserer klassischen Litteratur, deren Führer unser Goethe ist, dass sie uns nicht als ein nationaler Schmuck gilt, womit wir nach aussen hin prunken, sondern dass sie die Seele unseres deutschen Volkes selbst darstellt; dass unsere grossen Dichter nicht auf Bestellung gleichsam oder mit bewusster Absicht, wie etwa die römischen Dichter, den schönen Hausrat einer nationalen Litteratur lieferten, sondern dass sie Stimme sind alles dessen, was sich sehnend und ahnend in der Tiefe der deutschen Volksseele seit Jahrhunderten regte. Es geht die Sage, dass Homer den Griechen ihre Götter gegeben habe. So haben uns unsere grossen Dichter, vor allem Goethe, das Bild einer neuen, höheren Menschheit in die Seele gesenkt. Und nach diesem Bilde wallfahren die Besten der übrigen Nationen seit beinahe hundert Jahren. Warum lesen und studieren heute Hunderttausende in England, Frankreich und Amerika die Werke unsrer deutschen Dichter, und vor allem Goethes? Weil es sie wie die Offenbarung eines neuen Lebens daraus anspricht, weil darin der Hauch des welt- und schicksal bezwingenden deutschen Idealismus weht, weil sich ihnen daraus der Geist deutscher Freiheit mitteilt.

Denn fragen Sie mich, worin die Wirkung besteht, die Goethe auf uns und die Gebildeten anderer Völker ausübt, so antworte ich: vor allem in der *Geistesfreiheit*, die von seinen Werken und seiner Person ausgeht. Es ist noch nicht lange her, dass man unsern Dichter einen "Fürstenknecht" schalt, dem an der Freiheit wenig gelegen habe. Ja, es giebt heute noch Viele, für die Goethe an den Freiheitsdichter Schiller nicht heranreicht. Die so reden, haben wenig vom Geiste unseres Dichters an sich verspürt.

Gewiss nicht um jene politische Freiheit war es Goethe zu thun, die als billiges Schlagwort sich den Massen so leicht in süssen Phrasen predigen lässt. Aber mit Recht hat er selbst von seinen Schriften und seinem Wesen gesagt: "Wer sie verstehen gelernt, der wird bekennen müssen, dass er eine gewisse innere Freiheit gewonnen hat." Im Mittelpunkt der modernen Geschichtsbewegung steht das Streben nach der Befreiung der Individualität, des "Ich," von allen beengenden Fesseln, sei es nun dass es sich, wie in der Reformation, gegen die Gewalt einer gewissenbeherrschenden Kirche, sei es, dass es sich, wie in der französichen Revolution, gegen die Despotie des Staates auflehnt. Unsere klassische deutsche Dichtung steht in engster Beziehung zu diesem Streben. Ihr war die Aufgabe zugefallen, den gesunden, ganzen Menschen wiederzugewinnen, und ihn zu befreien vom Schutt der Überlieferung, der Gelehrsamkeit und der falschen Kultur, unter dem man ihn begraben hatte. Der deutschen Dichtung war es vorgesetzt, im Heiligtum unseres Gemütes die Quelle wiederzufinden, aus der alles Leben fliesst. Und diesen Befreiungsprozess hat keiner in dem Masse und Umfang vollzogen, wie unser Goethe. Und zwar nicht, indem er uns mit glühender Rhetorik hinreisst, oder als falscher Freiheitsprophet an unsere Leidenschaften appelliert, sondern indem er wie mit unsichtbarer Kraft unsere Seele umfängt und, wie das Sonnenlicht den Keim aus der Erde, so unser eigenstes Selbst aus uns hervorlockt. Ja, das ist das Heilende, das Stärkende und Befreiende von Goethes Poesie, dass, wer sich ihr mit ganzer Seele hingiebt, unbemerkt und heimlich, wie im Jungbrunnen der Sage, sein innerstes Selbst gestärkt, erhöht und befreit wiederfindet.

Darum aber "beherrscht er wie mit Stab des Götterboten" unser Herz, weil er den Mittel- und Quellpunkt des neuen Lebens, das er in uns befreiend weckt, im gesunden, lebendigen *Gefühle* findet. Auch diese Entdeckung gehört Goethe nicht allein an, sie ist gleichsam das Fundament, auf dem unsre gesamte klassische Dichtung aufgebaut ist; aber bei keinem der anderen Dichter, selbst nicht bei unserem grossen Schiller, der sich zu lange und zu viel mit der Schulphilosophie herumschlug, ist das intuitive, durchdringende, allumfassende Gefühl so sehr der Ausgangspunkt des ganzen Wesens, wie bei Goethe. Niemand darf sagen,

dass er in das Geheimnis der Persönlichkeit unseres Dichters gedrungen sei, wenn ihm das nicht in glücklicher Stunde aufgegangen ist. Unsere Zeit mit ihrer öden Verstandesbildung, ihrem Nachäffen der Wirklichkeit und ihrer Freude an den Darstellungen krankhafter Regungen in der Menschenseele, scheint gar kein Verständnis mehr dafür zu haben, was für Goethe das Gefühl bedeutete. Während wir heute unter "Gefühl" nur zu leich teine thränenselige Sentimentalität verstehen, ist Fühlen und Gefühl bei Goethe der Ausfluss frischester Gesundheit, die Thätigkeit jener klaren Einheit aller Seelenkräfte, die wir an ihm zuerst wieder kennen lernen. Sein Gefühl ist nicht blos ein weibliches Empfangen, sondern ein männliches Nachschaffen, nicht blos subjektive Stimmung oder Rührung, sondern ein lebendiges, mannhaftes Fassen und Ergreifen des Weltinhaltes. Noch können wir verfolgen, wie es ihm unter Herders Leitung zur Klarheit wird, dass im lebendigen Fühlen und nicht im abstrakten Denken die Daseinswurzel des Menschen zu finden sei. "Armer Mensch," ruft er damals aus, "an dem der Kopf alles ist." Die Geniezeit beginnt bei ihm, und nun ist es, als breche die langverschüttete Quelle menschlichen Fühlens mit elementarer Gewalt hervor. Wie rauscht und stürmt und wütet sie in den ursprünglichen Szenen des Faust und in den übrigen Werken der Geniezeit, und wie sprudelt und klingt sie in süssen Melodien aus den herrlichen Liedern seiner Jugendzeit! Ja, wir können die staunenden Zeitgenossen wohl verstehen, die zu dem jungen Dichter wie zu einem Gott aufblickten und willig in ihm ihren Führer und Befreier erkannten. Und er selbst ist sich seiner Aufgabe als Führer und Befreier wohl bewusst. Noch im späten Alter ruft er aus:

> Seht mich an als Propheten!
> Viel Denken, *mehr Empfinden*.

und die höchste Aufgabe und Wirkung seines Dichtens bezeichnet er damit, dass er sagt:

> Denn edlen Seelen *vorzufühlen*
> Ist wünschenswerthester Beruf.

Wir brauchen dem Dichterpropheten, der uns vorgefühlt hat, also nur *nachzufühlen*, wir brauchen uns von der Kraft, die aus seinem Herzen strömt, nur hinreissen zu lassen, um die Befreiung zu erfahren, die im selbstständigen, ureigenen Gefühle liegt. Gewiss mit Recht durfte Goethe von sich sagen, als man ihm zu seinen Lebzeiten ein Denkmal setzen wollte:

> Ihr könnt mir immer ungescheut
> Wie Blücher 'n Denkmal setzen:
> Von Franzen hat er Euch befreit,
> Ich von Philisternetzen.

Aber die Freiheit, die Goethe bewirken will, ist keine träge Empfindungsschwelgerei, noch bedeutet sie Zügellosigkeit der Leidenschaften. Das ist das Grosse und Vorbildliche seines Lebens und Schaffens, dass ihm die wahre Freiheit in der Selbstüberwindung besteht. "Alles, was unseren Geist befreit, ohne uns die Herrschaft über uns selbst zu geben, ist verderblich," sagt er in den Sprüchen in Prosa, jener Fundgrube seiner tiefsinnigsten Weisheit. Und wie ein Vermächtnis an sein Volk, ja die Menschheit überhaupt, klingt es, wenn er am Ende seines Lebens den sterbenden Faust ausrufen lässt:

> Ja! diesem Sinne bin ich ganz ergeben,
> Das ist der Weisheit letzter Schluss:
> Nur der verdient sich Freiheit wie das Leben,
> Der täglich sie erobern muss.

Ich weiss recht wohl, dass unsere Zeit sich von der Ausbildung der freien Persönlichkeit, wie Goethe sie verlangte, abgewandt hat, dass sie den Menschen nur als Glied der Gesellschaft gelten lassen will und glaubt, mit der Verwirklichung sozialer Ideen das Heil der Menschheit herbeiführen zu können. Lassen Sie mich, verehrte Festgenossen, am Geburtstage Goethes ins kommende Jahrhundert hineinrufen, in dem die sozialen Fragen ausgetragen werden müssen: nicht dem Herdenvieh, zu dem die alberne Weisheit unsrer Tage die Menschheit machen will, sondern der Gesellschaft thätig freier Persönlichkeiten im Sinne Goethes wird die Verwirklichung des Zukunftsstaates beschieden sein.

Wie Goethe zum Befreier wird, indem er uns lehrt, unser lebendig und gesund fühlendes Ich zum Massstab der Dinge zu machen, so wird er zum Befreier auch durch die Art, wie er der *Wahrheit* nahezukommen sucht. Es heisst uns das Bild des grossen Dichters verwischen, wenn man von ihm immer nur als dem schönheittrunkenen Dichter oder dem Künstler redet. Weit über den engeren Interessen des Dichters und Künstlers steht ihm die Wahrheit, die er

unermüdlich zu erforschen und darzustellen bestrebt ist. Und die Wahrheit ist ihm nicht das Gespinst abstrakter Begriffe und Gedanken, wie es die Philosophie darbietet, sondern er hat sie direkt von den Dingen selbst gewonnen. Seine Art, die Wahrheit zu fassen, hängt aufs engste mit der eigentlichen Stärke seines Wesens, seinem ausserordentlichen Gefühle zusammen. Er will die Wahrheit nicht blos erkennen, er will sie greifen, schauen, geniessen, fühlen. Er kennt die Wahrheit überhaupt nur insofern sie auf den Menschen Bezug hat. Nichts ist ihm verhasster als leerer Wortkram, der die Wahrheit der Dinge verhüllt. Er will die Dinge selbst haben, und nicht den leeren Namen:

> Gefühl ist alles;
> Name ist Schall und Rauch,
> Umnebelnd Himmelsglut.

Das eigentliche Wesen der Dinge ist nach ihm nur in sichtbaren, greiflichen Gestalten zu erkennen, und nicht aus hohlen Begriffen. Daher das unbedingte Zutrauen, das er in die Sinne setzt, als die Werkzeuge zur Erkenntnis der Wahrheit; daher sein Denken in Bildern, das früh schon als "gegenständlich" bezeichnet wurde, womit man sagen wollte, dass "sein Anschauen selbst ein Denken, und sein Denken ein Anschauen sei." Will man sich den Unterschied zwischen dem abstrakten Denken und dem Denken, das Goethe uns lehrt, zwischen der Wahrheit, die jenes giebt und der Wahrheit, die dieses uns vermittelt, recht klar machen, dann denke man sich einen Menschen, der ein Land, sagen wir Deutschland, von der Landkarte kennt, und daneben einen Menschen, der es durchreist und mit eigener, lebendiger Anschauung gesehen hat.

Wer die Geschichte des deutschen Geisteslebens kennt, der weiss, wie Goethes Denken bis auf unsere Tage befreiend wirkte, wie an ihm der deutsche Geist langsam lernte, von der Wolkenhöhe verstiegener philosophischer Spekulation herabzuklettern und an der Wirklichkeit zu gesunden. Und wer unsere amerikanischen Schulen kennt mit ihrem Wortwissen, ihrem leeren Gedächtniskram und ihrem toten Mechanismus, der ahnt, welche Geistesfreiheit, welch neues Leben uns aus der Denkweise Goethes noch zufliessen können.

Aber es hiesse Goethe schmählich misverstehen, wollte man sein Drängen auf Wirklichkeit, sein anschauendes, sinnliches Denken im Sinne des geistlosen Materialismus unserer Tage auslegen. Für ihn gab es keine Materie ohne Geist, noch einen Geist, der sich anders als in den Erscheinungen der physischen und sittlichen Welt offenbare. Während Andere dem grossen Weltgeheimnis durch luftige Spekulationen beizukommen suchen, liegt ihm das grosse Geheimnis eben in den Erscheinungen der Natur offen zu Tage. Aber Erscheinungen sind ihm nur der Schein des dahinter versteckten Wesens, das er durch seine Naturforschung, die so nur ihre Erklärung findet, annäherd zu fassen sucht. Am nächsten steht jenem Urgeheimnis, das wir staunend verehren, nie aber völlig erkennen können, das, was er die Urphänomene nennt, d. h. gewisse letzte Erscheinungen in der physischen und sinnlichen Welt, wie das Licht, das Schöne, die Liebe u. s. w., die wir nicht weiter erklären können, "in denen sich die Gottheit offenbart, hinter denen sie sich aber hält, und die von ihr ausgehen:"

> In unsers Busens Reine wogt ein Streben,
> Sich einem Höhern, Reinern, Unbekannten
> Aus Dankbarkeit freiwillig hinzugeben,
> Enträtselnd sich dem ewig Ungenannten;
> Wir heissen's: fromm sein!

Ja, im letzten Grunde ist alles Denken, Forschen und Dichten Goethes darauf gerichtet, den Menschen zu gewinnen und die Wahrheit, die ihn angeht. Kein Dichter vor ihm, weder Shakespeare noch Sophokles hat uns wie er die Tiefen des Menschenherzens aufgeschlossen und uns die inneren Abgründe gezeigt, die drohend den Menschen umgeben. Und weil er den Menschen so gründlich kannte, hat er es auch vermocht, zu zeigen, wie keiner vor ihm, was der Mensch kann und soll. Nicht in glänzenden Idealbildern, an die niemand glaubt, und die niemand verwirklichen kann, sondern in ewigen, lebenswahren Gestalten, die Fleisch von unserem Fleische sind, in Forderungen, die das Beste in uns zur Thätigkeit aufrufen. Wie die sittliche Welt das eigentliche Ziel Goethes ist, so ist sie auch das Gebiet, wo der Dichter so recht als Schöpfer und Führer erscheint. Denn das ist das Grossartige der Auffassung des Menschenberufs bei Goethe, dass danach der Dichter und mit ihm der einzelne Mensch bestimmt ist, Anteil zu

haben an der Schöpfung Gottes, ja die Schöpfung gewissermassen fortzusetzen auf sittlichem Gebiete. Nirgends findet dieser Gedanke, wie der Mensch so Gott gleichen könne, herrlicheren Ausdruck, als in dem wunderbaren Gedicht "Das Göttliche," der Krone von Goethes Hymnen, früher "Der Mensch" überschrieben:

Edel sei der Mensch,
Hilfreich und gut!
Denn das allein
Unterscheidet ihn
Von allen Wesen,
Die wir kennen.

Heil den unbekannten
Höhern Wesen,
Die wir ahnen!
Ihnen gleiche der Mensch,
Sein Beispiel lehr' uns
Jene glauben.

Denn unfühlend
Ist die Natur:
Es leuchtet die Sonne
Über Bös' und Gute,
Und dem Verbrecher
Glänzen wie dem Besten
Der Mond und die Sterne.

Wind und Ströme,
Donner und Hagel
Rauschen ihren Weg,
Und ergreifen
Vorübereilend
Einen um den Andern.

Auch so das Glück
Tappt unter die Menge,
Fasst bald des Knaben
Lockige Unschuld,
Bald auch den kahlen
Schuldigen Schädel.

Nach ewigen, ehrnen,
Grossen Gesetzen
Müssen wir alle
Unseres Daseins
Kreise vollenden.

Nur allein der Mensch
Vermag das Unmögliche:
Er unterscheidet,
Wählet und richtet,
Er kann dem Augenblick
Dauer verleihen.

Er allein darf
Den Guten lohnen,
Den Bösen strafen,
Heilen und retten,
Alles Irrende, Schweifende
Nützlich verbinden.

Und wir verehren
Die Unsterblichen,
Als wären sie Menschen,
Thäten im Grossen,
Was der Beste im Kleinen
Thut, oder möchte.

Der edle Mensch
Sei hilfreich und gut!
Unermüdet schaff' er
Das Nützliche, Rechte,
Sei uns ein Vorbild
Jener geahneten Wesen!

Gewiss, der Mensch allein vermag das Unmögliche. Lassen Sie uns, verehrte Festgenossen, allem Geschwätz der sogenannten Wissenschaft von Determinismus und mechanischem Fatalismus zum Trotz den Goetheschen Glauben an die Willensfreiheit des Menschen festhalten; denn aus diesem Glauben ist von jeher wie alles Sittliche, so alles Grosse in der Menschheit hervorgegangen. Müssen wir uns nun auch von der absoluten Erkenntnis des grossen Weltgeheimnisses staunend bescheiden, dann ist es uns doch erlaubt, mitzuwirken an dem grossen Weltzweck. Das Sittlich-Gute zu verwirklichen, in welcher Lebenslage wir uns auch befinden mögen, darauf kommt es an. Und zwar nicht, weil wir sollen, wie die Moralisten uns ewig vorhalten, sondern weil wir können, was wir wollen, wenn und soweit wir wollen.

Seine schönste Darstellung findet das grossartige Menschheitsprogramm Goethes in der Faust-Szene, die ich vorhin schon erwähnte. Was Goethe selbst frühe schon fand, das geht dem sterbenden Faust wie eine Offenbarung auf: dass im sittlichen Thun, im Schaffen am Weltzweck, nicht zum eigenen Genusse, sondern zum Wohl der Mitmenschen, die höchste Aufgabe des Menschen liegt. Seinem rastlosen Arbeiten ist es gelungen, Räume für Millionen zu schaffen, und nun sieht er im Geiste, wie diese Millionen, thätig frei, in seinem Sinne das Gute wirkend in endlose Zukunft hinein seine eigene Persönlichkeit zu einem freien, im Dienste des Guten stehenden Volke gleichsam erweitern. Dies ist der höchste Augenblick seines langen, irrenden und strebenden Lebens, und mit Recht darf er ausrufen:

Es kann die Spur von meinen Erdentagen
Nicht in Aeonen untergehn.

Es war wenige Wochen vor seinem Tode, als Goethe diese letzten Worte niederschrieb und damit gleichsam die Summe seines eigenen Lebens und Wirkens ausdrückte. Ja, wir dür-

fen von Goethe selbst sagen: Es kann die Spur von seinen Erdentagen nicht in Aeonen untergehn. Denn noch hat die Poesie nicht aufgehört, auch in der modernen Gesellschaft ihre Berechtigung, ihren heiligen, unvergänglichen Wert zu behaupten. Es ist Goethe gewesen, der ihr die neue, richtige Bahn anwies, und alle modernen Versuche, von dieser Bahn abzuweichen, müssen als verfehlt bezeichnet werden. Während die Naturwissenschaft seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters damit bemüht ist, die Natur als grossen Mechanismus aufzufassen, hat sich das Gefühl des Lebens, von dessen Dasein wir in unserer inneren Erfahrung überzeugt sind, wenngleich es die Wissenschaft nie erklären kann, in die Poesie zurückgezogen. Und kein Dichter hat dem Gefühl des Lebens in unserem Herzen und in der Natur solch gewaltigen Ausdruck gegeben, wie unser Goethe. Während die Forschung sich abmüht, der Natur mit Hebeln und mit Schrauben ihr Geheimnis abzuringen, singt der Dichter:

> Erhabner Geist, du gabst mir, gabst mir alles,
> Warum ich bat Du hast mir nicht umsonst
> Dein Angesicht im Feuer zugewendet,
> Gabst mir die herrliche Natur zum Königreich,
> Kraft, sie zu *fühlen*, zu *geniessen*. Nicht
> Kalt staunenden Besuch erlaubst du nur,
> Vergönnest mir in ihre tiefe Brust
> Wie in den Busen eines Freunds zu schauen.
> Du führst die Reihe der Lebendigen
> Vor mir vorbei, und lehrst mich meine Brüder
> Im stillen Busch, in Luft und Wasser kennen.

Wer darum das Heilige, Ewige und Unverletzliche der Menschenbrust sucht, das uns die Wissenschaft weder geben, noch erklären, noch nehmen kann, der wird sich an Goethe wenden, den tiefsten Kenner und gründlichsten Ausleger des Lebens.

JULIUS GOEBEL.

*Stanford University, Cal.*

## *THE TIME ELEMENT IN ENGLISH VERSE.*

THE relation of so-called "quantity" to the accentual rhythm of English verse has always been the bugbear of metrists. The subject might almost be said to be one which, like prophecy, maddens those who undertake it. From the days of Harvey's and Spenser's correspondence to our own time, it has remained unsettled. The Elizabethans, as is well known, made wild experiments in quantitative measures; much later Goldsmith wrote an essay on Versification,[1] in which he said—among other things—that the only difference between classical metres and ours is that the former count the feet and we count the sylables; Coleridge made a similar mistake in his famous preface to *Christabel;* Southey made the remakable statement that there is one true spondee in English, and only one, namely, *Egypt*;[2] and, almost in our own time, Mr. Spedding and Mr. Munro were led by Mr. Matthew Arnold's remarks "On Translating Homer" into a fruitless contention as to the possibility of classical dactyls and spondees in English. These are a few illustrations out of many.

Nearly all modern writers on the theory of verse have admitted that English words have no fixed syllabic quantities such as are postulated for the classical languages, but that English quantities, so far as they exist, are of varied and (in part, at least) subjective character. Some exceptions, it appears, are to be found among the poets. Thus Charles Kingsley wrote that he believed that "the theory of our prosody depending on accent is false, and that it really is very nearly identical with the Greek."[3] And Tennyson, oddly enough, while he had small respect for English hexameters, seems to have regarded English words as having quantitative values analogous to those of Latin and Greek, for he altered Coleridge's well-known line,

> "In the hexameter rises the fountain's silvery column,"

so as to make it quantitative, and, furthermore, is reported to have said that he knew "the quantity of every English word except 'scissors.'"

Metrists who have agreed that English words have no fixed quantities, are still at variance as to the relation of syllabic time-values to the element of accent in English verse. Two extremes may at once be distinguished: that represented by the common statement of German writers that the rhythm of our verse is based wholly on accent, and that represented most notably by the late Mr. Sidney Lanier, who held that, in the recitation of all English

1 Essay xviii, of the author's collection.

2 Preface to *A Vision of Judgment*.

3 *Letters and Memories*, ed. by Mrs. Kingsley. Vol. 1, pp. 338 ff.

verse, syllabic time-values are made as exact and regular, and hence as accurately measurable, as the notes of music. Mr. Lanier, of course, applied his theory with thorough consistency, and represented all sorts of English verse, even of the Anglo-Saxon period, in musical notation. He is almost universally regarded, however, as having been led by the analogy between music and poetry to carry his method of scansion to quite impossible lengths. The most characteristic example of this is his representation of the common iambic measure in "three-four" time, each accented syllable being given a time-value twice as long as that of the alternating unaccented syllables,—a method of reading which is easily shown to be contrary to all common practice, if we apply it by beating three-four time to any normal passage in Shakspere. It should never be forgotten, however, that a debt of gratitude is owed to Mr. Lanier for being the first to emphasize adequately the musical elements in our verse.

Besides those who make English verse to depend wholly on accent, and those who give the element of accurate time-values in it an equal place with the time-values in music, there has always been a third class disposed to confuse the two elements of quantity and accent. Of this class the most conspicuous example of recent times is Poe, who in his "Rationale of Verse" constantly spoke of accented and unaccented syllables as "long" and "short" respectively, and was even disposed to carry the identification into classical verse itself, treating the accepted scansion of Latin verses with small respect. This essay of Poe's has lately been defended by Mr. John M. Robertson, in the interesting Appendix to his *New Essays Toward a Critical Method* (John Lane, 1897). Mr. Robertson was led by his friendly attitude toward all Poe's work, and his doubtless well-founded impression that Poe is not rightly appreciated in his own country, to develop at considerable length the views of the latter regarding the unsatisfactory character of the accepted treatment of classical measures. Unfortunately he has deliberately perpetuated the confusion which he found in Poe in the use of the terms "accent" and "quantity." He even says that the attempt to distinguish them is ill-founded, "that quantity in speaking *must* amount substantially to the same thing as stress," and—again—that "Poe's identification of stress with length is perfectly sound." Whatever be the fundamental fact here, the use of terms cannot be commended. If quantity is swallowed up in accent, so that accent alone dominates our verse, that is one thing; if the conditions are such that a heavy stress and a long quantity nearly always concide, that is also a possible doctrine; but that is not to say that the two things should be identified. If all tall men wear long coats, or if all tall men wear no coats at all, it follows in neither case that tallness and long-coatedness are the same thing. It has been shown by Helmholtz, and by plenty of others, that duration of sound and intensity of sound are perfectly distinguishable facts, and that the one has no necessary connection with the other. The problem is: how are they related in practice? So far as Latin verse is concerned, it is not hard to see that there was frequently a tendency to *avoid* the coincidence of syllabic length and word-accent.

It has already been observed that Mr. Lanier did good service in emphasizing the analogy between poetry and music, but that he carried the analogy too far. It may, therefore, be worth while to consider, at just this point, the elements of likeness and difference in the two sorts of rhythm. Music and verse are both rhythmical sound: that is the starting-point. Mr. Lanier showed with sufficient certainty that rhythm is dependent upon both *time* and *accent*. He said, to be sure, that "time is *the* essential"[4] element; but this was not altogether what he meant, as he himself pointed out that the ear insistently marks off time by the sense of variation of stress, even when there is no real varation, as in the case of the tick-tack of the clock. He also pointed out how accent marks the rhythm of music quite as truly as that of verse, the rule being that ordinarily the first note of each measure shall receive a special stress. It seems, then, that the rhythm of music is based on the recurrence of accented sounds at equal time-intervals. The same thing is true of the rhythm of verse. For every kind of metre there is a normal verse-rhythm which is present in the mind as the basis on which the verse is built up, no matter how

[4] *Science of English Verse*, p. 65.

many variations may constantly occur. This normal rhythm is formed by a succession of accents at exactly equal time-intervals, such as can be marked off by a metronome, or by the mechanical beating of the foot on the floor. We realize that the verse as commonly read frequently departs from this regularity of intervals, but we say that we "scan" it when we preserve them faithfully. The normal interval we call a "foot." Exception must be taken, therefore, it seems to me, to another contention of Mr. Robertson's, namely, that "there is no time-unit." "Our feet," he says, "are a pure convention, and the sole rhythmic fact is the fluctuant relativity of long and short, or stress and slur." I am glad to be able to believe that the fundamental rhythmic fact is something less vague than this. The almost universal practice of measuring verse by theoretically equal "feet" seems to attest the real character of the intervals which it is sought to measure.

In both music and verse, the rhythm is based on the recurrence of accented sounds at equal time-intervals. The only difference is in the emphasis which one naturally places on the respective parts of the statement. In music we feel that the fact of fundamental importance is that the measures shall be equal in time, and that the accent is a mere means of marking this equality; while in verse we feel that the recurrence of the accents is the fundamental fact (a feeling borne out by the history of English rhythms), and that the equality of time-intervals is an additional source of pleasure. In music we regard any departure from the equal intervals as somewhat exceptional; but it would be strange verse which could be read with any satisfaction to the beat of a metronome. The normal rhythm suffers, however, if either of the two elements is wholly removed.

When we look for further distinctions between verse and music, it is noticeable that not only are the measures of music of mathematically equal length, but that all the sounds bear exact time relations to each other; each is either half as long, or twice as long, or a quarter as long, or four times as long, as its neighbor. The number of the sounds in a given measure, however, constantly varies; it is sufficient that the total length be that of the full measure. In verse these conditions are reversed. The separate sounds, while they vary in length, are not mathematically coördinated as to duration by the ordinary reader. It is easy to see that in a normal iambic line the accented syllables are not prolonged to precisely twice the length of the unaccented; but it is almost as difficult to say just what the time-relation of any two adjacent syllables is, as to say that one is stressed just twice as strongly as the other. On the other hand, the *number* of the syllables (that is, in modern English verse) is tolerably constant. In common iambics we have to explain exceptionally any appearance of three or four syllables in the place of two; while, on the other hand, it would be strange music in which the number of notes within each measure should remain constant for any considerable time.

Two other fundamental distinctions, namely those which differentiate music from verse *apart* from the elements of rhythm, may be mentioned for the sake of completeness. Music, apart from rhythm, characteristically depends on variation of pitch, and only incidentally (as in the case of the changing stops in a pipe organ) on variation of quality of sound, while verse, apart from rhythm, characteristically depends on variation of sound-quality,—that is, on the different sounds of different words,—and only incidentally on changes of pitch. Again, the changing sounds of music are only vaguely symbolic, while the changing sounds of verse are symbolic of definite ideas.

For the sake of easy comparison we may put these observations in a rough sort of table:

| MUSIC. | VERSE |
|---|---|
| *Rhythmical sound,* i. e. | |
| Recurrence of accented sounds at *equal time-intervals.* | Recurrence of *accented* sounds at equal time-intervals. |
| Separate sounds mathematically related in length, and constantly varying in number and arrangement inside rhythmical groups. | Separate sounds not mathematically related in length, and generally with unchanged number and arrangment inside rhythmical groups. |
| Apart from rhythm, dependent on variation of *pitch* (incidentally on *quality*). | Apart from rhythm, dependent on variation of *quality*, (incidentally on *pitch*). |
| Sounds vaguely symbolic. | Sounds symbolic of definite ideas. |

Before we go any further in the use of terms of time-value in respect of English words, it will be well to consider just what we mean by a "long" or a "short" syllable in English. It has already been indicated that the ear recognizes no such exact proportions in the quantity of syllables as are recognized for musical notes, or as are postulated for the syllables in Greek and Latin verse. It must also be remembered that the terms "long" and "short," as commonly used of English vowel sounds, are practically without significance for the matter of real quantity. They are applied for historical reasons, and do not represent existing facts. Thus we call the *o* in "hotel" *long*, and that in "cot" *short*, because the respective sounds are those historically associated with originally long and short vowels; bnt it is fairly clear that the *o* of "cot" takes rather more time in actual utterance than the *o* in "hotel." The so-called "short *o*" is, in fact, a sound so open that it has practically lost the *o*-quality. In the same way what we call "long *e*" is really a closed and prolonged short-*i* sound, and what we call "long *a*" is a short-*e* sound diphthongized. We do not seem to preserve in modern English any intrinsically long vowels such as we assume for early English, and such as we hear in German words like *Saal* and *See*,—sounds which obviously require more time for utterance than others.

How, then, can we speak with accuracy of syllables of different length in modern English? It may be said, in the first place, that we have a large number of genuine diphthongs, such as appear in words like *fine*, *frown* and *foil*. Such double sounds, from the very fact that they *are* double, as well as from the fact that (when of an open quality, as in the instances given) they require the vocal organs to traverse considerable distances in their pronunciation, may be assumed to require a longer time for utterance than monophthongs. Even such a sound as that represented by *au* or *aw*, while it has lost much of its diphthongal quality in modern English, seems still to sound longer than most monophthongs. In none of these cases, however, is it common to make the element of length at all conspicuous, except where it coincides with strong stress, and it requires a moment's reasoning to assure one's self that the vowel in *fine* is any longer than that in *fat*. I question, then, whether the variations of length in our vowel sounds can be regarded as of significance in metrical time. A word like "ought" or "out", should it occur in a place in the verse where a syllable was to be allotted the briefest possible time, would be passed over with due rapidity by nearly all readers, with no thought that the vowel sound required delay.

But in the earlier languages a syllable might be long, not only from containing a long vowel, but from the presence of consonants following the vowel in such a manner as to prolong the utterance of the whole. Are such phenomena found in modern English? It is certain that, as in the case of vowels, prolonged consonantal sounds are avoided, being passed over rapidly wherever possible, and that consonants are almost never doubled in actual utterance. Thus we have no syllables prolonged by double consonants after the manner of Italian words like *madonna;* and it may be said that, for most of us, the attempt to recognize the classical rules of length "by position," such as was made by the Elizabethan metrists, is impracticable. Nevertheless, we cannot get over the fact that two or three consonants commonly require more time for utterance than one; and in words like *strength*, *vexed*, *flushed*, and the like, almost everyone would admit that the length of the whole syllable is quite perceptible. Such syllabic lengths are, in fact, taken into consideration in the writing and reading of verse. Even the juxtaposition of two simple consonants, if they are of such a character that they cannot easily coalesce in pronunciation, will serve to lengthen the preceding syllable by making it—as we say—"closed." If we construct a brief anapestic line like this,

"For a man | ought to rise | by his might,"

the light syllables are all short enough to go "trippingly on the tongue." But if we change it thus,

"For this man | ought by might | to arise,"

we have injured the first and second foot by lengthening. The syllable "this" is too long for its place, by reason of the final *s* and the *m* that follows; and the syllable "ought," which

was short enough before, has been unpleasantly lengthened by changing the following *t* to a *b*, with the result that the *t* in "ought" has to be fully pronounced and, as it were, brought to a stand-still, before the *b* can be begun. A final *r*, it may also be noticed, is particularly tenacious of its right to be counted in syllabic time, in cases where it cannot be carried over into the following syllable. Dr. Child has just called my attention to the possible metrical significance of the negligent pronunciation of final *r* by New Englanders and others. In such cases the consonant is practically lost, and the preceding vowel may be said to be diphthongized, and hence lengthened. On the other hand, if the *r* is really given its rights, as is almost never the case in this country, it requires a perceptible time for utterance. These illustrations will serve to indicate how we may find in English verse syllabic lengths, not absolute but relative, dependent on consonant combinations.

This is perhaps as much as can be admitted for the existence of intrinsically long and short English syllables. But there is much more to be said for syllables made long or short artificially, when certain conditions are present. If we address a friend in surprise, saying "*Why, John!*" we not only throw a heavier stress on both the words uttered than they would ordinarily bear, but we perceptibly prolong them. In like manner, we realize that quite unimportant words, especially proclitics (like the italicized words in the phrase "*The* land *of the* free"), are not only unstressed, but are hurried over in less time than the accented words. Examples like this suggest what may in fact be admitted as a general statement, that accented syllables are very commonly prolonged. This is not, as we have seen, from any essential connection between the nature of accent and the nature of quantity. In certain cases, indeed, unaccented syllables have a tendency to be prolonged even more than those that bear the stress, as in words like *follow*, *morrow*, and others in which the final sound is easily capable of prolongation; in music such words are very commonly sung to an eighth note plus a quarter, although the short note is accented. The frequent coincidence, then, of stress and prolongation is due simply to the operation of the same cause: the grammatical or rhetorical importance of the syllable in question. A syllable will frequently be prolonged simply from its importance in the view of the speaker, or shortened from its lack of importance, just as it will usually be stressed when important, and left with little or no stress when unimportant. The effect will rarely be such as to give the syllables time-values bearing the exact proportions of one to two and the like, and they cannot, therefore, be easily represented by half, quarter, and eighth notes; but the fact that their length does vary with an approach to regularity may explain why Mr. Lanier attempted to represent them by such musical notation. This connection of stress and quantity, too, must be the cause of Mr. Robertson's attempt to identify the two. His statement that "quantity, in fact, in spoken verse, consists of stress *and* of the consonantal total of syllables," may be regarded as much more satisfactory than those previously quoted from his essay. It is, however, not quite accurate, and is made more misleading by what follows.

One other kind of syllable length, and that the most important for metrical purposes, remains to be considered. It is well established that *accents* not only differ according to the familiar syllabic stresses of the words used, but that in the reading of verse they are constantly varied in such a manner as to effect compromises between the regular word-accent and the normal verse-accent, when the two do not correspond of themselves. This being the case, we might well expect similar phenomena in respect of time-values. Separate syllables, the length of which is not based on absolute quantities, and which so easily vary their length in coincidence with varying stress, might be artificially lengthened and shortened in the reading of verse, in order to preserve the equal intervals between the accents, when the words of the verse would not of themselves fall into these equal measures. Such subjective variation of quantities is undoubtedly a matter of constant occurrence in the right reading of verse. It is most commonly practiced, and therefore most easily recognized, in the case of *shortened* time-values,—as in the line

"Do you see | this square | old yel | low book | I toss,"

where it is evident that the syllables "do you"

are shortened so as to occupy together the time of one normal syllable. The opposite practice, that of *lengthening* syllables so as to make up for insufficient time-values, is not so familiar, because it is not so commonly practiced. We shall presently see, however, how it ought to appear.

Once more, for the sake of convenience, let us attempt to put into the form of a summary the conclusions that have been reached. A syllable in English may be said to be *long*, for metrical purposes, from:

[1. The naturally long character of its vowel-sound, due to diphthongization or *open* quality.]
2. The presence of one or more consonants requiring a perceptible time for utterance.
3. Prolongation by the speaker
   a) because of the importance of the syllable, or
   b) because of the time which it ought to occupy in the place where it stands in the verse.

With these facts in mind, let us look at a few verses which will serve to illustrate the varying time-elements that constantly appear in English poetry.

1) The lone | couch of | his ev | erlast | ing sleep.
2) Of man's | first dis | obe | dience, and | the fruit.
3) My very | heart faints | and my whole | soul grieves.
4) Come, dear | children, | let us a | way.
5) Come from the | dying | moon and | blow.

The first of these, if read as a natural prose phrase, has no properly metrical character. The conflict of word and verse accent, in the first place, is such that the second foot contains a "trochee."[5] Moreover the syllables "lone couch" are naturally long, as they stand here emphasized, and "of his" are exceedingly short. In common speech, again, the first three words of the verse would be divided by a distinct pause from the last four. Such a group of words is by no means metrical. We cannot remedy the matter by accenting either "of" or "his," and we should do injury to the sense by depriving either "lone" or "couch" of its full accent. We can, however, *lengthen* the words "of his" beyond what they would have in prose utterance, giving each a distinct moment for enunciation, without any accompanying stress; and this, I believe, is what a reader will do who has an ear for the metre. In this case the phrase-pause between "couch" and "of" will be less marked than in prose utterance. There is another way, it is true, to make the line metrical; that is, by increasing this pause so considerably as to occupy the second half of the second foot, and put "of his," rapidly pronounced as in prose, together with "ev-" in the third foot. Some readers would adopt a method approaching this, but neither sense nor rhythm would be so well satisfied.

5 Although emphazizing, in this paper, certain quantitative elements of English verse, I have no desire to use the well-known classical names of feet to express time-values. They are well established among us as descriptive of phenomena purely accentual, and these are probably the only kind of phenomena which it is practicable to name definitely or to mark off into feet.

The second example quoted, the first line of *Paradise Lost*, is of a similar character. Mr. Robertson makes considerable use of it as showing the vanity of the usual method of dividing verses into equal feet. He quotes approvingly Professor Shairp's account of the way in which Clough explained the line:

> "The two feet 'first disobe-' took up the time of four syllables, two iambic feet: the voice rested awhile on the word 'first;' then passed swiftly over 'diso-,' then rested again on 'be-' so as to recover the previous hurry."

This is indeed the way the words would be repeated in prose, but such a reading neglects the rhythm. In the second foot one could and should give the syllable 'dis-' full syllabic time, instead of hurrying over it as in prose,—a policy assisted by the fact that it frequently has a marked secondary accent. Conversely, one should give 'first' less time-value than it would have in prose, without thereby depriving it of stress. In the fourth foot we have, as so commonly, two very short and light syllables standing on either side of a pause. In prose utterance the word 'and' would be allowed practically no time-value, but would be disposed of, as usual, by a mere nasal click. This *can* be done also in the verse, by permitting the pause at the comma to fill up the fourth foot, and counting 'and' as the opening of the fifth. But I should prefer to give 'and' a fairly distinct utterance for metrical purposes, and thus make out the normal length of the fourth foot,—still leaving the word without perceptible

stress. It is not probable, however, that anyone would read this line so as to preserve feet of perfectly equal time-value. There will commonly be a compromise, in such cases, between the typical syllable-groups of the verse and the syllable-groups of the words considered as prose. But that is not to say that the conception of the normal verse-scheme need be abandoned altogether.

The third line is another quoted by Mr. Robertson as showing the futility of dividing verses into feet. Taken by itself, or even with the following verses, it must be admitted to be puzzling. But when one looks up the poem it is seen to be a clear case of four-stress verse,—"iambic tetrameter."

"The air is damp, and hush'd, and close"

is the first line of the stanza, with perfectly regular feet. With this in mind one sees not only how the line in question is to be explained theoretically, but how it is to be read. "Very" is to be treated practically as a monosyllable,—the "y" a sort of appoggiatura. The third foot ("and my whole") is a substituted anapest, the first two syllables being naturally short and unstressed.[6] The second and fourth feet are spondees, containing syllables naturally long in the place where they stand: one must shorten them a little, in the reading, without omitting the stress, in order to preserve the equality of feet. Read in this fashion, the line is by no means troublesome among a number of tetrameters.

The fourth example is from Mr. Arnold's *Forsaken Merman*, a poem—it may be said in passing—which is throughout a metrical study of the very first order. At the outset the metrical type is dactylic, as is indicated by the second line—

"Down and away below."

In the opening line, however, there is only one dactyl, that in the fourth foot. "Come dear" and "children" must each in some way take the time of three syllables. The additional time may be filled out either by lengthening a syllable in the reading, or by a pause. In this case either method is possible. There are natural places for pauses after "come" and "children"; and the syllables "come" and "child-" are capable of slight prolongation without unpleasant effect. In actual reading one would probably follow each method in part, with the usual compromised result. It is to be noticed that at the end of the line there is a pause equal in time to the two short syllables which would normally conclude the dactyl; then we are ready for the opening dactyl of the following line. The reader with an ear for exact rhythm will find this whole poem full of pauses of delicately varying musical length.

The fifth and last of the examples is also in dacytlic rhythm. The irregularity, again, is that we have two dissyllabic feet, "dying" and "moon and," which should be equal in time to the normal foot "under the." How is the additional length to be obtained? Once more, by either pause or prolongation. A recent writer on metre quotes the line with a scansion which prolongs the second syllable of "dying" so as to make the word a *quantitative* iambus. I am doubtful as to whether any reader would prolong the "-ing" to twice the length of "dy-", but it would not be impossible to do so; at any rate the word is an interesting case where length and stress do not necessarily coincide. If neither syllable is prolonged, a pause may be made after the word which will fill up the length of the foot. In like manner, in the next foot, one may easily prolong "moon," or may pause immediately after it. In both cases I am disposed to think that each method would be followed in part by most good readers.

These examples, taken together, illustrate, perhaps as well as any chosen at random could do, the constant shiftings and compromises of time-value which a reader of poetry should observe in order to preserve duly both the natural utterance of the words and the equality of the rhythmical intervals. It is obvious that any interpretation of a given line will have much that is subjective about it; one cannot hope, then, that any small group of examples will be received as proof of anything, unless the given explanation of their rhythm is admitted to be typical. A prolonged considera-

6 I call "and" naturally short, even where it stands before a word begining with a consonant, because it is so neglected in common utterance that I do not think any ordinary ear would feel the length of the successive consonants. The *d* of "and" is of course rarely pronounced, except where it preceeds a vowel.

tion of the actual reading of poetry has led me to such interpretations as those just indicated. I hope, at some later time, to verify them by facts more scientifically gathered. It must be admitted that comparatively few readers of verse make any consistent use of such a system of compromises as I have described, except in the simple case where syllables are shortened in order to preserve the obvious rhythm. Most readers fix their attention either on the scheme of the metre or on the significance of the words *as words*, and thus exaggerate all the difficulties which variable verse presents. The good reader, it seems to me, is one who can perceive at the same time the fundamental rhythm of the verse and the constantly varying rhythms of the phrases involved, and who will adapt his utterance so as to show the greatest possible respect to both.

Finally, let us try to state as definitely as possible the laws that govern the time-element in our verse.

1. *In the normal verse, accents appear at equal time-intervals.* This, of course, does not preclude such variations as inversion, excess, or defect of accent. The unit of measure, the foot, is the distance not between the accents as they stand, but between the points where they belong in the fundamental rhythm.

2. *There is a tendency toward the coincidence of long and accented, and of short and unaccented syllables.* This is true in two different senses. In the first place, as we have seen, it means that an accented syllable is likely to be lengthened, and an unaccented syllable to be shortened, for the same reason that it is either with or without stress; namely, its relative importance. In the second place, it means that syllables which are of themselves perceptibly long are avoided in those places in the verse where very light syllables are expected, and—to a less degree—are preferred where heavy syllables are expected. This is by no means universally true, particularly in common iambic measures; but in dactylic and anapestic, where there is comparatively little time allowed for the two unaccented syllables in the foot, one is jarred by the appearance of an intrinsically long syllable in the place of one of these light syllables, even if it can be uttered without stress.[7] And a sensitive ear will object to the repeated presence of strong accents on syllables which are by nature incapable of prolongation.

3. *In the reading of verse, the length of syllables is varied artificially, so as to preserve the theoretically equal accent-intervals.*

4. *In like manner, pauses are constantly introduced in order to preserve these intervals.*

Rules 3 and 4, it is hoped, have been sufficiently explained by the preceding examples.

These laws, as here stated, are admittedly somewhat vague. I do not yet feel ready to say whether it may be feasible to state them with more exactness of detail. So far as I am aware, the only systematic attempt in this direction was made by Mr. Goodell, in his article on "Quantity in English Verse," in the *Proceedings of the American Philological Society* for 1885. Mr. Goodell states such laws as these:

"The thesis becomes a triseme if the next syllable bears the ictus. No syllable can be placed in this position which is incapable of prolongation."

"If the arsis is monosyllabic, a short vowel in the thesis followed by a single consonant is not lengthened by the ictus; the arsis is instead prolonged, giving an inverted trochee."

"With arsis monosyllabic, the strong tendency is to make the thesis short."

I have not yet sufficiently mastered Mr. Goodell's terms to be certain of criticising his rules intelligently. Unfortunately, he bases his work on what seems to me the fundamental misconception that the syllables in English verse bear such exact mathematical proportions to each other as to be capable of representation in ordinary musical time. He has, however, the same idea as to what quantity really is in English verse, that I have tried to make clear. Possibly the rules laid down in his article are on the right track. But since in all cases of irregular time-values there is so much room for subjective interpretation, and since the actual time-values of utterance seem usually to be compromises incapable of exact mathematical description, I am disposed to

7 Examples, quoted by Mr. Larminie, are found in the lines:

"For whoso *proves* kingly in craft,"

and

"Time sheds them like snow on *strange* regions."

think it improbable that any statements more definite than the four general laws already laid down would be found practically serviceable. I should certainly (as has already been indicated) not try to name feet or describe lines on any basis other than that of accent. I should call a foot of two stressed syllables a spondee, and one of two unstressed syllables a pyrrhic, remembering that the *length* of the two syllables would vary so as to preserve the general equality of the rhythmical intervals. These terms of classical origin have proved themselves illogically but practically applicable to the phenomena of English verse, and if used with consistency are of no little convenience. The important thing, however, is not a matter of terms; it is that the musical rhythms of our verse, consisting of varying time-values delicately marked off by accents, should not be lost sight of either in theory or practice.

Since most of this article was written, I have been led by Mr. Robertson's allusion to it to read the very interesting essay of Mr. William Larminie on "The Development of English Metres," published in the *Contemporary Review* for November, 1894. I am pleased to find in this what seems to me to be a clearer statement of the place of quantity in English verse than I have found elsewhere in print. This is particularly true in the treatment of long and short syllables in such measures as the anapestic, examples of which I have already borrowed from Mr. Larminie. The principal differences between his attitude and mine may be stated very briefly. He is disposed to exaggerate, as it seems to me, the element of fixed or natural quantity, and to use—at times—the terms "long" and "short" in the purely traditional sense in which they are applied to vowels like *o* in "cote" and "cot." The most marked characteristic, however, of Mr. Larminie's treatment of the subject, is that he assumes certain quantitative principles to be established, and judges the poets by their conformity to them. It cannot be said that he does this with any great injustice. My effort, however, has been what I trust may seem more unpretentious: to call nothing unclean which poets actually practice, but to show how their variations from fixed types may and should be atoned for by the reader. That very much of Mr. Browning's verse is, as Mr. Larminie points out, in theoretically bad quantity, perhaps no one would deny. Neither need it be denied that very much of it *can* be read in satisfactory rhythmical time. The truth is, both sides are right. Some one must lay down laws for the poets, some one for the readers. There is, perhaps, about as much chance that the advice of the one will be followed, as that of the other.

RAYMOND MACDONALD ALDEN.
*University of Pennsylvania.*

## *GRAIL ROMANCES.*

*The High History of the Holy Grail*, translated from the French by SEBASTIAN EVANS. Two volumes. London: Dent.

THE original of the present work is the Old-French romance best known as *Perlesvaus*,[1] the title as given by the translator being an adaptation of the name under which the romance is, at times, referred to in the body of the text.[2] In general, the work is a worthy addition to the number of Grail romances now accessible in English form. The two volumes comprising it are attractively printed in the usual good taste of the *Temple Classics*, and contain, besides the translation itself, an epilogue by the translator on the literary history of the romance. The volumes are also embellished with two frontispieces and title-pages, by Sir Edward Burne-Jones, which add considerably to the charm of the publication.

As a translator Dr. Evans has ably fulfilled a laborious task, and the idea of translating as far as possible in the manner of Malory was certainly a happy one. The class of readers that cares for such works as this is apt to have already some acquaintance with the *Morte d'Arthur*, so that the imitation of Malory's style of writing used by Dr. Evans is as suitable a clothing for the romance as could well have been found. Moreover, in this way much of the original flavor of the romance has been kept, and the mistake so often made of translating into "archaized" Modern English has

1 *Perceval le Gallois, ou le Conte du Graal*, publié d'après les mss. orig. par Ch. Potvin. Tome 1: le Roman en Prose. Mons: 1866.

2 *Li haus livres (estoires) du Graal.*

been avoided. The English version throughout reproduces faithfully the spirit of the French original, and, as far as a cursory perusal reveals, there are no noticeable slips in the rendering of the Old French into English. Fortunately, the beautiful story of the *Golden Circlet*, which is fragmentary in the French edition, has been restored almost wholly by Dr. Evans from the Welsh version of the romance.[3] The lacuna in the French edition, however, might have been more easily repaired if the Oxford manuscript[4] of the romance had been used, in which the story mentioned occurs in its complete form. Dr. Evans does not seem to have known of the existence of this manuscript. In places, perhaps, the translation is a trifle too free; compare, for instance, p. 251 of Vol. II, where the passage: "Je vi le Graal, feit li mestres, avant que li Rois Peschieres Joseph, qui ces onques fu, receulli le sanc Jessu-Crist,"[5] is rendered by: "I saw the Grail, saith the Master, 'or ever Joseph, who was uncle to King Fisherman, collected therein the blood of Jesus Christ." But this is pardonable in a work intended primarily for the general reader and not for scholars. On the whole, the translation seems to have been done with considerable care.

We must judge otherwise, however, when the epilogue to the work is considered. Space does not permit me to enter here into a full discussion of the important questions that Dr. Evans attempts to settle in the course of a few pages; but the chief errors into which he has fallen may be pointed out. To begin with, MS. II, 145 of the Bibliothèque de Bourgogne (Bibl. Royale, Brussels) is not, as Dr. Evans states on the authority of M. Marchal,[6] a sixteenth century manuscript, but one of the thirteenty century. The handwriting of the manuscript indicates its approximate date and Potvin's statement to that effect[7] should have been accepted in preference to a date given in an antiquated catalogue.

3 *Selections from the Hengwrt MSS.* Vol, I, Y Seint Greal, edited, etc., by the Rev. Robert Williams. London: 1876.

4 Catalogued as Hatton 82.

5 Potvin, *op. cit.*, p. 331.

6 *Catalogue*, Brussels, 1842, Vol. I, p. 223.

7 *Op. cit.*, p. 354.

Nor are the manuscript just referred to, the fragments of the romance preserved in a Berne manuscript (Berne 113),[8] and the Welsh translation of the romance, the only copies of the *Perlesvaus* extant, as Dr. Evans supposes. Five additional manuscripts are known which contain the romance some in a nearly complete form,[9] while others preserve only fragments. A list of these manuscripts has been given by Wechssler in the *Zeitschrift fuer romanische Philologie*.[10] Moreover, during the sixteenth century at least two incunabulum editions of the *Perlesvaus*[11] were issued, copies of which can be found in the French National Library. In both of these incunabulum editions, and in two of the manuscripts referred to,[12] the story of the *Golden Circlet*, reconstructed by Dr. Evans in his translation by the aid of the Welsh version of the romance, occurs in full.

On page 285 of Vol. II, Dr. Evans expresses the opinion that the "Seignor de Cambrein, mentioned at the end of the Brussels manuscript as the person who caused this manuscript to be written for a certain 'Jean de Nesle,'" was in reality the Lord of Cambrin (near Béthune), a landed proprietor, and not as Potvin thought, the Bishop of Cambrai. This opinion, however, Dr. Evans himself admits to be wholly conjectural, there being no evidence to show that such a landed proprietor ever existed. Why, then, vary from Potvin on such a slight ground as the difference between Cambrein and Cambrai? Potvin had a good reason for concluding as he did, though he may not state it in so many words. To any careful reader of the *Perlesvaus*, the religious tone of the romance and the proselyting spirit that pervades it, are obvious. Without doubt, the romance is in some way connected with a crusade, and was written (or copied)[13] at the instigation of one to whom the welfare of the Church was of some importance. Such a

8 Cf. Potvin, *op. cit.*, p. 354.

9 Oxford, Hatton 82 and Paris, B. N. F. 1428.

10 Vol. XX, pp. 80, 82: *Handschriften des Perlesvaus*.

11 In these the *Perlesvaus* is published together with the *Grand St. Graal* and the *Quête*.

12 Oxford, Hatton 82 and Paris, B. N. E. 1478.

13 The manuscript which Potvin edited, and which Dr. Evans has translated from Potvin's edition, pretends to be a copy of an earlier version of the romance.

one we know, was John III of Béthune, Bishop of Cambrai. The most natural supposition, thus, is that the "Seignor de Cambrein" is no other than he; while Potvin apparently *is* wrong in supposing that the particular bishop referred to was Roger of Warin, the predecessor of John of Béthune.

If, as Potvin says, the particular copy of the romance mentioning the "Seignor de Cambrein" (the Brussels manuscript) was written as an incentive to a crusade, it is also probable that the "Jean de Nesle," to whom the copy was presented, was the person of this name who took a prominent part in the Fourth Crusade.[14] Whether this Jean de Nesle is the same Jean de Nesle who, in 1225, sold the castellany of Bruges to Joan of Flanders, and to whom Dr. Evans says the copy of the *Perlesvaus* was presented, remains to be determined. In any case there is no reason why the *Perlesvaus* may not have been presented to Jean de Nesle shortly before he sailed for the Holy land in 1203.[15] The possible objection to this early dating is the fact that scholars have hitherto usually considered the *Perlesvaus* to be based on the Manessier and Gerbert continuations of the *Perceval* of Crestien de Troyes; but a careful comparison of the *Perlesvaus* with the continuations of Manessier and Gerbert will show that this theory can hardly be maintained.[16]

Again, Dr. Evans is unwarranted in saying that "in very truth the story of the Holy Grail told is not only the most coherent and poetic here of all the many versions of the legend, but is also the first and most authentic."

There may be a difference of opinion as to whether the *Perceval* or the *Perlesvaus* is the more poetic, though we dare say few will agree with Dr. Evans that the palm belongs to the *Perlesvaus;* but as to the relative age of the two works there is no room for doubt. As Birch-Hirschfeld[17] and Heinzel[18] have shown, the *Perlesvaus* contains undoubted borrowings from the *Perceval* proper; hence, no matter what other features of an earlier literary period than Crestien may be found in the *Perlesvaus*, the latter could not have been written until after the date of Crestien's poem. The passages quoted by Dr. Evans from the *Histoire de Foulkes Fitz-Warin* and the *Roman de Ham* in support of his claim, especially the passage from the former romance outlining the story of Chaos told in the opening chapter of the *Perlesvaus*, are very interesting, but certainly prove nothing beyond the fact that the writers of these romances considered the *Perlesvaus* the most authentic account concerning the Grail. The reason, however, why the *Perlesvaus* was held in such high esteem at the end of the thirteenth century is probably that the mystic, religious character of the romance was then more readily appreciated than the worldy wisdom found in the poem of Crestien.

Finally, Dr. Evans adduces the well-known passage on the Grail in the chronicle of Helinand as "the most striking testimony to the fact that this work is none other than the original Book of the Grail." This passage has been known to students of the Grail legend for some time, and until the appearance of Mr. Nutt's *Studies* had always been held as authoritative for dating the *Grand St. Graal.* Mr. Nutt first threw out the suggestion that Helinand may have had reference to a work from which the *Grand St. Graal* "took over its introduction;"[19] but in no case could Helinand have had in mind the *Perlesvaus.* The Grail, according to Helinand, is the cup of the Last Supper, a conception of the Holy Vessel which is foreign to the *Perlesvaus* and which Helinand must have derived elsewhere.

For the various romances that mention Blihis, compare Heinzel, *Ueber die franzoesischen Gralromane*, pp. 80-81. The suggestion that Blihis was the author of the *Perlesvaus* can hardly be taken seriously.

It is thus to be regretted that Dr. Evans did not devote the ingenuity and diligence which he shows as a translator to the preparation of the epilogue. All that was really needed to make the work complete was a readable pre-

14 Of. Villehardouin, *Conqueste de Constantinople*, ed. by N. de Wailly, Paris, 1872, pp. 8 and 48.

15 The author of the present review has made an investigation of the sources of the *Perlesvaus*, which he hopes shortly to publish. Additional testimony supporting this view will there be adduced.

16 The *Perlesvaus* is, however, probably based on both the Pseudo-Gautier and on Gautier himself.

17 Cf. *Die Sage vom Gral*, Leipzig, 1877, p. 136.

18 Cf. *Ueber die franzoesischen Gralromane*, Wien, 1891, pp. 171 ff.

19 Cf. Nutt, *Studies on the Legend of the Holy Grail*, London, 1888, p. 53.

sentation of the most evident conclusions that have been reached in regard to the composition, date, etc., of the *Perlesvaus*. But, instead, Dr. Evans has chosen to advance a theory of his own, which has the glaring fault of paying little or no attention to the treatment which the romance had already received.

But *The High History of the Grail* should not be neglected because the epilogue to it is poor. The important thing is the translation, and this, as we have said, is admirably done.

Wm. A. Nitze.

*Columbia University.*

## *GERMAN LITERATURE.*

*Deutsches Lesebuch in Lautschrift: Erster Teil*, von W. Vietor. Leipzig, Teubner, 1899. 8vo, xii, 159 pp.

The efficacy of a phonetic transcription in the teaching of English and French has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt. For rationally spelled languages, on the other hand, we may well question its utility; Spanish and Italian pronunciation, for instance, are sufficiently indicated by the addition of a few diacritics to the standard othography. Whether the spelling of German is irregular enough to warrant the use of a special notation, experience alone can decide; and no experiment has yet been attempted on a large scale. To any one wishing to make the trial, the appearance of Vietor's new book offers an excellent opportunity. The *Deutsches Lesebuch* is a small volume, attractive to the eye, clearly printed, and strongly bound. It begins with a table of sounds, followed by several pages of separate vowels and consonants and words, arranged for practice; all of which, by the way, would be unintelligible to an ordinary student without supplementary explanation. Then we have sixty-six pages of prose and verse in the usual orthography, and, facing each page, a phonetic transcription. The selections are fresh, thoroughly German, and adapted to the taste of a child from eight to thirteen years old. They are grouped in three classes: *Bei Scherz und Spiel*, *Bei der Arbeit*, *In Haus und Hof*. At the back of the book are some notes on matters of orthoepy and dialect. The alphabet employed is that of the Association Phonétique Internationale, very slightly modified; though not so pleasing as Vietor's own system, used in his *German Pronunciation*, it serves its purpose well enough. Less commendable is the practice of denoting rival pronunciations by two small letters separated by a sloping line, as in "'zak/xtə," meaning *sagte* with the *g* sounded either as a stop or as a spirant: such an abbreviation is readily understood by a phonetician, but cannot fail to increase the perplexity of a beginner. Furthermore, the bewildering abundance of symbols in the transcription suggests that perhaps too much is indicated; might it not have been better to leave some things—glottal stop, accent, divergent usage, stress-group, or breath-group—to the discretion of the teacher? One may doubt, also, whether the stagy or provincial tongue-tip trill is the best type of *r* to impart to the unsuspecting pupil. However, in spite of any such misgivings, we can unreservedly admire the workmanship of the *Lesebuch*, which, though constructed on a smaller scale, deserves a place beside the *Chrestomathie française* of Rambeau and Passy.

C. H. Grandgent.

*Harvard University.*

## *FRENCH VERSIFICATION.*

*The Technique of the French Alexandrine.* A study of the works of Leconte de Lisle, José-Maria de Heredia, François Coppée, Sully Prudhomme and Paul Verlaine, by Hugo P. Thieme. 8vo, pp. 68.

This monograph, which bears no date on its title page, was a Johns Hopkins dissertation of 1897. It was printed a few months ago at Ann Arbor. Students of French literature were already indebted to its author for his excellent bibliography of nineteenth century writers, published in Paris two years since, and this new publication adds to their obligations.

The dissertation is divided into two parts. Part i consists of an Introduction, which is in reality an historical survey of French versification since the seventeenth century, particularly in regard to overflow, rime and rythm. Here we find the principles of the classical verse stated, the causes for its passage into romantic verse, the rules for the placing of rests in the

classical verse, with remarks on the changes brought about by the romanticists and the contemporary poets, the laws for overflow with the romanticists and Parnassians, the kinds of rime and the many rules governing them, and finally the changes in the principles of rime, overflow and rythm brought about by the Parnassian and Symbolist schools of poetry. All these subdivisions are clearly explained and illustrated by numerous citations, which make of Part i a concise handbook of the poetic art of France for the past two hundred years (pages 5–14).

Part ii contains the new material collected by the author. Each of the poets named in the title is here taken up and studied with reference to the rimes he used, the verse-rests he favored, the hiatus he did not avoid and the rythms he employed. This study is carried on under numerous headings, which are numbered the same in the successive poets, so that comparisons and cross references are easily made. As might be expected Leconte de Lisle requires the largest amount of space (pp. 15–26), and presents perhaps the greatest interest, particularly in the matter of the rythmical systems he practised (pp. 24–26), and the influence these systems exerted on the Parnassians and their successors. De Heredia, who offers but one volume of poems for comment, and who is essentially of the art-for-art school, naturally receives shorter shrift (pp. 26–30). Coppée, more voluminous, and more impartial in his disregard of any system in his use of rythms, demands longer treatment (pp. 30–39), while Sully Prudhomme, who returns to the principles of the classicists, requires least notice of all (pp. 39–42). The last of the series is Paul Verlaine, the leader of the Symbolists, who rejected all law of rime or rythm (pp. 42–51). Dr. Thieme ends his consideration of Verlaine's verse with a table of statistics of the romantic rythms used in the five poets he discusses. These rythms vary from .08 per cent of the total rythms in Verlaine to .008 per cent in Sully Prudhomme. We thus see how the classical rythm is the natural rythm of French poetry.

The monograph is completed by a Résumé (pp. 53–66), which summarizes the points already made: First, a statement of the general laws of versification which obtained in the classical, romantic, and Parnassian schools respectively; then a comparison of the five writers in regard to their observance of rime, verse-rests, hiatus, overflow and rythm, the same captions being used that were employed with each poet separately. On this comparison quite interesting statistical tables are based; for instance, the comparative statistics on romantic overflow, where Coppée shows .13 per cent against Verlaine's .10. And finally a list of the innovations in versifications made by Verlaine and adopted by the Symbolists, grouped under fifteen heads with occasional subdivisions.

"These innovations," our author states, "give the poet absolute freedom in regard to overflow, rime-words, hemistich, and rythm, in short, absolute freedom in the structure of the Alexandrine."

So that the history of French poetry for the last century, like the history of French drama, shows a quite steady progression towards freedom in versification. A bibliography of treatises on versification and articles in periodicals concludes this excellent investigation.

F. M. WARREN.

*Adelbert College.*

---

## *GERMAN CULTURE.*

*Glimpses of Modern German Culture*, by KUNO FRANCKE, Professor at Harvard University. Dodd, Mead and Company, New York: 1898. 12mo, 233 pp.

THE *Social Forces* unrolled before the English speaking world the panarama of German intellectual life as reflected in German literature since the times of the migrations: the little volume entitled *Glimpses of German Culture* in a sense supplements the larger work by dealing in a lighter strain with characteristic phenomena of contemporaneous Germany, political, literary, artistic, academic. The range of interests exhibited in these charming pages is exceptional, and the tone pervading them is one of genuine sympathetic warmth.

The author passes in review a number of works which happily symbolize the status of literature in Germany to-day, among them Hauptmann's "Sunken Bell," Halbe's "Mother Earth," Sudermann's "John the Baptist," the

poems of Johanna Ambrosius, and the stories of Seidel and Rosegger; he furthermore gives us a glimpse of one phase of the artistic life of the Fatherland in a little essay on "Böcklin," speaks with deep appreciation of Hermann Grimm as a critic and an interpreter of culture, and discusses the social and political situation with vigor and insight in two or three more essays which in some respects may perhaps be regarded as the most satisfactory. To our sense the crown of the little collection is the essay devoted to Bismarck. The author explains the great statesman as the most powerful expression of many characteristic traits of national temperament, and corrects more than one false impression and belief current in America and England. The healthy vigor and sound admiration which fill every line of this study are truly uplifting.

In speaking with particular admiration of this last chapter, we do not mean to imply that the remainder of the book is less worthy of our attention. What we need in the country at large is a deeper understanding of modern German culture. For reasons which often elude all definition, there is a certain hostility towards most German importations—a belief that we can learn music and scientific methods from Germany, but nothing more. Especially German art, as the author rightly says, is almost totally unknown on this side of the Atlantic; Lenbach, Menzel, Uhde are names hardly heard here. Hence I should like to have seen a rather more detailed analysis of Böcklin's works, and more references to his colleagues.

Not in all respects, of course, do I find myself able to agree with the author's views. To me Sudermann is not as admirable a writer as he appears to be to Francke. He certainly has great power, his style is terse and vigorous, his versatility remarkable, yet a note of insincerity and an unmistakable striving for effect mar some of his best work. Consequently there is to me a difference in principle between Hauptmann and Sudermann. In Hauptmann we see always the genuine artist at work who, without side-long glances at his public, creates with that naïveté which delights us in all great poets, however complex their personalities. As for Sudermann's "John the Baptist," with all its brilliancy of conception and the skill of construction exhibited in it, it remains a drama without a dramatic figure. John is a subject for an epic or a historical novel rather than for a tragedy; his conviction that he is merely the forerunner of one greater than himself, his inner struggles, and the final collapse of his self-confidence, make him feeble dramatically, though interesting psychologically.

In the chapter on Impressions of Industrial and Patriarchal Germany, I should like to have seen more said of the remarkable points of contact between contemporaneous Germany and America: in both we find the mighty throb of a new beginning, in both youthful exultation and power, an atmosphere of enterprise and dash, and in both a certain lack of mellowness—less surprising here than in an old civilization fraught with traditions of culture.

Francke speaks of the remarkable fact that a nation like the Germans which submits to severe restrictions in matters of state, at the same time is fiercely jealous of its religious and intellectual freedom. He adds: "It seems as if the very pressure from without had helped to strengthen and enrich the life within." I should like to venture an additional explanation. The Anglo-Saxon and the German both crave liberty and are both willing to bleed and die for it. But the former, being essentially political in temperament, insists on institutions free from unnecessary and hampering trammels, while the latter, at bottom unpolitical, but intensely idealistic, will fight tooth and nail for the preservation of the liberty of the intellect. Wieland, who confessed to caring nothing about the form of government under which he lived, was a contemporary of Lessing, one of the greatest champions of intellectual and spiritual freedom; and Lessing was a German, whereas John Hampden was an Englishman.

I take issue with only one more statement, which is found in the introduction. To me, Nietzsche is not characterized by "diabolical contempt for spiritual endeavor." Absurd and hysterical as he often is, his aim in the last analysis must be regarded as the very opposite of "diabolical and unspiritual." Whatever one may think of the "Zarathustra" and

of the feasibility of its doctrine, the underlying idea is deeply spiritual.

If I have expressed a few views different from the author's, it was not in cavil; on the contrary, I regard this book as a delightful and healthy contribution for which we have every reason to be thoroughly grateful.

CAMILLO VON KLENZE.
*University of Chicago.*

## *ENGLISH LITERATURE.*

*Some Principles of Literary Criticism*, by C. T. WINCHESTER, Professor of Eng. Lit. in Wesleyan University. London and New York: The Macmillan Co., 1899.

PROFESSOR WINCHESTER is well known to the American Literary public as one of the editors of the Athenæum Series; as the author of an excellent little manual entitled, *Short Courses of Reading in English Literature*, as an efficient member of the Modern Language Association of America, and of the Commission of Colleges in New England on English Admission Examinations.

In the preface to the volume now before us for examination, the author tells us,

"that he has attempted neither to expound a philosophy of criticism nor to elaborate a critical method; but simply to state some qualities that by common consent are to be found in all writing deserving to be called literature, and to lay down some fundamental principles that must be assumed in all sound critical judgments."

To this province and purpose, Prof. Winchester has strictly and, in the main, successfully confined himself. The results, however, as we believe, would have been more satisfactory had he given us, in a condensed form, "a philosophy of criticism," and had he discussed, in accordance with the title of his book, literary criticism, rather than literature itself.

After an introductory chapter on, "Definitions and Limitations," he proceeds to define literature, to unfold the four cardinal elements that enter into it,—Emotion, Imagination, Thought, and Form,—closing with a study of Poetry and Prose Fiction.

The statement, as the outset,

"that of the three methods of approach to literature, biographical, historical, and critical, literary criticism is concerned only with the third,"

needs modification. Literary criticism has to do with literature at every point of it, in every phase of it, and with every approach to it, especially so, as what may be called the affinities and relations of literature were never more apparent and important than they are now. Moreover, to the author's definition of literature, serious objection must be taken, a definition which goes far to impair the value of the volume. We refer to the extraordinary place which he gives to Emotion. "It is the power to appeal to the emotions," he says, "that gives a book permanent interest, and, consequently, literary quality." All other elements must be subordinated to this and explained by it, and the Professor adds the peculiar statement, "that it is the very transiency of emotion which makes a book of lasting interest." This, to our mind, is a contradiction in terms, not defensible as a theory or in the light of literary history. On such an hypothesis, one is puzzled to see what we are to do with the great intellectual masterpieces of literature, even with the mental side of poetry and fiction. Much of the best literary product of Bacon and Wordsworth, and Coleridge and Browning, and George Eliot and Emerson, must thus be ruled out of court. We find emotion in these authors, it is true, but "intellectualized emotion." Prof. Winchester, in referring to De Quincy's "literature of knowledge and of power," while rightly insisting that all true literature must move men, strangely errs in maintaining that men cannot be moved save through the medium of the feelings. His own discussion of the imagination, intellect, and taste, as expressed in literature, is inconsistent with such a position. In fact, the author is better than his theory and, as he goes on, wittingly or unwittingly teaches a saner doctrine, as he says "that there can be no really profound emotion without something great in the underlying ideas."

It is thus that the submitted definition of Poetry—"That variety of the Literature of Emotion which is written in metrical form"—is a faulty one in its narrowness; the imagination, the taste, and even the intellect not being sufficiently emphasized. In fine, the author's conception of literature, as thus expressed, is too limited and exclusive, and fails to note the

essentially different ways in which the emotions stand related to prose and verse, respectively, and to the respective types of prose and of verse. Forensic prose, and lyric and tragic verse, are emotional in a sense and to a degree not at all applicable to other forms of literature, such as narrative and critical prose, or narrative and descriptive verse, and yet any one of these forms is as truly literature as any other. These comments apart, Prof. Winchester's volume is marked by mature thinking and helpful suggestion; is pervaded by a profound literary seriousness, and an absorbing desire to find and state the last and best word on the various topics discussed. His emphasis of the importance of personality in literature; his reflections on the relation of art to the ideal and the real; his insistence that literary form is based on substance; and his protest against the Experimental School of Zola and the naturalistic tendencies of Modern Fiction, are all indicative of clear thinking and a highly worthy aim to be of valid service in the cause of truth and letters. Moreover, it is in place to say, that it is, in many respects, gratifying to see the Baconian style of Elizabethan days reproduced in modern English prose.

TH. W. HUNT.

*Princeton University.*

## *MEDIÆVAL DRAMA.*

*Jacques Milet's Drama "La Destruction de Troye la Grant,"* its principal source, its dramatic structure, by THOMAS EDWARD OLIVER (Heidelberg dissertation). Heidelberg: 1899. 8vo, pp. 257.

IN the prologue to his play Milet twice mentions its principal source. The story of Troy, he says, had been written before his time "En latin et en prose laye" (cited by Dr. Oliver on p. 11), for which reason he will avoid repetition by dramatizing the matter. Accordingly, returning to his home he finds "ung livre ouvert Faisant des troyans mencion" (Oliver, p. 12), and begins his history of Troy. The Latin work he mentions has been supposed to be Guido de Colonna's *Historia Trojana*. The "prose laye" may have been a French version of Benoit's *Roman de Troie*, or perhaps a translation of Guido. The "livre ouvert" may have been the *Historia*. It could not have been the translation, since Milet states, at the end of his prologue, that his drama was translated from Latin into French (Oliver, p. 11). The purpose of the dissertation in regard to the source of Milet is to see whether this Latin book was Guido's.

Many writers, however, have claimed in spite of Milet's words, that Benoît's poem is the real original of *La Destruction*. Dr. Oliver has, therefore, made a double comparison, between Milet and Guido, on the one hand, and Milet and Benoît on the other. This comparison he has carried on passage for passage and line for line, notwithstanding the absence of critical editions of either of Milet's assumed predecessors. The results of so minute an investigation are given on pages 10 and 11 of the dissertation in these words:

"there exists *no* direct relationship between Milet and Benoît, . . on the contrary, wherever, in an episode common to all three, Benoît's relation differs from Guido, Milet invariably follows Guido, not Benoît. Negatively also, wherever Guido omits anything in Benoît, Milet omits it also. . . . His main source at least is a work in Latin and that work is Guido's. That here and there traces of other influences occur, in no case however of Benoît, will be seen."

These conclusions of the author seem wholly supported by the facts adduced throughout his work. Variations from Guido are either due to Milet's creation of new situations, or occur only in unimportant details. A short summary of these differences would have been useful.

A second object of the dissertation is to determine the merit of Milet as a dramatist, through a careful study of the structure of the play. The results which the author has reached are not tabulated, but may be found under the various subdivisions which were used in the investigation of the source. They might be summarized in somewhat the following order: Milet shows a liking for monologues, justified by the tendency of the plays of his day, for dreams, for fixing on his characters certain traits or attributes, for scenes between lovers and for dialogue passages. It is quite interesting to note that while Milet's dialogue varies most agreeably the plain narrative he could extract from Guido's prose, it is decidedly inferior in dramatic qualities to the lines of Benoît which might correspond. Indeed Milet seems

to be but a poor play-wright. He lacks spirit and vigor. And these deficiencies are by no means atoned for by his poetry. The line of literary generation from Benoît through Guido to Milet is one of decadence.

Dr. Oliver adds greatly to the value of his study by an Appendix which contains excellent tables of proper names. They are arranged in three divisions: those names which are common to Benoît, Guido and Milet; those common to Guido and Milet; those found in Milet only. These tables are accompanied by abundant notes and comments. There is also a list of references to the lines which mention the standards carried by the Greeks and Trojans, and to the refrains which occur in the play. Besides the usual Bibliography and a subject Index to the dissertation, we find also an enumeration of the manuscripts of Guido belonging to the National Library at Paris.

F. M. WARREN.

*Adelbert College.*

## *YIDDISH LITERATURE.*

*The History of Yiddish Literature in the Nineteenth Century*, by LEO WIENER, Instructor in the Slavic Languages at Harvard University. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1899. 8vo, xv+402 pp.

YIDDISH or Judeo-German, also passing under the name of "Jargon," has recently, through the poems of Morris Rosenfeld, the sweet, sad singer of the New York ghetto, compelled the attention even of *littérateurs*. Mr. Wiener's book thus comes timely. The author brings the requisite qualities to this work. He is thoroughly familiar with the subject matter and the peculiar political, economic, and religious atmosphere in which it originated, and is, at the same time, well acquainted with the modern methods and standards of literary criticism. Above all, he is in sympathy with his subject. This one might assume *a priori* in a pioneer work of this nature. The mere bringing together of the material entailed many hardships and sacrifices; for, unlike the historian or critic of any other literature, who has the works to be discussed by him finely printed and conveniently bound, with biographical sketches of the authors and other data in the prefaces, at his elbow, the author of this book had to "compass sea and land," from the Atlantic Ocean, across the Channel, over the Neva and Niemen to the Black Sea, in search of his material or of the unknown writers. But one can notice almost on every page of the book that the author has put his heart into his work, that his pen quivered with emotion while writing it. At the same time he is not an enthusiast; he does not idealize or gloss over shortcomings. On the contrary, if he goes to extremes it is on the side of severity of judgment; it seems occasionally as if he put on the colors too sombre and sable.

The two chief forms of literature, poetry and prose, are treated by Mr. Wiener separately. For the prose at least he distinguishes three periods, each marked by an event or movement in the history of the Jews which influenced the tone and tenor of its literature: 1. from the beginning of the century to 1863, when the Jews, in consequence of the revival inaugurated by Moses Mendelssohn, began to emerge from the dull and dismal night of the eighteenth century; 2. from 1863 to 1880, when under the comparatively benign and liberal reign of Alexander II the Jews cherished the dream of soon being adopted into the family of their gentile fellowmen; 3. from 1881 to the present, when the rigorous laws enacted against them in Russia, and the subsequent persecutions, rudely and cruelly awakened them from this dream and made them realize that they were still a "separate people" among the nations, but, at the same time, roused their national consciousness. Selections from several writers are given in a chrestomathy at the end of the book.

It may be doubted whether this arrangement is a happy one. It entailed a certain looseness in the handling of the material, and many repetitions. In fact, it would seem as if Mr. Wiener first wrote the second part of his work, which treats of the prose writers, and as if the first part, the poetry, was an afterthought, and was combined with the second without much editing. If the author had treated both forms of the literature synchronistically, taking author by author, and illustrating his comments on them by characteristic passages from their writings, he would not only have made his

book more interesting reading, but would also have facilitated for the average reader the task of forming an opinion of the literary value of Judeo-German literature, and of the merits of each writer.

By way of introduction, Mr. Wiener discusses in a philosophical manner the genesis and the characteristics of Judeo-German, and its relation to literary German. He rightly contends that Yiddish was not a spontaneous creation of the Jews; its origin and development was due to the isolation of the Jews: their seclusion in the ghetto in Germany, and their emigration from Germany to Slavic countries.

"Previous to the sixteenth century the Jews in Germany spoke the dialects of their immediate surroundings," and "had there been no disturbing element introduced in the national life of the German Jews, there would not have developed with them a specifically Judeo-German literature."

But few Germanists will accede to the author's claim for Judeo-German of the position of a normal and legitimate dialectic development of German. It is not merely, or chiefly, its adopting foreign and heterogeneous elements, as is the case with Osmanli and Hindustani, which the author quotes as parallels, but its mutilating and deforming the "Germanic basis" that makes it appear a hybrid speech. But whatever it is, being the mental vehicle of about five million people not the lowest in the scale of culture, it has sufficient interest not only from the linguistic or literary point of view, but also from the historical and the ethnological.

In an interesting chapter on "Folklore" we learn that Jewish folklore is in richness, variety, and imaginative inventiveness not inferior to that of any other nation. Tales, or cycles of tales, have been woven around Abraham, Moses, King David, the prophet Elijah, who since his assumption into heaven has become a kind of Jewish Hermes who mediates the news between heaven and earth, Maimonides, who in addition to his attainments in science and philosophy, has been made a wizard, and other biblical and rabbinical worthies. But in a spirit of broadest toleration the heroes of other nations have been admitted into this fairy temple. So, for instance, Alexander the Great, Don Quixote, Bevys of Hamptoun, and even uncouth, cannibalistic Polyphemus.

Coming to the Judeo-German poetry, Mr. Wiener mentions as its chief characteristics that it is "retrospective" (? introspective ?), that it has "more or less of a lyrical tinge," and that the objects and phenomena of nature are "never used for their own intrinsic interest." These characteristics may, however, be said to have been accentuated, rather than engendered and developed, by the conditions under which the Jews lived. They are peculiar to the Semitic genius. The Semites excelled only in lyric poetry and its variety, gnomic or didactic poetry; in the epic and the drama they did not advance beyond the merest beginnings, as we find them in the historical books of the Old Testament, in the book of Job, and in the Canticles. The poetical treatment of nature for its "intrinsic interest" is foreign to the ancients in general. Even the classical poets, with few exceptions, handle nature only in interweaving it with human action and emotion.[1] In the Old Testament especially, nature is nowhere spoken of as a self-subsistent entity, but rather as the manifestation, one might say as the outer garment, of Jehova, and all its phenomena and workings are referred to him. The thunder is Jehova's voice, the lightnings his servants, the winds his messengers, the sun the herald of his majesty, etc.[2] In fact, the Semitic languages have no word denoting the totality of the phenomenal existence, corresponding to the Greek κόσμος and Latin *mundus*, because the universe was not present to the Semitic mind as a separate, independent entity.[3]

The poetry has for its subject mostly the vicissitudes of Jewish life and is, as a rule, turned to the serious if not sombre side of life. It is either elegiac in tone, bewailing the trials and sorrows of life, or didactic, urging the people to enter upon the path of reform and progress. Romantic love, around which most of the lyrics of other nations move, is scarcely represented in Judeo-German poetry, a feature which it shares with the pre-Alexandrian Greek literature.[4] The Judeo-German poetry attains its height in Ehrenkranz, Perez, and

1 Cf. Shairp, *Poetic Interpretation of Nature*, pp. 119, 157.

2 Cf. Pss. viii, xix, civ, etc.

3 Cf. E. Landau, *Die dem Raume entnommenen Synonyme für Gott in der neuhebräischen Litteratur*, pp. 1–4.

4 Cf. E. Bennecke, *Women in Greek Poetry*.

Rosenfeld, who sometimes rise above the misery of the ghetto and the quarrels of the reformers and Hasidim, and sound a higher key-note, setting in vibration the deeper chords of the human heart. Such, for instance, are Ehrenkranz's *Der Elender sucht die Ruhe* (*Chrestomathy*, p. 260); Perez's *Monish* and *The Sewing of the Wedding Gown*, of which Mr. Wiener says:

"If Thomas Hood's 'Song of the Shirt' is to be compared to a fine instrument, then this poem is a whole orchestra from the sounds of which the walls of Jericho would fall;"

and Rosenfeld's *Aufn Busen vun Jam* (*Chrestomathy*, p. 324). Rosenfeld is certainly unsurpassed as regards pathos, chasteness of diction, and music of rhythm.

The prose literature of the first period, that is from 1817 to 1863, is of a "militant nature." Its battle-cry was the "Haskala," that is, the enlightenment which broke forth from Germany. While it was thus obviously much influenced by German writers, it is interesting that the translation of Campe's *Discovery of America* was the first book of a secular nature to be published in Judeo-German, and the "first ray that penetrated the ghettos from without." The leaders of this period were the noble Isaac Baer Levinsohn (better known for his excellent works in Hebrew), Lefin and Aksenfeld.

In the second period, from 1863 to 1881, the battle for which the men of reform had fought seemed won. Jews were admitted to the Gymnasia and Universities, and participated in large numbers in the culture of their Christian fellow-citizens. There seemed, therefore, to be no *raison d'être* for a specifically Judeo-German literature, and there was in consequence a falling off in the quantity and quality of Judeo-German writers. Still that period produced such writers as Solomon Jacob Abramowitch and Linetzki, who carried Judeo-German letters to a height of artistic finish and stylistic perfection never attained before. In *The Little Man* and *The Meat Tax*, in which he portrays the Jewish communal boss who, *mutatis mutandis*, is not unlike the American political boss, and in *The Dobbin*, in which, under the guise of a psychological study of a demented, a kind of a Wandering Ahasuerus, he delineates the history of his people, Rabinowitch appears as a writer imbued with the earnestness and intuition of a prophet. Livetzki's chief work, *The Polish Boy*, in which he depicts with Rabelaisian humor the evolution of a Hasid, is a perennial fountain of mirth, and is justly considered a classic. This period also witnesses the foundation of literary periodicals intended to concentrate and direct the various forces.

The misfortunes which overwhelmed the Jews at the beginning of the third period in the year 1881, gave a new impetus to the Judeo-German literature, and was of paramount influence upon its tone and tenor. The Mendelssohnian reform and the Russian assimilation having failed to prove panaceas for all the ills of the Jew, the better writers of this period endeavor to "create a national consciousness, to instill in the people the idea of human dignity, to develop individual character." The literature of this period is thus at once national in spirit and universalistic in character. It applies itself to the Jew, not as a Jew, but as a man. At the same time it is raised, as regards method and form, to the plane of Western literature. We find in the periodicals departments for criticism, bibliography and science. Three writers are prominent in this period who, different as they are as regards talent and method, are all alike imbued with a lofty ethical conception of the mission and function of a writer, and animated by a sincere devotion to the welfare of their people: Mordechai Spector, who, though not possessed of a brilliant imagination, is, in his portrayals of the life of the humbler classes, distinguished by a sincere, objective, and calm though sympathetic tone, and a dignified diction; Solomon Rabinowitch, impulsive, enthusiastic, and artistic, who addresses himself to the middle class, though as a true artist he "writes to entertain, not to instruct;" and Leon Perez, whom we have already met as a poet. Mr. Wiener says of him that he

"must be counted among the greatest writers not only of Judeo-German literature, but of literature in general at the end of the nineteenth century."

This judgment is borne out by his "*Bontsie Silent*" (*Chrestomathy*, p. 332), which in its ad-

mirable blending of deep pathos and quaint humor, seems to be woven of tears and smiles.

The Judeo-German productions in this country are in the main an echo of those in Russia, whence most of the *literati* have come. Still, as might be expected, the different political and economic conditions here have not been without modifying influence. On the whole, it can be said that the Judeo-German literary activity is here, in consequence of the greater political liberty, more varied and more conform to modern methods, but falls below that of Russia as regards originality. If Judeo-German is in Europe an anomaly, the outgrowth of abnormal conditions, it is in this country an exotic plant.

As Mr. Wiener in the prefatory note to the *Chrestomathy* holds out to us the prospect of a larger selection from Judeo-German literature, I would express, in closing, two *desiderata*. The first is that he introduce it with a grammatical outline of Judeo-German, comparing its morphology and structure with that of German. This would enable one to form an estimate of the linguistic aspects of Judeo-German. The second is that he provide it with an archæological glossary explaining the religious or ritual expressions and phrases. This would enhance the interest and facilitate the understanding of the book for the general reader.

I. M. Casanowicz.
*National Museum, Washington, D. C.*

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### *DONNE'S "ANYAN."*

To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes,

Sirs:—In the well-known poem of Dr. John Donne, *Hymn to God, my God, in my Sickness*, the fourth stanza is as follows:

> "Is the Pacific sea my home? Or are
> The eastern riches? Is Jerusalem?
> Anyan, and Magellan, and Gibraltar?
> All straits, and none but straits, are ways to them
> Whether where Japhet dwelt, or Cham, or Shem."

Manifestly the only proper name requiring explanation is "Anyan," which is ignored both in Grosart's large edition of Donne, and in the Muses Library volumes. We are sometimes reminded of Donne's own remark (*Satire* ii):

> "As slyly as any commenter goes by
> Hard words, or sense."

A short time ago, one of my pupils, Mr. John Rush Powell, in looking over a newspaper reprint of a map of the world made by Ortelius in 1587, found the word "Anian" marked in the Northern portion of what is now Alaska. I immediately wrote to Mr. John Fiske about it, and he courteously furnished me with the necessary information. "Anian" or "Anyan" was a theoretical N. E. passage from the Pacific to the Atlantic, more than a hundred years before Behring Strait was known. This is the "Anyan" of Dr. Donne's poem, and not only satisfactorily explains what has been to many students a puzzling word, but adds a peculiarly interesting bit of geography to a poem already remarkable for its fantastic use of maps and its plays on the word "strait."

Wm. Lyon Phelps.
*Yale University.*

### *TOMAR LAS DE VILLADIEGO.*

To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes,

Sirs:—While there is no doubt that the Spanish phrase *tomar las de Villadiego* or *tomar las calzas de Villadiego*, means 'to flee hastily,' or better 'to run like forty,' nevertheless, the origin of the expression is an unsettled problem. The following note, while not solving the difficulty, is suggestive in that it makes *Villadiego* not a man but a town or city.

In Act xii of *La Celestina*, the servants Parmeno and Sempronio are in the street waiting for their master's return from his visit to Melibea. They are discussing the dangers of the situation, and in the course of their conversation the following passage occurs:

Sempronio. Anda, no te penen á tí esas sospechas, aunque salgan verdaderas. Apercíbete, á la primera voz que oyeres, á tomar las de Villadiego.

Parmeno. Leido has donde yo: en un corazon estamos. Calzas traigo, y aun borceguíes desos lugares (ligeros) que tú dices, para mejor huir que otro. . . . . .[1]

In the year 1631 appeared James Mabbe's English translation of the *Celestina* in which the above passage is rendered as follows:

Semp. Let this passe, ne'r trouble thy head with these jealousies, and suspitions of thine; no, though they should happen to

1 *Bib. de autores españoles*, Vol. iii, p. 51, col. 1.

be true. But prepare thy selfe, and like a tall souldier, be in readinesse upon the first Alarme, or word given, to betake thee to thy heeles. Do like the men of Villa-Diego, who being besieged, ranne away by night, with their Breeches in their hands.

PARMENO. Wee have read both in one booke, and are both of the same mind; I have not only their Breeches but their light easie Buskins, that I may runne away the nimbler, and out-strip my fellows.....[2]

CHARLES CARROLL MARDEN.
*Johns Hopkins University.*

## *NOTES ON LYRIC POETRY.*

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—In an article published under this title in No. 4, Vol. xiv of MOD. LANG. NOTES, Professor Schelling gives an interesting list of lyrics whose general theme is that of a lover attacking the citadel of his mistress' heart, or defending his own fortress. To further complete this list, there might be added a poem—one of the earliest pieces on this subject—by that "ingenious" writer George Turberville. In his "*Comparison of the Lover's Estate with the Soldier's Painful Life*" (Chalmer's *English Poets*, Vol. 2, p. 588), we have one of Turberville's many imitations of the pieces contained in Tottel's *Miscellany*. In this case, he has plainly taken as his model Lord Vaux' poem cited by Professor Schelling, though he has changed the situation by causing the attack to be made on the citadel of Beauty. The description of the siege, the assault, and the final capitulation of Beauty is elaborated at some length in Turberville's customary manner.

EDWARD B. REED.
*Yale University.*

## *TOTE.*

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—This word, signifying to carry, as a load, seems first to have come into use in Maryland or Virginia. It is supposed, I know not on what grounds, to be of African origin, introduced by the negroes. The dictionaries seem not to know of any early use of the word.

In the Proceedings of the Maryland Assembly, 1697, is embodied a communication from a planter who reports that one of his servants was shot by an Indian while "he was toting fence rails."

WM. HAND BROWNE.
*Johns Hopkins University.*

[2] *The Tudor Translations*, Vol. vi, London, 1894, p. 196.

## BRIEF MENTION.

The National German-American Teachers' Association has issued circulars, in German and English, setting forth its purposes and policy, and making various announcements. The objects of the association, as there stated, fall under two distinct heads: 1. The improvement of the American schools in general and of the teaching of German in particular, with a view to an ultimate reform of the entire educational system; 2. The promotion of the intellectual and material interests of the German teachers in this country, and the preservation of the German language among the German-born population. The membership of the association is not, however, restricted to teachers of German birth or parentage; all persons interested in the aims of the society can be admitted and are invited to attend the annual meeting to be held at Philadelphia after the close of the school year. The *Erziehungsblätter*, hitherto the official organ of the association, will be succeeded by a new publication entitled *Pädagogische Monatshefte, Zeitschrift für deutschamerikanisches Schulwesen;* the last two words of the sub-title, which are, in their proper sense, applicable at most to the educational institutions maintained by German-speaking communities, congregations, or denominations, and using the German language as the medium of instruction, are here meant to include the teaching of that language and of its literature in this country generally. The new periodical is to differ from the existing ones in discussing principally pedagogical questions, and in having a special department devoted to the lower schools, from the *Kindergarten* to the Grammar School.

The list of school editions of German texts has recently been augmented by a number of attractive short stories. The easiest among them is Johanna Spyri's *Rosenresli*, which in subject-matter, and in the extreme simplicity of its style, is admirably suited to beginners who have overcome the first difficulties of connected prose. It is edited by Miss Helene H. Boll, for D. C. Heath & Co., on a partly novel plan intended to facilitate and ensure the acquisition of a working vocabulary and to develop skill in sight-reading. To these ends special stress is laid upon the etymological identity of German and English words, cognates being printed, in the vocabulary, in heavy type; and the new

words on each page are given in a separate alphabetical list, which is to be studied before the text is read. The plan is well carried out, with but few errors and omissions. The notes, however, are needlessly burdened with philological lore taken (not always correctly) from Kluge's *Wörterbuch*, and are marred by enigmatical phraseology and by numerous bad mistakes.

Next in point of difficulty are to be mentioned the stories edited by Dr. Bernhardt in three little volumes, published likewise by D. C. Heath & Co.: Frommel's amusing *Studentengeschichte "Eingeschneit;"* Baumbach's *Waldnovellen*, most of them humorous, and all of them intensely German; and a collection of stories in a more serious vein, comprising, under the general title *Stille Wasser*, Anna von Krane's *Solitaria*, Hans Hoffmann's *Der faule Beppo*, and Wildenbruch's *Das Orakel*. Each volume is provided with a full vocabulary and is carefully and judiciously annotated; a few errors and infelicities of translation do not detract from the good quality of the editor's work.

While these texts are elementary, that is, suitable for the first and second years of a High School Course in German, Wildenbruch's *Der Letzte*, edited by Dr. F. G. G. Schmidt (for D. C. Heath & Co.), can hardly be taken up before the third year. It may be doubted, moreover, whether a story so exquisitely sad should be put into the hands of any but fairly mature students beyond High-School age; even the average College Freshman is not likely to appreciate its beauty, or to read it in a sympathetic spirit. The notes in Dr. Schmidt's edition contain a good many errors; there is no vocabulary.

Three other new texts of intermediate grade present, in an abridged form, larger works of acknowledged literary excellence. The abridging is in all three cases done with much skill and good judgment. Dr. B. W. Wells has succeeded in the difficult task of making Sudermann's *Der Katzensteg* available for schools without interfering with the continuity of the story, or materially impairing its power; only one objectionable passage seems to have escaped his vigilance. The notes, though very concise, generally give sufficient help; but a fuller discussion of the numerous allusions to unfamiliar customs and institutions would have been welcome to many teachers. The book is published, as is also the next one, by D. C. Heath & Co.—Freytag's *Aus dem Jahrhundert des grossen Krieges*, so far as it treats of the thirty-years' war, has been edited by Dr. L. A. Rhoades, with generally excellent notes which, however, should also explain such terms as *Stände*, *Reichsstädte*, *gestäupte und gebrannte Dirnen*, of the meaning of which the English equivalents given in the ordinary dictionaries do not convey to the mind of the average student any adequate idea.—Rosegger's *Die Schriften des Waldschulmeisters*, edited by Prof. L. Fossler, for Henry Holt & Co., is comparatively simple in style, but teems with uncommon words and constructions, and with Austrianisms, which, though carefully explained in the notes, make this text suitable only for students with a pretty well developed German *Sprachgefühl*; the philosophical spirit of the whole and the minute descriptions of nature, too, will appeal only to minds of a certain maturity.

---

The Modern Language Association of Ohio held its Tenth Meeting at Columbus (Ohio State University), Ohio, on Friday and Saturday, December 1 and 2. The following Program of exercises was carried out.

FIRST SESSION (Friday, December 1, 2 P. M.).

1. Address of Welcome, William Oxley Thompson, President, Ohio State University: 2. President's Address, The Modern language Teacher's Task in the High School, William Werthner, Principal Steele High School, Dayton: 3. Das Hildebrandslied, Miss Sarah T. Barrows, North High School, Columbus; 4. The Allegorical Structure of the Roman de la Rose in English Literature, Edgar E. Brandon, Miami University: 5. Wagner's Music Dramas, Miss Clara Orton, Central High School, Columbus: 6. The Use of Phonetics, Charles W. Mesloh, Ohio State University: 7. Nomination of Committees, etc.

SECOND SESSION (Saturday, December 2, 9 A. M.)

1. From the Diary of a High-School Teacher of German, Gustav F. Broemel, High School, Springfield: 2. Le français n'est pas encore une langue morte (to be read in French), Mlle. M. C. Duby, Columbus: 3. Schiller's Wilhelm Tell, (to be read in German), Miss Marie Duerst, Steele High School, Dayton: 4. Schiller's Development as a Dramatist, Willis A. Chamberlain, Denison University: 5. Business Session, Reports of Committees, etc.: 6. The Middle English Legend of the Assumption, George H. McKnight, Ohio State University.