# MODERN

# LANGUAGE NOTES.

---

A. MARSHALL ELLIOTT

*MANAGING EDITOR.*

JAMES W. BRIGHT, HERMANN COLLITZ,

*ASSOCIATE EDITORS.*

---



VOLUME XVII

1902

BALTIMORE: THE EDITORS.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

## ORIGINAL ARTICLES.



## REVIEWS.

CORRESPONDENCE.

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

**Baltimore, January, 1902.**

## *IS "WE" THE PLURAL OF "I?"*

THERE are few of us, I imagine, who have not of late repeatedly encountered the assertion that "we" is not the plural of "I." In most cases, I dare say, the statement is allowed to lapse without debate, as a mere intellectual subtlety, of no practical importance in grammar, even if it were true. But the discovery is claimed by so many different persons,[1] is seconded by so many names of authority, and is apt to be announced with such assurance of its originality, profundity, and importance that we seem challenged either to speak our objections now, or ever after hold our peace. The arguments brought forward to support this novel proposition may be summarized as follows:

1. *We*, *nos*, ἡμεῖς, etc., in our Indo-European tongues are apparently not derived from the same root as that found in the singular *I*, *ego*, etc. There is therefore a presumption against regarding those words as in any sense the plurals of these.

2. *We* is not even a plural at all, but only a "multiple"; for a plural is a group whose units are alike in kind, whereas the units which compose this group are diverse in kind, including for example, *I*, *thou*, and *he*.

3. *I* represents a conception absolutely unique, and can therefore have no plural. "There simply can be no plural," says Prof. Owen, "of that of which there is but one."—Such is the determined assault; let us see what may be offered in the way of defence.

I. As to the first point, it may be noted that whatever force there may be in the presumption that because *I* and *we* are etymologically dissociated, they cannot be associated as members of the grammatical group known as an inflection, is met, and more than met, by the counter-presumption arising out of the unanimity with which grammarians of all time up to the present, and of all tongues, have agreed so to treat them, and have done so in spite of the fact that the etymological discrepancy must have been quite as apparant to them as it is to us. Such composite groups are, indeed, by no means rare in those practical classifications of *facts* which alone are the purpose of grammar;—witness such series as *am—be—was*, *go—went*, *aller—vais—irai*, *esse—fui*, ὁράω—ὄψομαι—εἶδον, *good—better*, *bonus—melior*, ἀγαθός with its multiple associates, and many more that might be named. It seems strange, indeed, that it should never have occurred to those who make use of this argument that if it proves anything, it proves too much; for there is the very same presumption against considering *me* as the objective of *I*.

II. The second argument—that *we*, though confessedly designating a group, is not a plural at all, inasmuch as the units composing the group are not alike in kind,—really begs the question at issue by the definition of plurality which is assumed as its premise. The validity of this definition, therefore, demands our next attention. In the first place we note that it is wholly *à priori*, resting upon a merely logical or subjective distinction which there is no attempt whatever made to demonstrate as actually binding within the objective realm of grammar. Whether a word is or is not plural *in grammar*, depends not necessarily at all upon the presence or absence of certain logical ideas in its content, but only upon the way in which language for its own ends has seen fit to rate it. Multitudes of expressions distinctly involving the idea of plurality are grammatically singular; as, for example, *crowd*, *forest*, "*Full many a flower is born to blush unseen.*" Others again, with no such distinct plurality of idea, are grammatically plural; as, for example, *riches*.[2] Indeed, the category of plurality

1 I am not at the present moment so circumstanced as to be able to trace the discovery to its first announcement; nor, if I were, should I think it worth the while. The statement is found, without indication of its source, in Prof. Sweet's *New English Grammar, Part I*, a text-book which has been in use some dozen years or more, and I have read its announcement as an independent discovery by Prof. Edward T. Owen, of Wisconsin, in his thesis for the doctor's degree entitled *A Revision of the Pronoun*, and bearing date of January, 1900.

2 The history of this particular form does not at all affect the present discussion, which is concerned with the *status de facto*, not *de jure*.

can scarcely be said to emerge at all in the field of grammar proper, save as the idea of plurality finds linguistic reflex in the behavior of speech; that is, in the use of distinct inflectional forms, and of certain prescribed sequences to signalize its presence. Were it not for these, questions of plurality or singularity,—like the kindred questions of abstractness, concreteness, generality, particularity, and so forth,—would be lexical merely—would be questions of verbal definition—as for the most part they actually are in uninflected languages such as the Siamese and the Chinese. But our present discussion, be it remembered, is grammatical. The question whether *we* is or is not a plural resolves itself then into the following: 1. Is it plural in form? 2. Is it plural in syntax? As to the last question, it will not be necessary now to do more than call attention to the practical unanimity with which our European tongues have assigned plural forms to the pronouns in question. The image and superscription on these well-worn coins of speech is often nearly effaced. But where it can still be deciphered, in whole or in part, the legend seems unmistakably plural.3

All the testimony that we have, moreover, goes equally to show that these words require the plural sequence;—and the testimony on this point is by no means scanty. We freely waive citation of the most obvious sequence of all, the sequence of the nomination of these pronouns by the first person plural of the verb in all cases where the verb-plural distinguishes person. To cite this sequence would be too much like the circular reasoning we just now had occasion to deprecate. But apart from this case, wherever the verb-plural is plural merely and not personal as well, the common plural form must *de rigueur* attend upon the pronouns in question; and in all cases where it is possible, adjuncts of these pronouns, whether attributives, oppositives, or predicate-complements, must wear the plural livery. So then, tried by the only tests which are conclusive in grammar—and upon this point I apprehend there will be substantial agreement—*we* is plural after all, multiple though it be. And if our definition of plurality is so drawn as to exclude "multiplicity," so much the worse for our definition. The definition will have to be cut to fit the facts, not the facts cut to fit the definition.

III. We pass on now to the third point of the argument: that there can be no plural of *I*, because *I* represents an idea absolutely unique, and therefore incapable of pluralization. This argument rests upon the tacit assumption, again *à priori*, that the plurals of substantive words always faithfully preserve the ideal content of their singulars. But in the realm of fact, that is, in the realm of grammar, it is frequently found that plurals are formed from singulars for which, according to this assumption no plurals should be possible. What actually happens is, indeed, no mystery: the added idea of plurality is allowed to modify the original concept of the singular so far as may be necessary to permit the combination of the two. The ordinary nouns of material, such as *iron*, *copper*, *ice*, for example, in their unmodified form present the idea of continuous or indeterminate substance, an idea quite as difficult to pluralize as the idea of the pronoun in question. But these nouns are free to form plurals,—*irons*, *coppers*, *ices*,—which, through reaction of the plural idea, come to designate discrete or determinate substance. Precisely similar is the case of abstract nouns, whose plurals are inevitably concrete; as, for example, *cold*, *colds*; *health*, *healths*; *ira*, *irae*, in Vergil's famous line. So too with proper names,—the class, forsooth, to which our latest wisdom would assign the very pronoun in question.4 I may say "Smith," and then I doubtless mean a certain definite personality, a concept absolutely unique in any given utterance of mine as that which is indicated by "I." But I may also say "the Smiths," though the uniqueness evaporates quite in the pluralization. Here too, as in the other case, the argument proves too much, since it would make plurals impossible to all substantives save class-nouns only. In all these cases, no doubt, the plural becomes *logically* the plural of a class-concept,

3 The exceptional usage of the Sanskrit, where case-endings of the singular number seem imposed upon a stem plural, or 'multiple,' in signification, need not be considered here, since no one yet, as far as I know, has ventured to suggest that *we* is singular.

4 Owen: *A Revision of the Pronoun*, p. 122.

whose singular we may often represent by the help of some extraneous modifier; as, for example, when we say "a Smith," or "the flat-iron." But grammatically *Smiths* is the plural of *Smith*, and *irons*, of *iron*.

Lest doubt still linger about either of the points we have just been discussing, let me present one more example, not more conclusive perhaps as to principle, but more strikingly parallel in detail to the case of *I* and *we*. The word *mother*, used absolutely, is as unique as the word *I* itself;—by no possibility of thought could a person have more than one mother. Both words, *I* and *mother*, represent termini of personal relationship—the one of relationship of uttered speech, the other of relation to origin and source. That one represents the hither terminus of relation, and the other the farther terminus, makes no difference whatever in this discussion. Both relations, moreover, are "egocentric" according to Professor Owen's phraseology, and he would doubtless make haste to characterize *mother* as "pedocentric" also. Both terms are subject to instant and complete shift as to designated object upon shift of the speaker's rôle in the "colloquial drama." Both relationships, however, are unique in one direction only; the unique *I* may have for its co-respondent a singular *thou* or a plural *you;* while *mother* may stand in her peculiar relation to me alone, or to others with me. That is, the designated point in each case is still a point, whether it be the origin of a single line or of several divergent lines. But when I pluralize the word *mother*, and say, for instance, "Their mothers were all present," I multiply, so to speak, the points of origin, and postulate a series of parallel relationships-in-fact, wherein the uniqueness is distributed, and so in appearance lost. Precisely in the same manner, when I say, "We have come to help you," I have merely multiplied my points of origin, and have postulated a series of parallel relationship-in-speech. In my capacity—self-assumed it may be—of speaker *pro tem.*, I associate with me in the declaration a number of persons, each one of whom, I intimate, would say, were he to speak for himself, "I have come to help you."[5] If *mothers* then, of undoubted right is the plural of *mother*, I see no valid reason why *we* should not equally be the plural of *I*.

And finally, turning from this immediate discussion to the general field, we find that the work to which our new grammarians have set themselves is really great and important,—nothing less, in fact, than the revision and reconstruction of the grammatical categories and of grammatical system. To its accomplishment they have brought most admirable zeal and enthusiasm; and they have certainly made a promising beginning. But in the light of the present discussion it may not be superfluous to remind them to beware of attempting to administer the objective realm of grammar as if it were a mere dependency of the subjective realm of logic; to beware of mistaking dialectical subtlety for the firm grasp of fact; and to beware of following the deceitful glare of paradox rather than the steadfast lamp of Truth.

CORNELIUS BEACH BRADLEY.

*Paris.*

5 In certain forms of concerted speech, as, for example, in the chorus of a Greek tragedy, the distribution of relation or function which we have just seen made in thought, is made in actual fact, and each member for himself says "I."

---

## *ETYMOLOGICAL NOTES.*

1. NHG. *eilen* from MHG., OHG. *īlen* is compared with ON. *il*, OE. *ile* 'sole of foot,' and referred to the root *ei-* 'go' (Persson, *Wz.* 78; Kluge, *Et. Wb.* s. v. *eilen*), and also connected with Skt. *iyarti* 'erregt, erhebt,' *īrtē* 'setzt sich in bewegung, erhebt sich,' Gk. *ἰάλλω* 'send, throw' (Schade, *Wb.;* Uhlenbeck, *Ai. Wb.*).

In any case *eilen* is probably from the root *ei-*, and we may compare Lith. *eilė̃* 'row, series, generation,' *eĩlyju* 'put in rows, arrange.' The primary meaning here is 'course, line, series.'

2. OE. *ādl* 'disease,' *ādlian* 'be sick, be ill, become infirm or weak' may be compared with ON. *illr* 'ill, bad, wicked' <**iðla-*, pre-Germ. **oitló-* (or **əitló-*) and **itló-* 'gone, departed, departing,' whence 'weak, ill, bad.' From the idea of separation come also OHG. *ītal*, MHG. *ītel* 'leer, ledig, eitel, vergeblich; rein,' OS. *īdal* 'leer, nichtig,' OE. *īdel* 'empty, desolate, destitute, useless, vain, idle,' *ā-īdlian* 'be free (from); get rid of, frustrate, annul.' All are from the root *ei-* 'go,' and related to Gk. *οἶτος* 'ill-fate, misery, ruin, death,' Skt. *ēta* 'eilend, dahinschiessend,' *īti* 'plage, not,' *ēnas* 'unglück, frevel, sünde.'

The 'ill, evil, wrong' is frequently thought of as that which departs, swerves, bends, sways, etc.

3. So we may explain *evil*, OE. *yfel* 'bad, wicked; painful, miserable,' Goth. *ubils* 'übel, schlecht, böse,' which have been connected with ON. *ūfr* 'unfreundlich, übermütig,' OHG. *uppi* 'bösartig,' and further with Goth. *uf*, *ufar* (cf. Kluge, Uhlenbeck, *Et. Wbb.*). According to this explanation pre-Germ. **upélo-* meant 'über die schranken gehend.' But the base probably meant rather 'turning, waving, wanton, üppig; turned, distorted, perverted,' and may be referred to Skt. *vápati* 'wirft, streut,' OE. *wafian* 'wave,' *wæflian* 'talk foolishly,' etc. (cf. author, MOD. LANG. NOTES, xv, 98).

4. Similarly *worse*, OE. *wyrsa*, Goth. *wairsiza* 'schlimmer, ärger,' which are referred to OHG. *werran* 'verwirren,' Lat. *verrō* 'sweep, brush; sweep along,' Gk. *ἀπό-Fερσε* 'swept away,' may be derived from a base *u̯er-so-* 'whirl, twist,' which is also in OE. *wrase* 'knot, lump,' that is, 'twist.' From this come 'sweep,' as in OE. *swāpan* 'swing: sweep; hurry, rush,' and 'wrong,' as in OE. *wringan* ('twist'), 'wring:' *wrang* 'wrong.'

5. From the root *u̯ei-* 'turn, bend, twist' come OE. *wīdl* 'defilement, impurity,' *wīdlian* 'defile,' Lat. *vitium* 'fault, defect, blemish, vice.' Compare Skt. *váyati* 'webt, flicht,' *vyáyati* 'windet, wickelt,' *vitá-s* 'gewunden,' Lat. *vītis* 'vine,' OHG. *wīda* 'weide,' etc.

6. From 'turn, twist' come also MHG. *geweide*, *ingeweide* 'eingeweide.' NHG. *ausweiden* 'das eingeweide herausnehmen' proves nothing as to the original meaning, since it was formed after the original meaning was lost sight of. So E. *gut* 'ausweiden' was formed directly from *gut* 'intestine' with no thought of the primary signification.

*a*. For the derivation of words for 'intestines' from 'winding, twisting' compare the following: OHG. *slingen* 'winden, flechten:' *geslinge* 'geschlinge,' with which compare Lat. *laqueus* 'noose, snare, schlinge:' *lactis* 'gut.' —Gk. ἕλιξ 'twisted, winding, spiral; twist, whirl, tendril, curl, volute: bowels.' Just as from *u̯ei-* 'wind, twist' comes OHG. *wīda* 'weide,' so here we have Gk. ἑλίκη 'a winding, twisting: willow,' Lat. *salix*.—Skt. *vēṣká-s* 'schlinge zum erwürgen' (root *u̯ei-* 'twist'), Lith. *viskiù* 'bebe,' OHG. *wisc* 'strohwisch,' ON. *viskr* 'bündel:' Lat. *viscera*. — Skt. *kṛṇátti* 'spinnt, dreht,' Goth. *haurds* 'hürde:' *hairþra*, OHG. *herdar* 'eingeweide.' This old explanation is semasiologically unimpeachable, though another explanation is possible.— E. *rope* 'seil:' *ropes* 'geschlinge.'—OHG. *garn* 'garn': ON. *gorn*, Lith. *žarnà* 'darm' (cf. Kluge, *Et. Wb.*).

7. From 'twist, bend' comes 'shrink, shrivel, wrinkle, wither:' Lat. *viescō* 'shrivel, wither,' Lith. *výstu* (aor. *výtau*) 'welke,' E. *wither*. Compare OHG. *scranchōn* 'schwanken, mit schrägen beinen gehen:' OE. *scrincan* 'shrink, contract; wither, fade;' OE. *wrencan* 'twist, turn:' *wrincle* 'wrinkle.'

8. From 'wither, fade' may come 'faded, dark-colored, livid, blue.' This explains Lat. *vitrum*, OHG. *weit*, OE. *wād* 'woad,' a plant formerly used for coloring blue.

9. From a base *u̯ei-so-* 'twist, whirl' comes OHG. *wisc* 'strohwisch' as we saw above. From the same base with another suffix come ME. *wisp* 'wisp,' Dan. *visp* 'rute,' *vispe* 'mit einer rute peitschen,' Sw. *visp* 'quirl,' *vispa* 'quirlen.' Compare further Skt. *vēṣati* 'ist tätig, wirkt, bringt zu stande,' Lith. *vaisinu* 'mache wachsen,' *vaisà* 'fruchtbarkeit, *veisiù* 'durch fortpflanzen sich vermehren machen,' OE. *wise* 'growth, plant;' Skt. *vēṣṭatē* 'windet sich,' Lith. *výstau* 'windele;' *visgù* 'zittere, schlottere.' We see from this that the idea of rapid motion which is seen in NHG. *wischen*, *entwischen*, *erwischen* is original just as it is in Lith. *viskiù* 'bebe.' I am inclined to believe also that we should refer to this base Lat. *viscum* (*viscus*) 'mistletoe;' 'birdlime,' *viscidus* 'clammy, sticky, viscid,' from a base **u̯isko-* 'ropy, stringy, glutinous,' which would correspond to OHG. *wisc*. In this case Gk. ἰξός 'mistletoe; birdlime' may be for **Fιόκός* rather than Lat. *viscus* for **vixus* (cf. Brugmann, *Grd.* I², 868).

10. In any case this gives a clue to OHG. *mistil*, OE. *mistel* 'mistletoe,' which doubtless received its name from its glutinous berries, and may, therefore, be derived from OHG. *mist* 'kot, mist,' Goth. *maihstus* 'mist,' but not OE. *mist* 'nebel.'

11. ON. *hnot*, OHG. *nuz*, OE. *hnutu* 'nut' come perhaps from pre-Germ. **qn̥dā-*, and

may be compared with Skt. *kanda-s* 'wurzelknolle,' Gk. *κόνδος·κεραία, ἀστράγαλος* (Hes.), *κόνδυλος* 'knob, knuckle.'

12. Goth. *qistjan*, OHG. *quistan* 'verderben,' *quist* 'verderben, vernichtung' have been referred to Lith. *gendù* 'verderbe,' etc., and to Lith. *gèsti* 'erlöschen,' Skt. *jásatē* 'ist erschöpft.' Either explanation is possible, but the latter is more probable on account of ON. *kvasa* 'ermatten.'

13. Lith. *gendù* 'gehe entzwei, verderbe, verwese,' *gadinù* 'beschädige, verderbe,' Serv. *gaditi* 'verderben, ekelhaft machen, besudeln,' etc., which have been connected with Goth. *qistjan* (cf. Schade, *Wb.* s. v. *quist*) may come either from a root *gᵘed-* or *gᵘedh-*. In the former case compare MLG. *quattern*, *quettern*, MHG. *quetzen*, *quetschen* 'stossen, quetschen, zerdrücken,' *kützer* 'knauser,' and Skt. *gada-s* 'krankheit' (cf. Uhlenbeck, *Ai. Wb.* s. v.).

Or we may compare, in the second case, MLG. *quad* 'böse, schlecht, nachteilig; schaden,' Du. *kwaad* 'böse, hässlich,' MHG. *quāt*, *kōt* 'kot,' Dan. *kvadder* 'schlamm,' Lith. *gẽda* 'schande,' Pol. *żadny* hässlich, garstig,' etc. (cf. Brugmann, *Grd.* I², 610). To these we may add Skt. *gādhá-s* 'furt,' Ir. *baidim* 'tauche unter, ertränke,' Gk. *βάθος*, *βένθος* 'depth,' *βόθρος* 'hollow, ditch.'

The two roots are probably related, perhaps originally identical. The primary meaning must have been 'press into, press upon, crush; be pressed down, sink,' etc.

14. Goth. *qipus* 'bauch, mutterleib,' OE. *cwiþ* 'womb,' etc. I connect with OE. *codd* 'bag; cod, shell, husk, skin,' ON. *kodde* 'kissen,' *koðre* 'hodensack,' Gk. *βύττος γυναικὸς αἰδοῖον* (cf. Zupitza, *Germ. Gutt.* 81).

*a*. The womb and stomach were often thought of as a 'sack' or 'pouch' or as a 'wrapper, covering:' Goth. *nati*, OE. *net* 'net:' *nette* 'caul,' Gk. *νηδύς* 'belly, bowels, stomach, womb' (cf. Uhlenbeck, *Et. Wb.* s. v. *nati*).—E. *caul* 'covering of network for the head: omentum, amnion.'—OE. *hama* 'dress, covering: womb.'—Skt. *vapā* 'caul, omentum,' primarily 'wrapper:' Goth. *wamba* 'bauch' (cf. author, Mod. Lang. Notes, xv, 99).—OHG. *herdo* 'vellus:' ON. *hreðjar* 'scrotum,' OE. *hreþer* 'womb, heart,' but probably not Goth. *hairþra* (see no. 6 *a*).—Lat. *volvō* 'turn, roll,' Gk. *εἰλύω* 'wind, wrap, cover,' Lat. *volva* 'wrapper, covering, integument: womb.'—ON. *skorpa* 'crust, bark,' OE. *sceorp* 'dress,' ON. *skreppa* 'ranzen:' Lith. *skramblỹs* 'magen.'—Lith. *krẽpszas* 'grosse tasche, bettelsack:' OHG. *href* 'mutterleib, unterleib,' OE. *hrif* 'womb, stomach,' *gehrifian* 'bring forth' (young).—Lat. *uter* 'bag:' *uterus*.—Lat. *lūra* 'skin, leathern sack: entrails.'—Goth. *balgs* 'schlauch,' OE. *belg* 'bag, pouch:' E. *belly*.—Lith. *vėntaris* 'ein grosses netz in der form eines sackes:' Lat. *venter*.—OE. *sēod* 'purse, pouch:' *newesēopa* 'pit of stomach,' Goth. *suþn* 'magen.'

15. Goth. *ga-rēdan* 'auf etwas bedacht sein' is derived from a base *rē-dho-* from a root *rē-* in Lat. *rē-rī* 'believe, think' (cf. Brugmann, *Grd.* ii, 1047). The primary meaning was 'turn toward; lead toward,' or the like. This gave 'turn one's attention to, think about; care for; guess; strive for, find,' etc., in the various derivatives. The root *rē-* occurs also in ML. Franc. *rāmen* 'zielen, denken,' MHG. *rām*, *rāme* 'ziel, zielen, trachten, streben,' *rāmen* 'zielen, trachten, streben,' *rœmen* 'etwas als ziel ins auge fassen,' OS. *rōmon* 'streben,' OE. *rōmian* 'possess,' that is, 'erzielen.' Compare Skt. *rādhnóti* 'kommt zurecht, bringt zu stande, gewinnt,' OHG. *rāt* 'rat, vorhandene mittel, vorrat,' OS. *rād* 'rat, gewinn,' Lith. *randù* (aor. *radaũ*) 'finde.'

16. E. *rove* 'wander, roam' is supposed to be the same as the obsolete *rove* 'practice robbery on the seas.' They should, however, be kept distinct. *Rove* 'wander' may be referred to OE. *-rāfian* 'wind, twist' in *ā-rāfian* 'unwind, unravel,' which gives also E. *rove* 'twist slightly.' Compare also OE. *ge-rifod*, *rifelede* 'wrinkled,' ON. *reifa* 'move, stir,' *reifr* 'cheerful, munter,' *rifa* 'bind together,' Du. *reven* 'die segel einbinden,' E. *reef*, etc., Sw. *ref* 'schnur, angelschnur,' OE. *ge-rif* 'catch' (of fish). These pre-suppose a pre-Germ. **rei-bho-* 'twist, turn, wind,' with which compare OHG. *reif* 'seil, strick, reif,' OE. *rāp* 'rope,' etc., pre-Germ. **roibhnó-* or **roi-bo-*.

17. E. *smirk* 'smile in an affected manner,' OE. *smearcian* 'smile' have been connected with MHG. *smieren*, *smielen*, E. *smile*, which is supposed to represent an OE. **smȳlan* (cf.

Kluge and Lutz, *Eng. Et.* s. v. *smile*). This, however, is impossible. For OE. *smearcian* would correspond to a Goth. **smarkōn* (or *-kan*), while MHG. *smieren* would presuppose a Goth. **smiurōn* or **smērōn*, with *-ē-* from pre-Germ. *-ēi-*, and, therefore easily combined with Lat. *mīrus* and ME. *smile*, OE. **smīlan*, bases **smei-ro-*, **smei-lo-*. In case MHG. *smieren* represents a Goth **smiurōn*, we must separate it both from Lat. *mīrus* and OE. *smearcian*. That the *-ie-* of MHG. *smieren*, *smielen* comes from *-eu-* is probable from MHG. *smollen* 'lächeln; schmollen.' We have here a base *smeu-*, *smu-*, which is also in MHG. *smutzen* 'den mund zum lachen verziehen, schmunzeln,' *smutzern*, *smunzen*, *-zeln* 'schmunzeln,' Lett. *smaule* 'mund.' The primary meaning of *smeu-* in this group is 'draw together.' From this developed 'smirk, grin; pout, sulk.' Whether E. *smile* belongs here or to Lat. *mī-rus*, Skt. *smáyatē* 'lächelt' it is impossible to say.

OE. *smearcian*, however, belongs to neither. It is rather cognate with NHG. dial. *schmorkeln* 'schrumpfen.' We have, therefore, the same development in meaning as above. And yet they can not be connected unless we derive all from a root *smē-* with various suffixes, which, to be sure, is a possibility. Compare the same change in meaning in OHG. *grīnan* 'lachend oder weinend den mund verziehen,' NHG. *greinen*, E. *grin*, *groan*.

18. Colloquial E. *swig* 'drink in long draughts, gulp,' earlier 'suck,' is not a corrupted form but corresponds to Sw. dial. *swegd* 'schlucken, verschlingen.' These are related to ON. *sûga*, OE., OHG. *sūgan* 'saugen,' Lat. *sūcus* 'juice, sap; drink, draught.'

19. OHG. *swein* 'knecht,' ON. *sveinn* 'knabe, jüngling, junger mann, diener' (whence E. *swain*), OE. *swān* 'man, warrior; herdsman' are from pre-Germ. **sṵoi-no-s* 'angehöriger; leibeigener,' a derivative of IE. *sṵo-i̯o-* (*seu̯o-*) 'suus:' Skt. *svayám* 'selbst,' OChSl. *svojĭ*, Pruss. *swais* 'eigen,' whence also Lith. *svaĩnis* 'schwager,' *svainė* 'schwägerin.' From *sṵo-* 'own' are also derived IE. **sṵe-sor-* 'sister,' **sṵe-k̂uro-* 'socer' (cf. Kluge, *Et. Wb.* s. v. *Schwester*, *Schwäher*).

20. ON., OE. *tōl* 'tool' are supposed to be derived from a Germ. root *tau-* 'make.' I should derive it rather from the root *dĕlo-*, *dŏlo-* 'separate, divide, split:' Skt. *dálati* 'berstet, springt auf,' *dala-m* 'stück, teil,' OChSl. *dola*, Lith. *dalìs* 'teil,' Lat. *dolō* 'hew, chip; fashion, contrive,' *dolus* 'contrivance, artifice, deceit,' *dolābra* 'mattock, pickax,' Gk. δόλος 'artifice, trick,' OHG. *zāla* 'nachstellung, gefahr,' ON. *tāl* 'list, betrug, gefährdung, schaden,' OE. *tæl* 'fault-finding, censure,' *tælan* 'blame, calumniate,' OHG. *zālōn* 'wegreissen, rauben' (cf. Schade, *Wb.* s. v. *zāla*, *zālōn*; Prellwitz, *Et. Wb.* s. v. δόλος, δηλέομαι). From the same root are also Lith. *dalgis* 'sense,' ON. *talga*, *telgja* 'schneiden, schnitzen.'

From 'divide, separate' come, with different development of meaning, OHG. *zellan* 'zuteilen; zählen, rechnen; erzählen,' *zalōn* 'zählen, rechnen; erzählen,' etc. (cf. Prellwitz, *Et. Wb.*).

From 'tear, rend' come Lat. *dolor* 'pain, smart, ache; sorrow, grief,' *doleō* 'feel pain; grieve.'

FRANCIS A. WOOD.

*Cornell College.*

---

## *ANOTHER VERSION OF THE BALLAD OF Lord Randal.*

THE following version of the familiar ballad known variously as "Lord Randal," "Lord Ronald," and so on, was discovered by Mr. H. C. House, of Kingfisher College, Oklahoma, sung in a railroad camp at Geary, Colorado. It should be added to the fifteen or so versions, some of them American, of which Prof. Child makes an exhaustive study, *English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, I, 151 ff. The identity of the ballad is unmistakable. All the conventional features, the poison, the legacy, the iteration, and the dialogue are present, modified to suit altered local conditions.

*Johnny Randall.*

"Where was you last night, Johnny Randall, my son?
Where was you last night, my heart's loving one?"
"A-fishing, a-fowling; mother, make my bed soon,
For I'm sick at my heart, and I fain would lie down."

"What had you for breakfast, my own pretty boy?
What had you for breakfast, my heart's loving joy?"
"Fresh trout and slow poison; mother, make my bed soon,
For I'm sick at my heart, and I fain would lie down."

"What will you will your brother, my own pretty boy?
What will you will your brother, my heart's loving joy?"
"My horse and my saddle; mother make my bed soon,
For I'm sick at my heart, and I fain would lie down."

"What will you will your sister, my own pretty boy?
What will you will your sister, my heart's loving joy?"
"My watch and my fiddle; mother, make my bed soon,
For I'm sick at my heart, and I fain would lie down."

"What will you will your mother, my own pretty boy?
What will you will your mother, my heart's loving joy?"
"A twisted hemp rope, for to hang her up high;
Mother, make my bed easy till I lie down and die."

This is sung to a slow monotonous air, not identical with any of those noted by Prof. Child. Mr. House hopes later to collect further material. He thinks he could identify several other well-known ballads, sung in a modified form in western railroad and mining communities.

Louise Pound.

*University of Nebraska.*

---

## *AN UNSUSPECTED BIT OF OLD ENGLISH VERSE.*

According to the *Res Gestæ Alfredi* attributed to Asser, Bishop Werfrith (otherwise Werferth, Wærferth) of Worcester translated at King Alfred's command the *Dialogues* of Gregory the Great. Asser's words are, as translated by Conybeare (*Alfred in the Chroniclers*, p. 106): 'And then did God shut not His ears to his cry (for righteous was it, and from a good will), but gave him comfort, and sent unto him, for the arising of light in his darkness, one Werfrith, Bishop of the Church of Worcester, a man well taught in the Divine Scripture. And he, at the King's bidding, was the first to turn the books of the Dialogues of Pope Gregory and of Peter his disciple from Latin into Saxon, giving sense for sense most clearly and elegantly.' This is repeated by Simeon of Durham (Conybeare, p. 157) and John of Brompton (Conybeare, p. 204). It is to Wærferth (for so Alfred spells the name) that Alfred sends the *Pastoral Care*, according to the testimony of the Hatton MS., though copies were no doubt also sent to other dioceses. The superscription is: *Ðēos bōc sceal tō Wiogora ceastre*, and immediately the Preface begins: 'Ælfred kyning hāteð grētan Wærferð biscep his wordum luflice and frēondlice.' Moreover, King Alfred by his will made a bequest to 'Wærferðe bisceope.' Wærferth was consecrated bishop of Worcester on June 7, 873, and died in 915 (Florence of Worcester). It has been conjectured that he was called to Alfred's court about 884, and that his translation was not made till after 890 (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*). Keller (*Die Litterarischen Bestrebungen von Worcester*, p. 4) says that he was educated in the monastery of Worcester, and that under him Worcester for the first time appears in literary history.

His translation of the *Dialogues* was first published at Leipsic in 1900, as *Bischofs Wærferth von Worcester Uebersetzung der Dialoge Gregors des Grossen* (*Bibl. der Ags. Prosa*, *Bd. V*), with the name of Hans Hecht as editor. There are three MSS.: Cott. Otho C. 1 (Brit. Mus.); Hatton 76, formerly 100 (Bodleian); C. 322, formerly S. 10 (Corpus Christi College, Cambridge). Of these the first and third (O and C) represent the same original version, while the second (H) is a later and abbreviated recension, in details resembling O rather than C. In general, O is regarded as most exactly representing the lost original, but unfortunately it was much damaged in the fire

of 1731. All the MSS. belong to the period 1025–1050 (Hecht, p. vii).

C and H have a preface ostensibly written by Alfred; O lacks this, but has a preface of its own. This latter preface, originally published by Krebs in 1880 (*Anglia* 3. 70 ff.), has been printed as prose, not only by him, but by Hecht, and partially by Keller (*op. cit.*, p. 6).

Keller gives a translation, and proposes to substitute the name Wærferð for Wulfstan.

As the preface readily falls into verse, save for two imperfect lines, I propose to print as follows (*ð* and *þ* as italics only because the font lacks the Roman letters):

ADDRESS OF THE BOOK TO THE READER.

Se ðe mē rǣdan . . . *ðe*nce,
hē in mē findan mæg, gif hine feola lysteð,
gāstlices līfes gōde biesene,
*Þ*æt hē ful ēa*þe* mæg upp gestīgan
tō ðām heofonlican hāme, *þ*ār by*ð* ā hyht ond wynblis
on burgum, *þ*ām *þe* Bearn Godes
sielfes hiora ēagum gesēon mōtan.
*Þ*æt mæg se mon begytan se *þe* his mōdgeðanc
æltowe by*þ*, ond *þ*onne *þ*urh his ingehygd
tō *þ*issa hāligra helpe gelīefeð,
ond hiora bisene folgað, swa *þ*ēos bōc sagað.
Mē āwrītan hēt W*ærferð* bisceop,
*þ*ēow and *þ*earfa *þ*æs *þe* ālne *þ*rym āhōf,
ond ēac Walden*d* is wihta gehwelcre,
ān ēce God eallra gesceafta.
Bide*þ* *þ*ē se bisceop se *þe* ðās bōc begeat
*þe* *þ*ū on *þ*īnum handum nū hafast ond scēawast,
*þ*æt *þ*ū him tō *þ*eossum hālgum helpe bidde,
*þe* heora gemynd hēr on gemearcude siendon,
ond *þ*æt him God ælmihtig forgyue *þ*ā gyltas
*þe* hē geworhte, . . . . . .
ond ēac resðe mid him se ðe āh ealles rīces geweald,
ond ēac swā his bēahgifan, *þe* him ðās bysene forgeaf;
*þ*æt is se sēlesða sinces brytta,
Ælfryd mid Englum, ealra cyninga
*þ*āra *þe* hē sīð oððe ær fore secgan hȳrde,
oððe hē iorðcyninga ær ǣnigne gefrugne.

1 *ðance*; 3 *godre*; 11 *fulgað*; 12 *Wulfstan*; 13 *aof*; 14 *walden*; 27 *hiorðcyninga*.

TRANSLATION.

He who is minded . . . to read me can find in me, if he is much inclined, a good example (*or*, good examples) of the spiritual life, so that he full easily may mount upward to the heavenly home, where joy and bliss are ever in the dwellings for those who are privileged to gaze with their eyes upon the Son of God himself. To this can he attain whose soul is righteous, and who moreover believes with his heart in the help of these saints, and follows their example, as this book relates [them]. Bishop Wærferð, the servant and beadsman of Him who set all his glory on high, and [who] is Lord of everything, one eternal God of all creation, commanded me to be written. The bishop who procured this book, which thou now hast in thy hands and beholdest, beseeches thee to implore help for him from the saints who are here commemorated, and [to ask] God almighty to forgive the trespasses which he has wrought, and likewise [to grant him] rest with Him who rules the whole Kingdom; moreover, [the same] for his bracelet-bestower, who laid this command upon him, that is, Alfred, the best treasure-giver among the English of those that he first or last has heard of, or of any earth-kings that he has learned about.

NOTES.

1. The sense is only to be conjectured. *Dence* may, after all be *ðance*, since the form can hardly be construed with *rǣdan*; it is too far away (after a break), and we should rather expect the indicative, so that *ðance* may be the dative of the noun.

*mē*. Cf. the preface in verse to the *Pastoral Care* (Sweet, p. 9): 'mē his wrīterum sende sūð and norð.'

2. Cf. the first two of the lines discovered by Napier in the Vercelli manuscript:

Hēr mæg findan fore*þ*ances glēaw
se ðe hine lysteð lēoðgiddunga.

4. *ēa*þe *mæg*. So *Chr.* 173.
*up gestīgan*. So *Gu.* 763; *Chr.* 630.
5a. *heofonlican hāme*. Cf. *Rood* 148.

5b-6a. Cf. *Chr.* 750: 'þǣr is hyht ond blis;' also 529b-530a: 'hyht wæs genīwad, blis in burgum;' and *Gu.* 926b-927a: 'hyht wæs genīwad, blis in brēostum.'

6b. *Bearn Godes.* Keller translates as if *bearn* were nom. plur., whereas it is evidently acc. sing; *bearn* in the plural with *Godes* is found only *Gen.* 1248, in a sense which is here inapplicable. Cf. in general *Chr.* 1348.

7. Cf. *Chr.* 392 ff., 1650.

9. *ælfowe.* Not otherwise in the poetry.

10. *tō . . . geliefeð.* For the construction cf. *Harr. Hell* 69: 'swā we ealle tō þē ān-gelȳfað;' more remote is Schmid, *Gesetze*, p. 168 (see Wülfing, § 882).

12. One is reminded of the inscription on the Alfred jewel.

13a. Cf. *Ph.* 165: 'þegn and þēow þēodne mærum.'

13b. Cf. *An.* 344: 'þegnas þæs þe þrym āhōf' (with apparent allusion to *Ps.* 8, 1, which was used as an antiphon on Ascension Day); *An.* 1324: 'cyneþrym āhōf.'

14. Cf. *Sat.* 125, 584-5; Chr. 981.

15. So *An.* 326, 703; similarly *An.* 1719; *Hy.* 3[10].

18. For the construction cf. *Chr.* 1352: 'ēaðmōde tō ēow ārna bǣdon;' *Ps.* 140: 'þonne ic bēne tō þē bidde.'

21. The MS. indicates no break, but 1. the alliteration is lacking; 2. the verb *forgyue*, 20, can hardly be used in two senses, to govern both *gyltas* and *resðe*. The writer's vocabulary is rather limited, it is true: cf. *bi(e)sene* 3, 11 with *bysene* 23; *begytan* 8, *begeat* 16; *helpe*, 10, 18; *bidep* 16, *bidde* 18; *forgyne* 20, *forgeaf* 23; *ond eac* 14, 22, 23; yet we can hardly believe that he would employ the one word with the twofold meaning, nor that he would extend its application to line 23, and thus incur the risk of seeming to implore the forgiveness of his lord's sins.

22a. *resðe.* The *sð* is an almost distinctive trait of the Alfredian texts (*Gram*[3]. 196, 1); cf. *sēlesða* 24. To the same effect are *siendon* 19 (*Gram*[3]. 427, N. 1), and perhaps *þeossum* 18, though this may be Mercian (*Gram*[3]. 338 and N. 4).

22b. Cf. *El.* 726: 'þū þe āhst dōma geweald;' *Gifts of Men* 27: 'se þe āh dōmes geweald;' *Rood* 107: 'se āh dōmes geweald;' *Sat.* 118: 'āh him alles gewald;' *Beow.* 1727: 'hē āh ealra geweald.'

23. *bysene.* In the sense of 'charge, commandment' also (according to Grein) *Gen.* 533, 571, 651, 680.

24. *sinces brytta.* So *Gen.* 1857, 2727; *Jud.* 30; *Beow.* 607, 1170, 2071; *El.* 194.

25-26. *sēlesða . . . ealra cyninga.* Cf. *Beow.* 1685; *Harr. Hell* 117, 119.

25. *mid Englum.* So *Wid.* 61.

26a. Cf. *El.* 240: 'ne hȳrde ic sīð nē ǣr . . .;' *Chr.* 893: 'þāra þe ǣr oððe sīð;' *Chr.* 1067: 'þāra þe sīð oððe ǣr.' With such statements as 25b-27 cf. 1 Kings 3. 12 (=2 Chr. 1. 12); 2 Kings 18. 5; 23. 25, from which, indeed, the formulas may be derived.

27a. *iorðcyninga.* Cf. *Exod.* 393-4: 'eorðcyninga se wīsesta;' 'þām æðelestan eorðcyninga;' and see *Dan.* 306.

27b. Cf. *Men.* 101-2: 'ne hȳrde ic gumena fyrn ǣnigne ǣr æfre bringan. . .'

*ǣnigne.* The construction is awry, but indeed the whole line seems superfluous.

Perhaps the chief difficulty which the text presents is that of the occurrence of the word *Wulfstan* in line 12. There is no Wulfstan, contemporary with Alfred, who can be thought of. Keller (58 ff.) has shown that Wulfstan II, or St. Wulfstan, Bishop of Worcester—not to be confounded with the Wulfstan (of York) whose name is associated with the homilies—is probably the person the scribe had in mind. Now this Wulfstan died in 1095, and was born about 1012. Evidently he cannot be said to have ordered the composition of this work, which we know on external evidence to have been translated by Wærferth; nor can he refer to Alfred as his lord (l. 23). We might think of him as ordering the transcription of the book, since, as Keller shows, a large amount of copying was done at Worcester in his time. Yet the connection of the thought from line 12 to the end forbids this assumption. We can only suppose, with Keller, that the scribe, perhaps, Wulfgeat (Keller, pp. 64-68), substi-

tuted the name of Wulfstan for Wærferth in a moment of thoughtlessness, especially as Wulfstan seems to have been the most strenuous and inspiring man at Worcester, even before he became bishop. He was successively schoolmaster, precentor and sacristan, and prior, and enjoyed the favor both of the Lady Godiva of legend, and of King Harold. To show that such a substitution was easily possible, Keller (p. 6) quotes from the *Vita Oswaldi*, where *Wlstanum* occurs for *Wilfridum*.

On this hypothesis, everything is in order. The matter of the preface is such as Wærferth might have written; he distinctly refers to Alfred as his king, states, in full accord with Asser, that Alfred commissioned him to do this task, and praises him as one would expect such a king to be praised by a loyal associate; he aptly characterizes the book itself; and his language, though the transcription is of a period nearly a hundred and fifty years later, still bears unmistakable marks of the early West Saxon which we call Alfredian.

A word as to the poetical phraseology. Formulas and whole lines are adapted from the earlier poetry to the writer's somewhat prosaic purpose. For the details reference may be made to the notes, but I cannot forbear to call special attention to such parallels as these: the exact correspondence of line 15, with *Andreas* 326, 703; the echo (2–3) of the lines discovered by Napier; and the adaptation ($5^{b}$-$6^{a}$) of formulas from the *Christ* and ($13^{b}$) the *Andreas*. These of themselves would tend to fix the date of the preface, and would show the familiarity of Alfred and his coadjutors with the Cynewulfian poetry.

A transitional passage, which I have not reproduced (Hecht, p. 2), still further confirms the views presented above. With manifest reference to such scriptural passages as John 4. 14; 7. 38, the writer characterizes the matter of the book as a pure stream flowing from the breast of Gregory, and this figure is wholly in accord with that developed as the epilogue to Alfred's translation of the *Pastoral Care*. Moreover, it is to be noted that the image is again resumed, by the Corpus MS. (which does not have the Otho preface) as well as by the Otho, in the form of preludes to Books III (Hecht, p. 179) and IV (p. 260).

In dealing with Gregory's *Dialogues* for the first time, it is a pleasure to recall that Professor Henry Johnson, of Bowdoin College, was the first to make a complete copy of the Cotton MS. (Otho), in the autumn and winter of 1882–3, and to observe that the title-page of the printed work states that it has been edited 'Nach einer Copie von Henry Johnson.'

ALBERT S. COOK.

*Yale University.*

---

## *SHAKESPEARE'S QUEEN MAB.*

SHAKESPEARE'S character of Queen Mab first appeared in *Romeo and Juliet*, i, iv. She is the fairie mid-wife, and comes in shape (state?) no bigger than an agate-stone on the forefinger of an alderman (burgomaster A.). Shakespeare makes Titania queen of fairies in the play dealing with the fairy-lore gathering round St. John's Eve. That Queen Mab rather than Titania of *M. S. N. D.* caught the popular fancy is proved by her vogue soon afterwards. Mab is queen of fairies in Jonson's *Alchemist* and *Satyr*, Brown's *Brittania's Pastorals* (1613–16), Milton's *L'Allegro*, Herrick's *Fairy Temple* and *Oberon's Palace*, in Randolph's *Amzutas* (1638–45–52), and in Porlis *Parnassus*, 1657, where the names of the fairy court are given, with Oberon as emperor and Mab as empress. Hazlitt-Ritson's statement in the *Fairy Lore of Shakespeare*, that Drayton in 1627 alone mentions Mab as the wife of Oberon should therefore be modified. Dekker made Titania queen of fairies.[1] Other examples of Mab's appearance may occur to the reader; in 1692 an opera *The Fairie Qucene* was performed by their majesties' servants, but this I find to be merely an adaptation of *M. S. N. D.* About a century later *Queen Mab, or the Fairies Jubilee*, was composed for the jubilee at Stratford, September, 1797.

The lines about Mab introduced to explain an allusion, have had a remarkable effect when Mab's rôle is compared with the more ambitious one assigned to Titania. The text of the lines is unsatisfactory, there being many changes in order and in diction. It may be

1 J. O. Halliwell, *Illustrations of Fairy Mythology*. Shakespeare Society, 1845.

that a closer study of the text may throw light on the origin of Mab. Why, for example, should *burgomaster* have been written for the first quarto? The word was new; *N. E. D.* gives the first example for 1592. A writer in *New Shakesperiana*, Sept., 1901, refers to a paper by Professor J. D. Butler,[2] in which these lines are shown to contain many words that occur in Shakespeare but once. While Shakespeare's fancy would have been sufficient to originate the idea of the lines, and even the name itself, one can hardly escape the feeling that he borrowed the idea, and the name, as he did that of Titania.

The difficulty of the passage is in no way relieved when one considers the theories suggested for the origin of Queen Mab. Donce[3] seems to have started the explanation that Mab is a contracted form of *Dame Abonde* (Habundia). Keightley[4] inclines to this view, and adds that *Habundia* rules over the fairies in Heywood's *Hierarchie of Angles* (1635). Thoms,[5] in his essay on the *Folk-Lore of Shakespeare*, first published in the *Athenæum* in 1847, carefully explains Donce's theory. Still Thoms does not agree with it; he sees in *Mabh* an Irish queen of fairies mentioned in Beaufert's *Ancient Topography of Ireland*[6] a more probable source for Mab. But he had already satisfied himself of the Celtic origin of Mab on very different grounds.

"I saw in this designation a distinct allusion to the diminutive form of the elvin sovereign. *Mab*, both in Welsh and in the kindred dialects of Brittany, signifies a child or infant, and my readers will . . . . agree with me that it would be difficult to find any epithet more befitting one who 'comes in shape no larger than an agate stone.'"

The Welsh *mab*, meaning child, was also thought by Wirt Sikes[7] to be a satisfactory source for Mab, although he shows no further proof and explains no intermediate steps.

"From his Welsh informant Shakespeare got his *Mab*, which is simply the Cymric for a little child, and the root of numberless words signifying babyish, childish . . . and the like."

Sikes was doubtless also influenced by the common notion regarding the *Mabinogion* or the collection of tales 'told to the young in by-gone days.' Marley[8] follows Sikes in his interpretation of the *Mabinogion* and of Mab. This notion of the *Mabinogion* should give way to a more accurate idea.

"The word *Mabinogi* is derived from *Mabinog*, and that was a person belonging to the bondic system, meaning a sort of literary apprentice, or young man who was receiving instruction from a qualified bard, and the lowest description of *Mabinog* was one who had not acquired the art of writing verse . . . he was usually a young man, not a child in the nursery, and it is utterly wrong to suppose the *Mabinogion* to be nursery tales.[9]

Loth[10] agrees with Rhŷs. The connection between Mab and Welsh *mab* can therefore not be regarded as established. Welsh *mab* seems to be a form of Celtic *mac*, and is so given in Du Cange. "*mab* filius, idiomate Aremorico, Hibernis *mac* . . . *map* vero aut *Mab* Brittanis, et *Mac* Hibernis dicitur." Glossaries of Lowland Scotch (Jamieson, Halliwell and others) give *mab*, a slattern, and *mabbie*, a cap; but these show kinship with *mabble*[11] to dress slovenly. The Gaelic *mab*[12] means tassel, and so in Irish.[13] The verb *mab*, in Gaelic, to stammer, suggests onomatopæia; it also means to abuse, vilify.[14]

Analogy in form is of course no necessary mark of relationship between Celtic *Mab* and Mab. In effect, though the principle is not stated, this idea is suggested by the entry under Mab in the *Century Dictionary of Names*. Another source for Mab is there given which deserves attention. *Medb*, queen of Connaught, mentioned in Irish poems about

2 Papers of the New York Shakespeare Society, vol. v. I have not seen this paper.

3 *Illustrations of Shakespeare and of Ancient Manners*. First Edition, 1807.

4 *Fairy Mythology*.

5 *Three Notelets to Shakespeare*, London, 1865.

6 I have not seen the book.

7 *British Goblins*, 1800.

8 *English Writers*, iii, 257-9.

9 Rhŷs, *Arthurian Legend*, p. 21.

10 *Les Mabinogion*, 7-8.

11 Cf. the familiar *moble, mobled* queen, Hamlet, II, cf. also Upton, *Critical Observations on Shakespeare*, London 1748, p. 320.

12 McAlpine, *A Pronouncing Gaelic Dictionary*.

13 O'Rielly, *Irish-English Dictionary*; here also = hand.

14 *Highland Society's Dictionary*, quoted by McAlpine.

the year 1100, is cited as the prototype. Two objections, aside from other considerations, appear upon an examination of the *Medb* saga; the first involves the disparate natures of Mab and *Queen Medb*, and the second the phonology of *Medb*, *Meadhbh*, *Mhedhby*, as the name is variously written.

Shakespeare's Mab is most diminutive; *Medb* of the Irish stories might well be a giantess for the deeds she works. She is the type of bravery. Carmichael,[15] it is true, mentions *Medb* and the fairies almost in a breath when he translates

> 'Thine is the skill of Fairy woman
> Thine is the courage of Maelhh the strong.'
> Vol. 1, p. 8.

In his notes (ii, p. 306) he states that Meabh, queen of Connaught and wife of Ailill, [who] lived at Rath Cruachan, the fort of Cruachan, was the cause of the Tain bo Cuailgne, the [cattle] spoil of Cooley, and was the type of bravery. Kennedy[16] quotes

> 'The six best women that in this world were
> After Mary the Virgin Mother
> Were *Maev*, Saav, and fair Saral,
> Faind, Eimer and the sorrowing Acal.'

Fiona Macleod, in the notes to the text in *The Laughter of Peterkin*[17] calls *Medb* 'this most famous queen of antiquity.' The references to *Medb* in the Coir Anmann[18] (Fitness of Names) where nicknames of other heroic Irish characters are explained, indicate the protagonist nature of the Irish queen. Her fighting ability is shown in Dr. Douglas Hyde's *Literary History of Ireland*, p. 323. Other accounts of *Medb* are given in Meyer and Nutt's *Voyage of Bran* and in Eleanor Hull's *Cuchullin Saga*. In the introduction to the *Cuchullin Saga* it is stated that

"this terrible personage is remembered by the Irish as the queen of the Fairies. She is probably the Queen Mab of Spenser's Fairie Queene."

Aside from the last two assertions, enough has been shown to indicate the heroic character of *Medb*. The surprising statement that Medb is probably the Queen Mab of Spenser's *Fairie Queene* is of course a slip; but in looking more closely at Spenser's *Gloriana* no harm is done. Spenser completed three books of the *Fairie Queene* by 1590. In spite of Harvey's thrust 'if so be the Faery Queen be faire in your eie than the Nine Muses, and Hobgoblin runne away with the garland of Apollo,' there is little in the artful treatment of Gloriana[19] to suggest a prototype in folk-lore or in its literary treatment. Indeed the fact that *Una* was made to play a rôle of fairy queen in Ireland aptly illustrates the tendency of popular tradition to adopt the characters of literature. Among the *Keen of the South of Ireland*[20] these verses occur:

> 'The earth that we tread on
> To its center doth tremble
> At the cry—at no cry
> Of this earth doth resemble
> For the keen of the dwellers
> Of dark Cairn Thierna
> Has reached Una's palace
> On misty Knockfierna.'

In a note to these verses we are told

"that the fairies were supposed to inhabit Cairnthierna, a hill near Fermoy in the county of Cork. Knockfierna is a well-known mountain in the county of Limerick over which a fairy queen named Una is said to preside. Spenser wrote his *Fairie Queene* between these two hills."

If, as stated by Eleanor Hull, Medb is still the name of the fairy queen in Ireland, it seems to me quite possible that the English usage, widespread in the seventeenth century, was carried to Ireland, first as a literary influence, as in the example of Una, and later as a more popular influence, resulting in the confusion of the two names, Medb and Mab.

The other objection to regarding Medb as the prototype of Mab concerns the oral value, in Ireland, of the name Medb. In Irish texts the name is frequently printed *Medb* and at first glance the visual change from *Medb* to *Mab* seems natural enough. Irish *dh*, however, did not represent English *db* orally, but rather English *v*. The spirant nature of the letters is indicated by other forms of the name. O'Curry renders *Mhebhe* by Meave.[21]

15 *Carmina Gadelica*, 1900.

16 Patrick Kennedy, *Legendary Fictions of the Irish Celts*, 1891; source not given.

17 1897, p. 287.

18 Windisch, *Irische Texte*, iii, 2 f.

19 *Fairie Queene*, Bk. 1, cantos i, vii; ex. Cleopolis; Bk. 2, c. x; Bk. 3, prologue; Bk. 6, c. x.

20 Percy Society, xiii.

21 *The Battle of Magh Leana*, Celtic Society, Dublin, 1855, p. 60–61.

Carmichael, *op. cit.* gives *Mêve* for *Maebh*. Fiona Macleod has *Maev*, and says[22] 'the name . . . is variously spelt. The original is Meadb, or Medbh, and is properly pronounced Māve (rhyming with wave).' The critical texts of Windisch[23] show various readings of the name; vol. 1, Medb, *gen.*; Medba, *dat.*; Meidb *acc.*; Vol. 2, ii, § 228, Meibh; § 270, Mhedhbha, *gen.*; § 274, Medhbh, *nom.*; Mheidhbhe, *gen.*, but Meadhbh *nom.* four words later; § 284, Meadbh, *nom.* Messrs. Meyer and Nutt write the name Medb in English translation. Eleanor Hull has Meave thus suggesting the spoken form. The last, and it would seem the most authoritative, note on the oral value of the name in Ireland is given in Dr. Douglas Hyde's *Literary History of Ireland*. The name is indexed as Mève or Meadhbhb. A note, p. 26, adds:

"Mève, in Irish *Meadhbh*, pronounced Mève or Maev. In Connaught it is often strangely pronounced 'Mow' rhyming with 'cow.' This name dropped out of use about one hundred and fifty years ago, being Anglicized into Maud."

The 'strange' pronunciation Mow, like cow, is explained by the rule for final consonants given in Windisch, *Irische Grammatik*, §§ 2. 3, 63.

The phonology of the name of the Irish queen, together with her characteristics, make questionable the theory that Mab was suggested by Queen Mēre, or indeed that Queen Mēre acquired the traits of the 'good people' until after Shakespeare's Mab became popular.

Something should be added to the old theory of Donce that Mab is contracted Dame Abonde. It was first explained that the contraction might take place after a manner illustrated by the names Numps from Humphrey, Ned from Edward, Noll from Oliver.[24] Another suggestion offers Italian *mabella* as a similar case, or perhaps *mabilia* (<amabilis).[25] In the absence of definite connection between Mab and common names, Dame Abonde should be more closely studied.

22 *Op. cit.* p. 287. 23 *Irische Texte*, Leipzig, 1880.

24 Keightley, *Fairy Mythology*. Am. Ed., p. 476.

25 Camden, quoted from Thoms, in *Romeo and Juliet*, Variorum, Furness, p. 61, note. Cf. *Notes and Queries*, 1, 242.

A couplet with the name is found in the works of William of Auvergne, Bishop of Paris, who died in 1248.[26] The fabliau from which the couplet was quoted is printed in the *Recueil Général et Complet des Fabliaux*,[27] Tome vi, p. 1–7. A note[28] to the fabliau by reference to the introduction of de Reiffenberg's *Chronique rimée de Phillippe Mousket*[29] throws light on Dame Avonde

"Nous avons rangé avec Caseneuve, Lantin de Damerey et Roquefort *Habunde* parmi les fées; mais loin d'être une de ces essences poétiques que décrivent les romanciers, c'était une créature toute plébéienne, toute vulgaire, une espèce de déesse subalterne qui avait quelque rapport avec Diane, dans sa rôle de Phoebus, du reste la même qu'*Hérodias*, avec *Holda*, *Beratha* ou *Bertha*, qu'un Christianisme grossier avait substituées à Diane."

De Reiffenberg finds *Habonde* in the *Roman de la Rose* vv, 18618, 18685, where he thinks Herodias was confused with Habonde

"et que celle-ci était une dégénération superstiteuse de quelque divinite celtique ou germanique. Ce devait être une espèce de dame blanche ou l'un de ces génies que les Celtes nommaient *dusi*" (pp. cxli ff.).

He adds in quoting from William of Auvergne

"tel est, écrit-il, ce démon, qui, sous les traits d'une femme, parcourt, dit-on, avec d'autres, pendant la nuit, les maisons et les celliers, et qu'on appelle *Satia*, à cause de la satiété, et *dame Abunde*, à raison de l'abondance qu'ils procurent, à ce qu'on prétend, à ceux dont ils fréquentent les demeures; tels sont les démons appelés *dames* (*fées*, *bonnes dames*, *bonæ sociæ*, *dames blanches*) par les vieilles femmes."

De Reiffenberg thought Dame *Abonde* not unlike *Abnoba* 'la Diane de la Forêt-Noire.'

For one who has not access to the French folk-lore journals,[30] de Reiffenberg's introduction is the best treatment of French fairy-lore that I have seen.

26 Donce, *op. cit.*

27 By M. M. Montaiglon et Raynaud, Paris, 1890. For the identification of the fabliau I am indebted to Prof. Elliott.

28 P. 154.

29 Collection de Chroniques Belges Inédites, Brussels, 1838.

30 An excellent 'fairy' bibliography is given in Rhŷs's *Celtic Folk-Lore, Welsh and Manx*, Clarendon Press, 1901; and in Hartland's *Science of Fairy Tales*. Cf. also the philosophical bearing of the subject in the various volumes of the *Grimm Library*, Nutt.

Haisée, Haisel, or Haiseau, the writer of the fabliau quoted by William of Auvergne was Norman; only one poem of his was known until the edition by Montaiglon and Raynaud. They added three more, some idea of which is given by Bédier.[31]

"Ses poèmes se distinguent entre tous par leur manière rapide, fruste, brutale. Un vers de Haiseau nous permet de dire qu'il était Normand: une de ses héroïnes jure, en effet, par 'Saint Hindevert de Gournai,' et ce sanctuaire ne devait pas être connu très loin à la ronde. La petite ville de Gournai en Bray possède une église de Sainte Hildevert, datant du xii[e] siècle, et classée aujourd'hui parmi les monuments historiques."

The fabliaux were doubtless written in the thirteenth century.

This was the century in which the Romance *fairy* made its appearance among the Saxon *elves*. How much adaptation of continental lore there was in England, and how far English fairy lore was influenced by Celtic, and by French (perhaps originally the same) can only be determined after a clear exposition of the lore on the continent. The *Indiculus Superstitionum*[32] mentioned by de Reiffenberg, would make, historically at least, a good starting point.

W. P. Reeves.

*Kenyon College.*

## *GERMAN LITERATURE.*

*Romeo und Julia auf dem Dorfe*, von Gottfried Keller. Edited with Introduction and Notes, by W. A. Adams, Ph. D., Assistant Professor of German in Dartmouth College. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1900.

Although this edition is not entirely new, to review it may not be untimely, for Gottfried Keller is now coming into vogue in this country, and he will soon have a secure position in the German course of many colleges. It may as well be said at once that Dr. Adams's edition of one of Keller's very best stories will hardly have a stimulating effect upon our incipient Keller-cult. The editor, instead of utilizing the rare opportunity afforded him to expose the epoch-making art of a great writer, has made the futile attempt to characterize him by means of safe generalities. Whatever the reader's attitude toward the rugged Swiss novelist may be, nobody will challenge Prof. Adams's fainthearted admission that 'as poet and man' Keller is 'not without merit.' I incline to doubt whether the editor has himself formed a full and final estimate of the author of *Romeo und Julia*. He considers this novel 'not altogether a typical Keller story, because there is so little humor in it, and because its end is tragic.' Can it be that the humor, both delicate and grim, in which the tragic story of Sali and Vreeli is bathed, should fail to be appreciated by reason of its subtlety? And is Keller's optimism so unreasonable that by it he is compelled to hitch an all-is-well conclusion on to each rendering of the great tragi-comedy, Life?

Of the remaining apparatus of our edition I feel constrained to judge even less favorably than of the Introduction. There appears to be no tangible standard of annotation. In a book like ours, which because of its stylistic difficulty is sure to be reserved for a stage of progress at which the student shall have learned to wield his dictionary and grammar with some degree of facility, the linguistic commentary should deal only with actual difficulties. In Keller's writings there is an abundance of these, even apart from specific Helveticisms. To comment on words and phrases like: *Äcker*, p. 1, n. 3; *Art*, 2, 2; *gen*, 3, 1; *einen Wink geben*, 6, 5; *der Erlös*, 13, 3; *boten*, 14, 2; *d. h.*, 23, 3; *einige*, 47, 2; *in einem seltsamen Bann*, 48, 2; *Kapriolen*, 59, 1; *Kirchweih*, 64, 1; *Winden*, 76, 1; *stattlichen*, 78, 5; *Triangel*, 90, 5; *Eiertanz*, 92, 1; *rumorte*, 92, 3; and to quote at length the Century Dictionary for the meaning of *Hellebarde*, is unnecessarily to cumber the apparatus.

But a graver impeachment of the commentary than is called forth by its casual supererogation can be brought on the score of its almost habitual defection in times of need. Opinions may differ ever so widely as to what passages ought to be selected for annotation;

31 *Fabliaux*, p. 438.

32 "Il est digne d'attention que l'*Indiculus superstitionum* du concile de Lessines, en 743, ne parle pas formellement des fées, qui sont probablement comprises sous les mots *de divinis vel sortilegis, de sacris silvarum*," etc., p. cxlv.

yet I think it will be agreed that a majority of the following deserved attention: p. 8, l. 12, *allwo;* ibid. 25, *stellte sich höchst frech*, etc.; 9, 23, *etwas in ihm steckte;* 11, 18, *fertig gepflügt;* 13, 7, *Bubenmädchen;* ibid. 25, *so sah man sie jetzt darum an;* 14, 15, *sich noch zu schaffen gemacht;* 15, 13, *alles muss zuletzt eine ordentliche grade Art haben;* 18, 27, *der sonst so wohlweisen Männer;* 22, 9, *grundfalschen;* ibid. 16, *statt unter ihrem Manne zu leiden;* 22, 26, *es;* 24, 10, *als* (scil. *das*) *eines festen*, etc.; 24, 25, *ihm* (a genuine ethical dative); 26, 16, *mit brauchte;* ibid. 18, *dürfte* (position); ibid. 21, *sich als Wirt aufzuthun;* 27, 12, *wolle* (construction); 28, 1, *um deswillen;* ibid. 21, *vornehm* (after the manner of fine people); ibid. 27, *das verlumpte Bauernpack;* 29, 24, *schlimmen* (here = dirty); 30, 5, *so so? so soli!;* ibid. 21, *fürnehmere;* 32, 18, *etwas Beissbares;* 34, 4, *hatte er und sein Sohn;* 35, 19, *wie dumm thust du!;* 36, 8, *alle das Zeug;* 38, 18, *beide alte Gesellen;* 39, 13–14, *indem er in Nacht und Wetter hinein und das liebe Gesicht anlachte;* 40, 10, *um das wusste;* 41, 25, *geschoren* (here = shaven); 43, 24–25, *zu verstopfen und herzustellen gewesen wäre;* 44, 11, *das wilde grüne Gewächs, was da*, etc.; 46, 11, *schneiden* (scil. *das Korn*); ibid. 17–18, *und wie geht es dir auch?;* 49, 3, *und* (scil. *ich*) *werde gewiss noch erleben* (constr.); ibid. 5, *Ihr zwei Spatzen;* 51, 9–10, *welche dem armen Sali nicht anders dünkte.* The inconsistency of this passage with 52, 20, *beide dünkte* (but cf. ibid. 22, *es dünkte ihm ein Königreich*) ought to have been noted; ibid. 17, *es war nichts Rechts dabei;* ibid. 19–20, *bist du mir auch ein bisschen recht gut?;* 53, 10–11, *lass uns ins hohe Korn sitzen;* ibid. 22, *dort blitzt eine* (*Lerche*); 62, 11–12, *sie brachte . . . ein Becken voll warmen Kaffee zusammen;* 63, 5, *sich* (stands for both accus. and dat.); 65, 26, *in minder als zwei Stunden;* 67, 18, *das ist mir die Zeit her*, etc.; 68, 1–2, *so hast du ihn gehabt* (here = lost); 72, 25, *Teufelshexlein, was du bist;* 73, 8, *es wird mir ganz schmachtend;* 74, 8, und *doch so vieler Dinge benötigt ist;* ibid. 16, *wofür uns Gott behüte;* 75, 10, *sein Plunder* (acc.) *und Habseliges gestopft;* 78, 18, *rechtliche* (here = respectable); 80, 6, *Unterhaltung* (here = *Unterhalt*); ibid. 11, *fernsichtige Höhe;* 82, 13, *klaren* (Helvet. for *reinen*); 83, 18, *du hässiges Ding;* 84, 9, *ganz kraus im Gemüt;* 85, 21, *Amörchen;* 87, 7, note omission of indef. art. before *andere;* 89, 6, *Verfremdung;* 92, 26, *Hudelvölkchen;* 93, 9, *Rebenschossen;* ibid. 17, *Handzwehle;* 97, 24, *gut zum Rat bin;* ibid. 25, *fraget niemandem was nach;* 98, 5, *da geht es auch nicht nach meinem Sinne zu;* 101, 22, *ihn* (refers to *Ringlein*); ibid. 24–25, *ei, wie ein feiner Ring;* it ought to have been pointed out that 60, 14–21, are snatches from folksongs, and the passage ought to have been carefully commented upon. To say: *weho* = *weh* is insufficient.

Altogether it would seem as if the vocables and locutions that were made the subjects of notes had been chosen at haphazard. And the commentary is also infelicitous in that it lacks the desirable accuracy and crispness. Many times the precise shade of the original meaning is missed from the translation or the synonymous phrase that is given. P. 3, n. 4, *für jeden Teil*, 'for each of the plowmen.' Why not: for each party?; 5, 4, *das verwilderte Wesen*, 'that wild patch.' But *Wesen* is Helvet. for *Anwesen*=property, and wild does not correspond in meaning to *verwildert;* 9, 5, *aller Enden* does not mean 'from every hole;' 11, 1, *als ob es reiflich nachzählte*, 'as if pretending to be wisely counting.' Either: as if, or: pretending, certainly not both together; 16, 1, *darauf kannst du Gift nehmen.* 'You may be sure of that' seems rather weak in comparison with the German; so does ibid. 2, *Wunder was für Merkwürdigkeiten=wunderbare Merkwürdigkeiten;* 17, 3, *Grund und Boden.* The word-pairs quoted as analogous can hardly be classed with this; 18, 2, *die wegzubringen sein Gegner bleiben lassen würde*, 'which his enemy would not try to remove.' In such a translation the sting contained in the remark would be lost; 22, 4, *alles hintereinanderhetzte*, 'set everything (!) in commotion.' The approximate meaning is 'set everybody by the ears'; 22, 7, *wenn er es arg trieb, so machte sie es bunt*, 'whenever he behaved badly, she made things lively.' The passage was misunderstood. It means: if (not whenever!) he was bad, she was even worse; 28, 4, the note on *Verlag* does not help the reader to find an English equivalent; 29, 1, *'etwas*

*absetzen*=to exist in abundance' is incorrect; 41, 1, *verlorner Bauersmann* is not a 'forlorn' farmer, but one who has "gone to the bad;" 42, 2, is superfluous, as *Korn* could not stand for: corn, in any case; 47, 5, *Kornblume* is not exactly 'bachelor's button,' nor is it 'the German national flower;' 49, 1, *wie gut Ihr gefahren seid*, 'what fine progress you have made.' Why not: 'how well you have fared?'; 52, 1, *Gelt, wenn ich es sagen wollte*, 'Just as if I would tell.' Rather: 'You would like me to tell, wouldn't you?'; 54, 2, could have been rendered by a similarly jocular turn of expression; 68, 1, *das hätten wir gerade noch nötig* should have been translated; 73, 2, *mir bass thun*, 'do me good.' Should not something have been said about *bass?*; 75, 4, *könnte ich nicht zweimal dran machen?* 'Couldn't I come twice for it?' The slangy flavor of the German might have been preserved; 78, 1, *ihren Frühschoppen*, 'their early morning glass.' Why 'early'?; 78, 2, *Eierkuchen* is not exactly an 'omelet,' but an egg-pancake; 90, 1, *von einem reichen Sonderling*, 'by a rich but (?) odd fellow.'

The following notes are not clear enough: 4, 3; 6, 7; 9, 3 and 4 (which might be condensed into one); 23, 4, ('*Blut*=girl!'); 24, 4, (*Schoppen* is not the same measure all over Germany); 27, 3. Especially lacking in fullness are the following: 28, 3; 37, 1; 50, 2; 75, 3.

Other passages appear to have been misunderstood by the editor. At least his comment falls wide of the mark: p. 5, n. 7, *dem Steckleinspringer*, 'a proper name.' Such is not the case. *Steckleinspringer* is a Helvetic term of derision for a constable or other government official. In South Germany *Steckenreiter* is sometimes used in the same way; 24, 2, *die übie Wirtschaft* does not mean 'the sorry plight,' but: 'the mismanagement, shiftlessness'; 24, 3, *einen grauen Narren*, 'such a fool. Cf. with such phrases as '*ein grauer Esel, ein blaues Wunder*,' etc. This is not to the point; *grau*, in this place, relates to the color of the old man's hair. Transl: 'gray-haired fool'; 47, 3, *Pflugzüge ihrer Väter*, 'plow-teams of their fathers.' *Pflugzüge* means, of course, the furrows cut by the plows; 56. 1, *er wird doch nicht gleich tot sein müssen?* 'It cannot be that he is already dead, can it?' This is not the burden of the German question, which holds out a cheering hope: 'Why suppose the worst, right away? He need not be dead, at all'; 71, 1, *Waisenvogt* is not the 'superintendent of the orphan asylum'; 88, 3, *wo die wohl hinaus wollen?* 'I wonder where they are going.' The meaning is: 'I wonder what they mean by it?'; 95, 1, *ich wüsste nicht.* This is not the 'subjunctive of modest assertion,' but a conditional subjunctive in the apodosis, with the protasis implied. It means: 'I should not know,' and not 'I hardly know.'

Minor shortcomings of the commentary are the repetition of the same note (on *Reif*,) pp. 118 and 111, and the commenting upon a difficulty in the second or third occurrence, instead of in the first, as 23, 1.

The literary allusions to *Wilhelm Tell* are not always germane to the text. The source of *Was er webt, das weiss kein Weber*, p. 12, l. 14, should have been cited.

The proof has been well read, on the whole. We note, however, p. 10, l. 4, *der Tönende* instead of *der tönende*, *Du* instead of *du* everywhere on p. 35, and in other places; 33, 2, after *Frack* insert comma; 56, 15, after *sinken* put full stop instead of exclamation-point; 67, 27, and 75, 13, for *d'ran* read *dran;* 86, 20, for *Lieb* read *Lieb';* 113, note on 41, 1, *verlorner*, spell as in the text; item, 118, note on 91, 2, *Liebehaus*.

This is a long *Sündenregister* when it is remembered that Dr. Adams's notes cover less than fourteen loosely printed pages; and one might question the necessity of marshalling *seriatim* the faults of so small a book. But Keller is a writer of such eminence as to have a claim to far better treatment than has been accorded his *Romeo und Julia* in Heath's Modern Language Series. Then, too, the matter is of a certain professional concern. Somehow it seems as though too many of our text-books failed to reflect that ripe scholarship which characterizes American college-teachers of German as a body. The publishers are rather too enterprising, it may be. Certain it is, that too many of the texts contained in the various language-series betray hurried work: the able editors were saving their deliberate scientific efforts for *majora opera.*

And the spirit of brotherly love that animates us all, has been keeping us silent. But I sometimes feel that if the critics would only do their worst, the editors might do their best.

OTTO HELLER.

*Washington University.*

## *SPANISH LANGUAGE.*

*Lo esencial del lenguaje castellano.* Obra basada en el nuevo método para el inglés de Albert Le Roy Bartlett. Por M. MONTROSE RAMSEY. New York, 1901: Silver, Burdett y Compañía. 8vo, 404 pp.

PROFESSOR RAMSEY'S book preserves the high merits and excellent features of Bartlett's *Essentials of Language and Grammar*. The object aimed at throughout is to induce the Spanish-speaking pupil to work his own way through the subject in a natural manner. The pupil is not dismayed with apparatus made up of brackets, braces, and diagrams. The book is meant to be interesting and thus easy. The contention of some of the child-psychologists that a child's whole course of study should be interesting first of all, embodies an important principle. As a model, the lesson on the origin of proper names (p. 51) seems pedagogically perfect in this respect, after *Un ligero estudio de las palabras* (p. 36). The illustrative material of the book is interesting as well as valuable, in contrast to the many grammars which contain a host of poor illustrations or a paucity of good ones.

The verb receives very full treatment which might, however, be shortened to advantage; the text should show the relative numerical importance of the conjugations and should state that 'accent' is the great factor. Whether the termination begins with a *fuerte* or *suave* vowel is a poor guide and untenable, making a simple thing complex for a pupil still in the grades. Furthermore, *fuerte*, on p. 14, refers to *a*, *e*, or *o*, but on p. 382, *fuerte* does not apply to *e*, and so is confusing. The pupil has a plain pattern to fill in if he begins by learning that under accent *e* changes to *ie*, and *o* to *ue* in each conjugation, but that the third conjugation, if irregular at all, is irregular, almost without exceptions, also in the gerund and third persons preterit. P. 332, l. 9, bot., *siempre* makes the statement faulty; p. 338, *adquirir* and *inquirir* follow in the present-stem the commoner verb *querer* under accent; p. 355, the statement in regard to *nacer* is superfluous, and for the meaning 'sprout, grow,' inexact; p. 356, the statement in regard to *yacer* is not clear, for it seems to imply that *yacer* is used only in the present tense, since the root does not change at all in other tenses; p. 357, *Freir: me tienen frito* occurs in *Alvareda*, 67, 4, (Holt ed.) In the verb tables, as elsewhere, the printer has served the author well, appealing to the eye to help the memory.

Professor Ramsey has quoted with great care and independence about fifty Cis-Atlantic Spanish authors and a third as many from Spain, all choice. The passages cited are well adapted for illustrative material; for instance, on page 240 there are nineteen illustrations of the adverb; on page 295 f. twenty-seven illustrations of the participle; on page 301, in thirty-eight lines, thirty-eight instances of intransitive verbs; on page 308 f., in twenty-three lines, twenty-one reflexives equal to passives. The letter from Venice by Phillips Brooks to his niece (Bartlett, p. 52) is appropriately paralleled by the Spanish one from Venice by Acosta to his niece, p. 72. Professor Ramsey gives the names of the authors oftener than Bartlett does. This is an advantage, for the pupil with no interest in names (often indeed unaware who the author of his text book is) will unconsciously or subconsciously absorb some of these names. As a work for the grammar grades of Spanish schools *Lo essencial del lenguaje castellano* seems to be admirable.

The following errata have been noted: The names *Julia* and *Luisa Pérez de Montes de Oca*, which refer to one and the same person, suffer confusion in the index, and the reference to page 230 is omitted; p. 13, l. 3, bot., *ayundándolas* for *ayudándolas;* p. 16, l. 3, bot., *oracion* for *oración;* p. 27, l. 8, bot., *zun-zún* too rare a word to use; p. 33, nothing is said of the accent mark in the case of *ti* and infinitives *oir*, *freir*, etc., *tí* occurs passim, four times on p. 270; p. 63, l. 7, *minuscula* for *minúscula;* p. 71, l. 2 and 7, the Latin should be in italics; p. 74, l. 10, *bara* for *para;* p. 78,

l. 6, *dirije* for *dirige;* p. 86, l. 6, *segun* for *según;* p. 93, the parenthesis should be italics; p. 105, l. 13, *regressar* for *regresar;* p. 164, l. 12 bot., *estos* for *éstos;* p. 172, l. 15, *las ricos* for *los ricos;* p. 202, l. 11, *Este* for *Éste;* p. 224, l. 3, *Julia* same as p. 229 et passim *Luisa;* p. 267, 371, *Fernán Caballero* should not be given by maiden name *Böhl von Fáber*, but by *Arrón de Ayala;* p. 271, l. 15, *piés* for *pies;* p. 331, l. 7 bot., *á veces* for *de verbos irregulares de la tercera conjugación* (*con pocas excepciones*); p. 331, l. 5, bot., *usualmente* for *en verbos regulares;* p. 331, l. 2, bot., *Raiz* for *Raíz;* p. 332, l. 9, bot., after *es* insert *casi;* p. 332, l. 4, *lleva* for *irregularidad queda;* p. 342, l. 9, *andábais* for *andabais;* p. 348, l. 10, after *venir* supply *viniendo.*

PERCY B. BURNET.

*Butler College.*

---

## *ENGLISH LITERATURE.*

*Introduction to the Study of English Literature.* By VIDA D. SCUDDER, A. M. Globe School Book Company, New York and Chicago.

PERHAPS a book of this class ought not to be taken too seriously. If, as in the present case, it is a light and fairly readable presentation of the subject, that is enough. One ought not to complain if, for example, the writer's final authority on the history of the English language is as far from canonical as M. Jusserand; or if the works of Brooke, Gosse, and Saintsbury, with their numerous inaccuracies, are 'among the books frequently used' in compilation; or even if bits of exaggeration creep in at times, such as the statement that in Elizabeth's reign 'the language of Chaucer was as different from ordinary speech as it is today.'

Unfortunately a few traditional errors touch the book with staleness. Thus Chaucer is amateurishly called, in one instance, 'an earnest child,' and again he is said to possess 'a heart as fresh as a child.' This is hardly the Chaucer of *The Wife of Bath*, *The Merchant's Tale*, or *Troilus and Criseyde*. 'The Latin of the Church,' we are told, 'was a decadent tongue, in which little that was vital was produced.' So we are well rid of such rubbish as the Latin Hymns, the Missal, the Breviary, the accumulation of poetic material in the patristic commentaries; and the literary pretensions of Bede, of Gregory, of Dante's master, Aquinas, are suppressed for ever. Centuries are easily cleared away by the statement that prior to the eleventh century 'conditions had long been stationary in Europe.'

The book is broken into a great number of short chapters, so that the reader, while thus secured from the weariness of sustained effort, is also safe from a sense of the nature and vitality of great cultural movements in English history. A brief excerpt from the table of contents will illustrate: The Mediæval Drama, The Fifteenth Century, The Rebirth, Learning and Poetry under Henry VIII., Outlines of Elizabethan Literature, Sir Philip Sidney, General Literature, Edmund Spenser, The Early Drama, William Shakespeare, etc.

It is a curious rule of proportion by which three pages are devoted to the *Song of Roland*, and six to the *Canterbury Tales*, but only seventeen lines to *Samson Agonistes*. And may one not question the wisdom which, in a book for high schools, gives fourteen lines to *Venus and Adonis* and *The Rape of Lucrece*, ten to *The Wife of Bath*, but only four to Burke and three to *Paradise Regained?* Twelve pages are occupied by Old English poetry, and one by Old English prose, the latter beginning, 'This prose . . . calls for brief comment only . . . . It lacks the sense of art, and is very dry and dull.' Ælfric is not even mentioned. A work so significant as King Alfred's *Bede* is ignored; the author finds no literary value worth mentioning in the preface or the concluding prayer of *Boethius;* in fact the great king is dismissed with a mere allusion. All this in a book confessing its desire to be 'in accord with the modern tendency which is bringing into clearer light the significance of our origins.'

The lists of reference-books are long, but not critical. They omit works as obvious as Minto's *Manual of English Prose Literature*, Morton Luce's *Handbook to Tennyson's Works*, Dixon's *Tennyson's Primer*, and Hudson's *Shakespeare;* the dreary Rolfe and Clarendon Press editions of single plays are recommended, but nothing is said of the more useful and judicious Arden and Pitt Press editions.

In point of style most teachers will agree that an abundance of fine writing is not a trustworthy means of imbuing young people with genuine enthusiasm for good literature. A student will not love Milton the more for hearing that 'his youthful feet, like those of his compeers, strayed in fields full of blossoms; but theirs were the lush meadows of the lowlands, his the high pastures close beneath the everlasting snows. The light of the upper air is in the cool brilliance of the flowers he tenders us.' The Freshman's style does not improve under the influence of such English as: 'He was not a country boy, steeped in the profound love of Nature, as Wordsworth was, he was city-bred;' or, 'Close consecutive discussion of the text is the best method to draw near to a great author;' or, 'The plays of Dekker are alit with pure poetry.'

After all, the book seems to deserve some attention, at least from the reviewer. The reasons are two in number. First, better books for the purpose than this are already available, whose right and lawful place is menaced by the advent of an inferior one. Secondly, this book is not unique, but typical, and any encouragement carelessly bestowed upon it only tends to make the species a prolific one, especially in the field of English.

CHARLES GROSVENOR OSGOOD.
*Yale University.*

---

## *DIVINA COMMEDIA.*

*Tavole schematiche della Divina Commedia di Dante Alighieri* compilate dal Prof. Dr. LUIGI POLACCO, seguite da 6 *Tavole topografiche in cromolitografia* disegnate dal Mo. GIOVANNI AGNELLI. Milano: Ulrico Hoepli, 1901. 12mo, pp. x, 167.

THERE are many aids to the study of the *Divina Commedia* in the way of commentaries, essays, indexes, etc., but Dr. Polacco is the first to offer us a Baedeker for the mystical journey. With this manual in his hand the pilgrim who would follow

> Dietro alle poste delle care piante

need never lament that

> . . . . la diritta via era smarrita,

for the whole itinerary is marked out, and every person and object of interest is indicated in the proper place, so that, notwithstanding the extent and complexity of the journey, it is always easy for the traveler to take his bearings.

Dr. Polacco gives eighteen *Tavole schematiche* for each *cantica* of the *Divina Commedia*, all arranged on the same plan. In the first table of the *Inferno*, for instance, he designates the sins of the several circles, citing one or two descriptive verses of the poem for each sin; in another table, with similar citations, the guardians and ministers of punitive justice; in another, the individual sinners; in another, the punishments and their reasons; in another, the utterances, blasphemies, and vulgarities of the damned; in another, their threats and insults; in another, the similes; in another, familiar quotations. The student who will take the trouble to copy a few of these tables will not only have the order of the poem fixed indelibly in his memory, together with the contents of each table as given by the compiler, but he will also have provided himself with a cabinet of mental pigeonholes in which all his further acquisitions of Dante lore may be conveniently stored.

A guide for the tourist and a method for the student are what the *Tavole schematiche* offer, and they are well adapted for their purposes.

Mr. Agnelli is favorably known to Dante scholars by his *Topocronografia del viaggio dantesco*.[1] In his six *Tavole topografiche* accompanying the present manual he pays less regard than in the former publication to the opinions and maps of other commentators and illustrators, working out the topography from his own careful studies of the poem. He gives us accordingly an *Inferno* whose descent, unlike that of most of those imagined by his predecessors, would not have been impracticable for the traveler of whom Virgil said,

> . . . . non è spirto che per l' aer vada,

and who said of himself,

> . . . . io, che meco avea di quel d'Adamo.

His *Purgatorio* is not the huge tower or smokestack figured by Russo and Solerti, but it is a real mountain, as Dante repeatedly calls it,

[1] Milano, Hoepli, 1891.

and as Ulysses says it appeared to him:

> . . . . N'apparve una montagna bruna
> Per la distanza, e parvemi alta tanto
> Quanto veduta non avea alcuna.

The *Tavole topografiche* are as simple as the complexity of the subject allows and they afford a real help to the comprehension of the poem. The *Inferno*, *Purgatorio*, and *Paradiso* are mapped out with the geometrical accuracy that the marvelous precision of Dante's description permits, details are fully indicated, and the course of the poet's journey is clearly marked. It is only in the descent from the Eighth Circle to the Ninth that the topographer finds an insuperable difficulty in attempting to reduce the particulars of the narrative to a graphic representation.

EDWARD ALLEN FAY.

*Gallaudet College.*

---

## *FRENCH LANGUAGE.*

*An Elementary French Reader*, by GASTON DOUAY. New York: Silver, Burdett & Company, 1901. Pp. 297.

THIS new candidate for public favor commends itself at first sight because the book is attractively printed and the page has a pleasing appearance. A closer inspection, however, shows that the book is not well adapted to the use of elementary classes, and it is only for such that a "Reader" has a *raison d'être*. In fact, easy and interesting texts are now furnished in so great a variety that the "Reader" is likely to diminish in popularity. Then, too, this is largely a book of extracts, in spite of the fact that the editor in his preface speaks disparagingly of books so made up.

Considered as an elementary reader, almost all the selections in the book are too difficult. Before the pupil has read a hundred pages, he will have encountered selections from Molière's *L'Avare*, la Bruyère's *Caractères*, Pascal's *Pensées*, Bossuet's *Oraisons Funèbres*, and others of almost equal difficulty and abstruseness.

Another defect in the book is that the notes are excessively numerous. Where there is a vocabulary, there is no need of definitions in the notes, the proper object of these being to explain matters that can not be properly explained in the vocabulary. Referring, for example, to page 216, it may be said that notes 7, 14, 15, 19, 20, 24, 31, 34, and 36 would better have been omitted and the appropriate definitions given in the vocabulary. Besides, when notes have as many as three figures to distinguish them, they become disagreeably prominent and disfigure the page. A reference to page 53 will show this. On the other hand, such expressions as "états généraux" (p. 9), "corvée" (p. 17), "jeu de paume" (p. 19), "la Terreur" (p. 22), are not explained either in the notes or the vocabulary. True, the text does give a hint of what these words mean, but that is no sufficient reason for not explaining them fully.

Again, some of the notes are too brief to be helpful. To mention only a few instances: p. 17, note 51; p. 21, note 63; p. 22, note 69; p. 25, note 76; p. 28, notes 83 and 85, which should have given a literal translation of the passage in question as well as an explanation. If a pupil gets the literal meaning of each word, he can usually see the meaning of the figurative expression; whereas, if the meaning is merely glossed over for him, he will certainly not recognize it when he meets it in another connection. Thus, if a pupil knew the meaning of each word in the sentence "il met sur pied une armée," he would be very likely to hit on the proper expression in English without any assistance.

Some notes, likewise, have been observed that are either misleading or absolutely incorrect. Thus p. 24, note 74, creates the impression that "un coup d'état" is an act of the government—which is, of course, not correct. P. 35, note 4 would better read "friction matches," since phosphorus is not necessarily present in the "allumette chimique." Concerning p. 58, note 9, it may be said that to translate "épée de chevet" by "vade mecum" would probably not help the student much. This is a case where it would be necessary to define the definition, which ought never to be expected. P. 61, note 26 is not clear and "accommoder de toutes pièces" p. 63, note 53, should not be translated "tear in pieces" because the pupil might take the words liter-

ally: "ciron" p. 84, note 5, should have been given in the vocabulary as "mite" and the note omitted. It may also be said, referring to this note, that the fact that Pascal was so "unscientific" would have been a good reason for omitting this selection. "Combat singulier" p. 108, n. 15, means "duel." A "single fight" means either "one fight" or a fight in which only one person takes a part, which is nonsense. In p. 115, note 13, it would have been more useful to tell us the *value* of the coin than to tell us its *size*. P. 128, note 9 does not mean "could not answer," but "took care not to answer." P. 130, note 32 gives us a curious translation, and one which, moreover, is not correct. The meaning is "don't meddle with things that don't concern you," but here, too, a literal translation would have been useful. "Porte bâtarde," p. 139, note 47, can not possibly mean "house door," since we are told just below that on passing this "porte" one found oneself in "un vaste jardin." The particular "porte" in question was evidently neither an ordinary small gate, nor a carriage gate, as might have been expected in a wall of this kind. P. 169, note 64 might have been more literally translated and then, too, spurs do not usually have "hilts." "Pêcher en eau trouble" p. 170, note 81, means according to Littré "faire des affaires peu honorables." "Brigadiers" p. 178, note 136, does not mean "corporals of cavalry," but "commanders of squads of gendarmes." "Correspondant" p. 180, note 154, is also incorrect, as the context will show. It might be translated "substitute." What the father evidently wanted was that Christodule should act *in loco parentis*, and look after the interests of his daughter.

The reason for dividing the book into four parts is not apparent, since there is no difference between parts ii and iii, either in the character, or the difficulty of the selections. Indeed, numbers iv and ix of part ii are, perhaps, the most difficult in the book.

Since the editor has given us one hundred and eighty-three pages of prose, and only five short poems, the inference is that he regards French poetry as of little consequence in elementary instruction, which many teachers would not admit.

Misprints are few, only the following having been noticed: p. 17, l. 18, for *époque* read *époque;* p. 21, l. 2, for *résérvés* read *réservés;* p. 96, l. 24, for *e les* read *elles;* p. 141, l. 17, note 1 should be 61; p. 148, l. 3, there should be no period after "Mme."

O. B. SUPER.

*Dickinson College.*

---

## *FRENCH GRAMMAR.*

*A French Grammar for Schools and Colleges, together with a Brief Reader and English Exercises*, by H. W. FRASER and J. SQUAIR. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1901. 12mo, iv + 551 pp.

THE authors of this grammar have brought to their work the critical judgment that comes from experience in the class-room, to which is added accurate observation of the needs of the student, and the conception of a correct and economical employment of time and effort on the part of both teacher and student. The list of French grammars is already long, and many of them are excellent, but the grammar under consideration contains many points of superiority which should recommend it to teachers of French in colleges and high schools.

The arrangement is as follows: Pp. 1–12 contain a treatment of French sounds. A feature which is welcome is the use of phonetic characters. The authors have wisely adopted an easy system of symbols already largely used, that of the "Association Phonétique Internationale," instead of giving us another independent system to add to the large stock already on hand. The use of the phonetic symbols is extended to the vocabularies which illustrate the lessons, and to the general vocabulary at the end of the volume. This will make the student more confident in his oral recitation, and will materially aid the work of the teacher, besides saving time eventually. The student is cautioned against the misconception that French and English sounds of similar nature are identical. This is only a hint, of course, but a necessary one too often omitted.

Part i, pp. 13–128, contains the essentials of French grammar presented in progressive and

logical order, including the most necessary simpler rules of syntax. A sensible feature is the presentation of the verbs of the regular conjugations by tenses, a clear and economical procedure. The regular verbs are taken up early and developed gradually in connection with the other parts of speech. Careful distinction is made between the use of the imperfect, the past definite, and the past indefinite; the last tense is used exclusively up to p. 106 to express past time, at which point it should become well established in the student's mind, and a confusion of this tense with others should be avoided.

Part ii is, as stated in the Preface, "a systematic grammar of modern French for later study and general reference," in which the arrangement is conventional, except that the verb is treated first. Here the verbal forms which have been scattered through Part i, are collected into a table of the three conjugations followed by the irregular verbs. Each irregular verb is followed by a list of verbs similarly conjugated. There is an alphabetical list of all irregular verbs.

The treatment given to prepositions is especially full, and will be found helpful to the student. The lists of prepositions used between verb and infinitive (pp. 199–209), between verb and object (pp. 217–219), and between adjective and object (pp. 260–262) are particularly valuable, and are more complete than in any French grammar heretofore published in English.

Of the five hundred and fifty-one pages, about one hundred and forty-five are given to exercises, ninety-one to a vocabulary and a word and subject index, and the rest to grammatical matter and a reader.

The exercises deserve especial commendation. The plan in Part i is to furnish abundant material for written and oral practice. The sentences are perfectly sensible, and illustrate the grammatical principles without sacrificing naturalness. In addition to the French models and the English sentences, a certain portion of each exercise is designed for oral practice. In this the question form is used. From exercise thirty onward, the narrative style is introduced, and a portion of the English sentences are built upon the narrative. Illustrative sentences (pp. 337–382) are also provided for Part ii. Composition exercises based upon the French Reader occupy pages 439–460. Proper attention is given to connected sentences at an early period, thus affording more naturalness and flexibility than would otherwise be the case. The exercises are so full and varied that this part of the work can be easily restricted or extended at all stages to suit the particular requirements of the course or the class.

The Reader contains easy selections from well-known authors of the last three centuries.

Economy is a feature of the work. In Part i the possessive adjectives and articles are treated together, the plural formation of nouns, adjectives, and possessive adjectives are considered simultaneously, and the verbs are presented by tenses.

The tenses that offer no difficulty are treated briefly, while those that are not so easily handled are given more extended consideration, and are not hurried.

This work is based on sound pedagogical principles, is complete and well arranged, is well adapted for use in a short or extended course in secondary school or college; it amply provides for the needs of the class-room and for private reference, gives in Part i only what is necessary to start the beginner safely, and in Part ii presents a full and satisfactory reference grammar. It is clear, progressive, concise, and interesting throughout; it is planned with experience behind it, and with the prospect of good results before it.

A. E. Curdy.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

## *SPANISH LITERATURE.*

*Crónica Troyana*, códice gallego del Siglo xiv de la Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid, con apuntes gramaticales y vocabulario por D. Manuel R. Rodriguez. Publícalo Andréz Martínez Salazar. La Coruña, 1900. 2 vols. fol. with facsimile.

*Estoria Troyãa* acabada era de mill et quatroçentos et onze annos (1373). Extraits du MS. de la Bibliothèque de Madrid I-i-67. Publiés par J. Cornu, Professeur de philologie romane á l'Université allemande de Prague. 8vo, pp. 34 (Extr. *Miscellanea Ascoli*, 1901).

It is certainly not a little strange that, after

being hidden away in some dusty corner of the library of the famous Marquis of Santillana, and afterwards in that of the Dukes of Infantado and Osuna, for over five hundred years, two scholars should, simultaneously, have determined to make this precious manuscript known to the world.

In my edition of *Macias, O Namorado*,[1] I had observed that Amador de los Rios, *Obras del Marqués de Santillana*, p. 608, mentions the existence of a Galician translation, of the fourteenth century, of the *Chronica Troyana* as existing in the library of the Marquis.[2] My final remark that I did not know whether this MS. had passed to the Biblioteca Nacional, with the rest of the Osuna collection in 1886, induced Professor Teza, of Pavia, well known for his important contributions to the history of Spanish literature, to write to Sr. Menéndez Pidal as to the whereabouts of this MS. His answer is as follows:

"*La Troyana* gallega está en la Biblioteca Nacional–MSS. I-i-67. Creo que la castellana del Escorial, aunque hecho tambien en la Corte de Alfonso XI y Pedro I, se hizo sobre la gallega, contra lo que afirme Amador de los Rios. Lo digo por algun galleguismo que descubrí en la del Escorial."

This is quite the opposite of what Sr. Martínez Salazar says: "No podrá dudarse de que este códice [gallego] es traducción casi literal del castellano escurialense, ó de otro anólogo," (p. xiii), and Professor Cornu is also of this opinion, as we shall see.

Of the codex here published, which consists of one hundred and eighty-five leaves of parchment, folios 1–100 and 119–128 were written by Fernan Martíis, the chaplain of Fernan Pérez de Andrade, a celebrated Galician knight, who had the manuscript made. This information is given on fol. 92r., which had been carefully erased, but which the use of reagents again made legible. It is as follows:

"Sabbean quantos este liuro virē que eu fernā mrs [Martíis] clerigo, et capelan de fernā perez dandrade escriuj este liuro, des onde sse começa esta estoria ata aqui. et escriuj aynda mays outro quaderno en que ha dez follas que uay aco adeãte. et scriujo per mãdado do dito fernā perez. Et sabede que este fernā perez foy fillo de Roy freyre dandrade et por mī creede de çerto que a este tẽpo que este liuro foy escripto que este fernā perez era omellor homen que auia entõçe en Galiza dos cõde ou rrico homen afora. Et sabede que el aeste tẽpo era homen de duzentos homens de cavalo armados a todo punto. Et era señor da vila da Cruña et da uila de Betãços et da Ponte de Ume. Et Ferrol et a Ponte de Ume derallas elrrey por sua herdade. Et outrossy tãben era señor de Neda et de Çedeira et de Santa Marta et de Outeyro et de Vilalua et de todos seus terminos de todas estas uilas et lugares et tãben das terras chãas en todas estas comarquas en gisa que quantos homens moravã en todas las ditas uilas bõos et ligeyros et arredor ẽnas. . . ."

And on fol. 92 vo. we read:

"Este liuro foy acabado viinte dias andados do mes de Janeyro. Era de mill et quatro çẽtos et onze annos. Et eu o dito Frnã ms [=Martíis] clerigo. Rogo et peço por lo amor de deus et por salvamento de suas almas et en penitençia de seus pecados aquantos este liuro virẽ et oyrẽ. que digan por la mĩa alma hũ pater noster. et hũa Avemaria. aa onrra de deus padre et de deus fillo e de deus spiritu santo. que me queyra pordoar. et da Virgen Maria sua madre quelle Roge por mī et por vos. queo queyra assy cõprir et outorgar."

At the end of the MS. in the hand of Fernan Martíis, we read:

"Este liuro mandou fazer o muyto alto et muy noble et muy eixelente Rey don Alfonso fillo do muy noble Rey don Fernãdo. et da Reyna donna Costançia. Et fui dado descriuĩr et destoriar ẽno tẽpo que o muy noble Rey dom Pedro rreynou. Ao qual mãtena deus ẽno seu serviço por muytos tẽpos et bõos. Et os sobreditos onde el vẽ seiã herdeiros ẽno rreyno de deus amen. feito oliuro e acabado o postremeiro dia de dezenbro era de mill et ccclxxxviii annos Nicolão Gz [Gonzales] scrivan dos seus liuros scriveu per seu mandado."

With the exception of *scriveu*, the third person instead of the first, these lines are the literal translation of the last lines of the *Estoria Troyana* in Castilian, finished at the end of December, 1350. In the opinion of Prof. Cornu this dispels every doubt as to the true relation between the Galician and Castilian texts.

Both editors have endeavored to reproduce the orthography of the MS. as nearly as may

1 Philadelphia, 1900, p. 33, note.

2 Cf. also the same author's *Historia Crítica de la Literatura Española*, vol. iv, p. 244, et seq.

be; both have kept the ancient punctuation "parce qu'elle repose sur de meilleurs principes que celle en usage aujourd'hui;" as Prof. Cornu says. The latter scholar has also distinguished between *u* and *v*, and used capital letters with proper names; this Sr. Martínez Salazar has not done, as it is not done in the manuscript. A comparison of the two texts shows very slight differences, and is a proof of the minute and painstaking care of Sr. Salazar and M. Cornu.

In the following notes, I give the text of Salazar first. Always *aujan*, C. *aviian* and *avian; vijñan: viinā; vijr: vīir; desparesca* (308): *desperesca; duron* (308) misprint, C. has *duron; da sua parte: de.* Salazar always uses the Spanish form *por*, while Cornu nearly always has *per; porla: pela; çerca* (309) typ. error, C. has *çerta; rrecebedes* (309) correct, C. has *rreceberdes; querra* (309) should be *queyra*, the subjunctive, as in C.; *home: homen* always. The final *e* of adverbs is always omitted in S. *apostament, adeant*, etc. Cornu nearly always represents the final *n* by a *tilde. retraudo et posfacado* (312): *rretrauda et posfacada*, as it should be; it is Breçayda who is speaking. *eemjgos: ẽemigos; ajudadeslos para seer: ajudadelos*, the former is correct; *avedes: aviedes* (10) is a misprint; *homes: homens* always; *escarnido: escarnudo*, the former a misprint. *deteemento, deteer, teemos: detẽemento, detẽer, tẽemos; amjude: amĩude; mereçesse* (321): *merçesse* (14); *perssiãos: Perssãos; mill: mille; dulgas: Dulgos; porn: peru.* On p. 321, l. 25, we have the spelling *elmos de panja*, where the variant given is *panjo*—and in the vocabulary the correction is indicated: error for *pauja:* Cornu has *elmos de Pavia;* cf. the name of the trobador *Joham Soares de Pauha, Payva, Pavia.*

Both of these publications are the work of scholars from whom we may expect the greatest accuracy, and both are most welcome—the briefer excerpts from the MS. especially to those to whom the larger publication is inaccessible. Prof. Cornu gives only the text, with some important remarks at the end, concerning his system of transcription.

The work of Srs. Rodriguez and Martínez Salazar is truly monumental: it is magnificently printed in two large folio volumes. The whole is preceded by an excellent grammar of the old Galician dialect, over eighty-five pages folio, from the pen of the well known scholar, D. Manuel R. Rodriguez, whose blindness has in nowise impaired the extreme care and accuracy with which he has preformed his task. The vocabulary, prepared by the same grammarian, is also singularly complete and admirably done. We have already spoken of the great accuracy and trustworthiness of the text presented to us by the learned editor, Don Andrés Martínez Salazar. It is what we should expect from a scholar of such high reputation as a paleographer. But Sr. Salazar has not only given us the whole of the Galician text as represented by the Madrid manuscript; this, as is well known, is incomplete at the beginning. Of these opening chapters that are missing—thirty-four in number—he supplies the Spanish text from the MS. in the Escurial, as an Appendix to his work, and in another appendix gives such chapters as are contained in the bilingual MS.—Galician and Castilian, belonging to Sr. Menéndez y Pelayo, and which are not found in the Madrid text. The introduction contains a detailed description of the manuscripts, and a very interesting account of his treatment of the various abbreviations and diacritical marks of the codex. Taking it all in all, the *Cronica Troyana* does great honor to Spanish scholarship and also to the Deputation of the Province of Coruña, through whose munificence this—one of the most important monuments of the old Galician dialect, has been made accessible.

HUGO ALBERT RENNERT.

*University of Pennsylvania.*

## *LITERATURE IN THE SOUTH.*

*Selections from the Southern Poets*, selected and edited by WILLIAM LANDER WEBER, Emory College, Ga. New York: The Macmillan Co. 1901. 16mo., pp. l+221, 25 cents.

"THIS book," says Dr. Weber, "is intended primarily to meet the recommendation of the Georgia Teachers' Association that applicants for admission into the Freshman Class of Georgia colleges be examined on selections from Southern poets. Yet the anthology is not compiled in a sectional spirit; for limited

as was the literary expression of the old South, it has not, as a rule, had adequate attention; and it is believed that there will be a demand for such a book wherever there is desire to study American literature."

That there will be a wide demand for this attractive little book hardly admits of a doubt. Hitherto the writings of Southern poets have not been accessible to students and general readers except in Clarke's *Songs of the South* (1896), an admirable book but a trifle too costly to be used widely in secondary schools. Miss Clarke's anthology, moreover, though it contains a biographical appendix, has no notes, the latter being a commendable feature of Dr. Weber's edition.

Twenty-five poets are represented and, while it would be easy to name not a few genuine poems (not poets) that the editor has omitted, it is doubtful whether his one hundred and ninety pages of text could have been better filled. His notes and biographical sketches are accurate, he makes no unwarranted claims for his authors, he never sacrifices literary judgment to sectional patriotism, and, so far as I have observed, there are but three typographical errors: "songs" for "song" (p. 65, l. 10), the omission of "forty" before "nights" (p. 75, l. 4), and "craftmanship" for "craftsmanship" (p. 196, l. 7). There is, however, here and there an infelicity of diction that could easily be removed in a second edition. Thus, for example, in the Preface (p. xiii):

"In the midst of this happiness his habits of using excitants returned, and the position on the *Messenger* was soon lost. The foregoing sentence has told in short the sad story of the remaining thirteen years of Poe's life."

The following note (p. 191) was read many times before the meaning dawned:

"Homer impresses us with the beauty of Helen of Troy by reporting as warriors men too old for battle saying: 'Small blame is it Trojans and well-greaved Achaians should for such a woman long time suffer hardships.'"

There are, it seems to me, two defects in Dr. Weber's book, though I have already shown my appreciation of its value by ordering more than one hundred copies for supplementary reading in my Freshman study of American literature: 1. It should be prefaced by an introductory review of literary conditions in the South before and after 1870.[1] The anthology needs such a setting in order to explain the comparative dearth of poetry in the South and to throw around the selections the historical environment necessary to their adequate interpretation. The biographical sketches are helps but they do not entirely compass the need; they do not enable the student to view Southern literature as an evolution, to understand the literary isolation of ante-bellum days, the causes of the recent renaissance, the growing sense of literary community, the changed attitude toward literature as a profession, the rise and decay of sectionalism, the increasing fidelity of Southern writers since the Civil War to what they have seen, heard, and know. A sketch of this sort, and Dr. Weber is abundantly able to write it, would supply background and perspective for every poem in the collection and be itself a needed chapter in the history of American literature.

2. The short bibliography given suggests the advisability either of entire omission or at least of radical change. Such entries as "Lanier: *Poems*," "Russell: *Poems*," "Ryan: *Poems*" add nothing to the completeness of the bibliography; and the special studies in individual poets, which make up most of the twenty-five works listed, had much better appear under the corresponding biographies than be collected here at the end. The separate space devoted to bibliography would then be reserved for the publications that treat either Southern literature as a whole or some particular problem or aspect of this literature. Such a bibliography would include, to mention only the works that Dr. Weber has omitted, Baskervill's "Southern Literature" (*Publications of the Mod. Lang. Assoc. of America*, viii); Bradshaw's *Southern Poetry prior to 1860* (B. F. Johnson Co.; 1900); Coleman's "The Recent Movement in the Literature of the South" (*Harper's Monthly*, May, 1887); Hale's

1 I have attempted to show the significance of this date as regards the renaissance of Southern literature in "The Possibilities of the South in Literature" (*Sewanee Review*, July, 1898) and "The Historical Element in Recent Southern Literature" (*Publications of the Mississippi Historical Soc.*, Vol. ii, 1899).

"The Poetry of the South" (*Methodist Review*, Nos. 151 and 152, Nashville, Tenn.); W. D. Howells's "The Southern States in Recent American Literature" (*Literature*, Sept. 10, 1898: Harper and Brothers); Ingle's *Southern Sidelights* (T. Y. Crowell: 1896); Kent's *The Revival of Interest in Southern Letters* (B. F. Johnson Co.: 1899); Mabie's "Literature in the South" (*The Outlook*, Dec. 2, 1899: reprinted by B. F. Johnson Co.: 1900); Manly's *Southern Literature from 1579 to 1895* (B. F. Johnson Co.: 1895); Brander Matthews's *Aspects of Fiction* (Harper and Brothers, 1896: cap. ii is a discussion of Page's "Old South" and Trent's *William Gilmore Simms*); Page's *The Old South* (Charles Scribner's Sons: 1896); and Tourgee's "The South as a Field for Fiction" (*The Forum*, Dec., 1888).

This list is not exhaustive but it is inexpensive, easily accessible, and represents, so far as I know, the best that has been said on the general subject of literature in the South. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that in this literature may be found the key to certain phases of social and institutional history in the South.[2] Were this literature more read *as history*, there would be less complaint that the rising generation is ignorant of its own history. "It is a trite saying," says Dr. James A. H. Murray (*The Evolution of English Lexicography*, p. 24) "that 'they do these things better in France;' but it is, nevertheless, sometimes true. Amid all the changes of government which France has seen in modern times, it has never been forgotten that the history of the French language, and of French letters and French science, is part of the history of France; the British government has not even now attained to the standpoint of recognizing this: among the historical documents published under the direction of the authorities of the Record Office, there is no series illustrating the history of the language, the literature, or the science of England."

C. Alphonso Smith.

*Louisiana State University.*

2 No one appreciated this fact more than the lamented Dr. Herbert B. Adams, former Professor of History in the Johns Hopkins University—a man whose genial nature and inspiriting example will live forever in the hearts of those who sat under him. At his request I mailed him a few years ago a long list of Southern novels, books of poems, and other literature that mirrored faithfully the life, traditions, and institutions of the South. He at once purchased them all and placed them in the University library *as material for the study of Southern history.*

## *FRENCH LITERATURE.*

*Le Chevalier à L'Épée:* An Old French Poem, edited by Edward Cooke Armstrong. (Johns Hopkins University Dissertation, 1897.) Baltimore, 1900. 8vo, 72 pp.

The present editor is the fourth to publish in full a poem belonging to the group of minor Arthurian romances. The anonymous author of the *Chevalier à l'Épée* imitates Chrétien de Troies both in content and language. In some twelve hundred lines, he devotes himself to setting forth, in a style which can claim to be little more than a pale reflection of Chrétien's artful narrative, a trio of somewhat disconnected adventures whose hero is the mundane Gauvain. The editor has made close and careful studies of: 1. the language of the author; 2. the language of the copyist; 3. the literary-historical features of the poem, examining particularly the three main episodes above referred to.

This work has been fortunate enough to obtain thorough-going criticisms from Profs. G. Paris[1] and A. Mussafia (the latter as reported by Dr. E. Herzog).[2] The former speaks in deservedly high terms of the permanent value of Mr. Armstrong's work on the poem. It would be surprising if there were anything of importance to glean in the track of these scholars; in fact, there is very little indeed. The interest of the publication, however, encourages me to add a few remarks on the wording of the text, and on certain outward features of the English commentaries.

Line 176: it seems more prudent not to assume *v* in *seure*, *siure*, nor in *roua* 374, *triues* 673, etc.; 184 better *dit* (and *ocit* 540); for the confusion, cf. *ocist*, just below; 275 *le* (G. Paris) is almost certainly required. The passage closely resembles *Erec et Enide*, ll. 443–449. (It would have been interesting if more of these verbal parallels could have been noticed in the "Notes to the Text.") Lines 289–90 *jalos: vos.* The meaning of the remark on this rime (p. 52) is not clear to me. As *jaleus* is known later (in spite of modern French *jaloux*) the rime is the same as 677–8 *angoissos:*

1 *Romania* xxix, pp. 593–600.

2 *Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Litteratur* xxii², pp. 151–155.

*vos*. Line 752, G. Paris reads: *Savez conment? J'é esprovez*, with lacuna between 754 and 755; Herzog: *Savez coment j'e esprové*. The line is rather a statement, and refers to the trial through which Gauvain has just passed, hence read: *Savez conment l'ai* (or *l'ê*) *esprové*, supposing no lacuna. Line 844 *li mener* may be retained, as Marie de France, *Fables* xxiii, 47, and cf. Herzog's emendation to line 1176; 863 *ce que doit?* (interrogation mark); 884 (and 1018) *a toz*, probably the preposition, hence *atot*.

I do not fear to appear hypercritical (especially as I freely acknowledge my own past sins of this kind) in mentioning the fact that some expressions used by the editor are un-English, suggesting too obviously the workshop. For a publication of permanent value, it is certainly not only of some importance, but of very great importance, that the English text should be carefully looked after before its presentation to the public. Germanisms like "fall together," Gallicisms like "the writing" (*la graphie*) and "precise a dialect," or "tutoiement and vousement" may easily be avoided. I should say also that Mr. Armstrong has too readily granted *droit de cité* to the French adjective *francien*, which, by well established analogy, should appear in English in the form Francian.

T. Atkinson Jenkins.
*University of Chicago.*

---

## *BIBLIOGRAPHY.*

*Books of Reference for Students and Teachers of French.* A Critical Survey by E. G. W. Braunholtz, M. A. London: Th. Wohlleben, 1901. 8vo, iv and 80 pp.

A careful perusal of this little manual leaves the critical mind in doubt as to what may be a just estimate to place upon it: the general idea appears to be so good and the workmanship so poor. The evident object of the work is to serve as a guide for a teacher of French in ordering books from a dealer, or in calling for them in some public library—an object which surely deserves the highest commendation. When, however, we proceed to examine the mode of carrying out this plan we are surprised at the crudeness and primitiveness which characterize the author's efforts.

We find, in the first place, no general divisions in the book, but merely some twenty-eight chapters all placed on a par with one another. Furthermore, these chapters appear to be arranged in no logical or even regular order: beginning with *Bibliographies* we end with *Geography of France*, after having passed through such intermediate stages as *Collections of Extracts*, *Phonetics*, *Provençal*, *French Pronunciation*, *Colloquial French*, *Education in France*, and *French History*, not to mention the nineteen other subdivisions. In some of the chapters an attempt at further classification has been made, although usually the information given is jumbled together in a few unwieldy paragraphs.

For example, the division for *Old French* consists of only two paragraphs, the first one covering nearly four pages and the second less than one page. The distinction made here is that the first paragraph is intended for those who wish to learn some Old French, and the second for those who desire to confine themselves to the modern language but who would like to get a glimpse of the Old French literary spirit. The modern French versions of the *Chanson de Roland*, however, are very inconsistently placed in the middle of the first paragraph, and several works intelligible only to those who know German appear in the second paragraph, whereas they might perhaps more properly have been assigned to a paragraph by themselves.

The *Critical Survey* of the title-page would seem to refer to the fact that several hundred of the titles cited have a few words of explanation or estimate added, while there has been a certain effort at constructing a framework into which the thousand or two references might be inserted. Although the material presented is more abundant than that in the somewhat similar work of Prof. Koschwitz, the author's selective faculty does not seem to have been largely called into play, and he certainly cannot be really acquainted at first hand with one-half of the books he recommends to the use of the student. The principle the author may have followed in making his selection is not apparent, but he seems to have had a

decided *penchant* for citing immense series of volumes which no student or teacher could think of purchasing for his own library. As might very naturally have been expected, especial prominence is given to works published in England, and this very properly indeed as being what the majority of his readers will most wish to know about.

The most important omission noticed is in the section on *Books and Manuscripts*, where no mention is made of Monaci's three collections of facsimiles, in spite of the fact that his collection of one hundred such is certainly the most available one for students of French palæography, taking into consideration both its scope and its price. On p. 22 we miss Prof. Warren's *History of the Novel.*

One of the most interesting of the opinions expressed by the author is to be found on p. 18, where we find the sentence:

"the admirable illustrated *Geschichte der französischen Litteratur*, by Suchier and Birch-Hirschfeld—is a worthy, and in some points even superior, rival of Petit de Julleville's large work."

As an amusing title we may cite (p. 50) "Poiré's *French course for evening classes.*"

The typography is rather poor throughout, and numerous errors of various sorts are noticeable, especially in French words.

Not even distantly approaching Prof. Koschwitz' work for advanced students, nor Prof. Rossmann's for practical work in Paris, the present book would seem to be rather better adapted as a *vademecum* for a student working in the large public libraries.

GEORGE C. KEIDEL.
*Johns Hopkins University.*

---

## *ENGLISH LANGUAGE.*

*An Elementary Old English Reader* (Early West Saxon), edited by ALFRED J. WYATT, M. A. (Cantab. et Londin.). Cambridge: At the University Press, 1901. 171 pp.

THIS Reader forms the continuation of the same author's *Elementary Old English Grammar*, which appeared in 1897. Covering, as it does, singularly familiar ground—its texts being taken from well-known and much used critical editions—there was little chance for display of original scholarship. In accordance with the scheme of his Grammar, Wyatt has confined himself entirely to Early West Saxon. Hence he had naturally to fall back on Sweet's edition of the *Orosius* and the *Cura Pastoralis*, and the Earle-Plummer text of the *Chronicles*. The selections from the latter include the major part of the Parker MS. annals up to 901 A. D.; *Orosius* is rather fully represented by nineteen selections (not omitting Ohthere's and Wulfstan's voyages); and the *Cura Pastoralis* is drawn upon for twelve chapters, in addition to Ælfred's Preface;—making in all ninety-six pages of reading matter.

It is a surprise to us that in this book, which is intended for beginners, the length of vowels has been left unmarked in the texts, only the MS. accents being given. Is the young student expected to master the quantity of vowels solely by means of the Glossary, or will he find it a pleasant task to enter the diacritical signs into the text himself? This method, in our opinion, only serves to increase the difficulties of the study. The beginner simply needs the marks of quantity; why, then, withhold them from him in an elementary book? Sweet followed a more practical course in reserving unmarked texts (from Ælfred and Ælfric) for those who had previously worked through his *Anglo-Saxon Primer* and *Reader*. Similarly, in the Glossary, we miss certain helps which are ordinarily supplied in books of this kind, namely the separation of compounds into their elements, the labeling of the strong verbs with their class numbers, and the occasional inclusion of inflectional forms, for example, the preterits of verbs or plurals of nouns. Hardly any etymological hints are given. Very likely, serious pedagogical reasons are responsible for this procedure; but we are strongly inclined to question its utility. We are willing to admit, however, that the actual users of the Reader may, after all, be the best judges of its practical merits.

The editor's work, as shown in the Notes and Glossary, is careful and scholarly, as in fact we had reason to expect from Mr. Wyatt. Especially the notes on the two Alfredian texts are quite welcome. A few explanations have been noticed which do not seem to the point.

33. 19, (*ond þa kyningas, ond þa oðre heahðungene men, swa micle leng swa hi maran speda habbað, hwilum healf gẏar*), *þæt hi beoð unforbærned ond licgað bufan eorðan on hyra husum*. Wyatt's note reads: "*þæt* 'during which time.' Supply *licgað* in l. 18 from *lið* in l. 16." We prefer to take *þæt* as the redundant conjunction, which is by no means uncommon in the apodosis (or its equivalent); for example, *Æfter þæm þe Romeburg getimbred wæs iiii hunde wintrum 7 lxxx, gemong þæm oþrum monegum wundrum þe on þæm dagum gelumpan, þæt mon geseah weallan blod of eorþan 7 rinan meolc of heofonum*, Oros. 162. 4; ib. 78. 1; 154. 1; etc.; *Of þære tide Paulinus se biscop syx ger ful, þæt is óð endan þæs cyninges rices, þæt he mid his fultome in þære mægðe Godes word bodode 7 lærde*, Bede 138. 28; etc., etc. The construction may also have been influenced by the occurrence of the conjunction *þæt* in the preceding clause: *Ond þær is mid Estum ðeaw, þonne þær bið man dead, þæt he lið inne unforbærned*, etc.

71. 7. *ðone naman anne we lufedon ðætte we Cristene wæren, & swiðe feawe þa ðeawas*. We do not regard Sweet's interpretation of *swiðe feawe þa ðeawas* ("very few of the virtues") as untenable. The construction is in a line with: *hie sume* 14. 20 (Wyatt's *Reader*); *mid sumum þam here*, 16. 30; 30, 16; *hie healfe*, 41. 22; further: *mid feawum hire geferum*, Bede 332. 21; ib. 388. 7 (see variants). Cf. Wülfing, i, §374.

73. 6. *ond ðeah þa worldlecan læceas scomað þæt hi onginnen þa wunda lacnian þe hi gesion ne magon, ond huru gif hi nouðer gecnawan ne cunnon ne þa medtrymnesse ne eac þa wyrta þe ðærwið sculon*. The note: "*nouðer gecnawan ne cunnon* 'are neither acquainted nor familiar with'" is somewhat enigmatical. Certainly *gecnawan* is to be understood as infinitive used with the verb *cunnan*, just as we find *ongitan ne cunnon* in the following clause. Other examples of this combination may be seen in Wülfing, ii, §388. *nouðer* has, of course, reference to *ne þa medtrymnesse ne eac þa wyrta*, etc.

We add a couple of gleanings from the Glossary.

The lemma *æfterfylgian* is rather misleading.—For *clæn* (adj.) we should read *clæne*.—There is no need to quote an adj. *fæstend* (?) with reference to *ða fæstendan* 87. 22.—How can *belifene* (*wurdon*) 41. 23 be explained from *belifian*, w. v.? Or *plegedon* 45. 34, from *plegan*, w. v.?—*wæde* is evidently misprint for *wædl*.—Corrections of quantity: *ānforlætan, āwēstan, Frēsisc, rēnian, witnian*.

A commendable feature of the Glossary is the distinction made between the prefix "(*ge*)" (when it is apparently meaningless) and "*ge*" ("when it has assignable force, or is invariably found prefixed to a particular word").

For the benefit of the unsuspecting student it might have been pointed out, by the way, that the conclusion of the *Pastoral Care* (*Ðis is nu se wæterscipe*, etc.), is meant as poetry. See Holthausen's print in *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Litteraturen* 106, 346 f.

We have little doubt that among the numerous Old English Readers now in existence this new one will be able to hold its own. It is sufficiently distinct in character and of a high grade of scholarship. Those who use it will find it a trustworthy guide.

FREDERICK KLAEBER.
*University of Minnesota.*

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### *A NOTE ON LEAR.*

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—It is hazardous at this late day to offer a new interpretation of that much disputed passage in *Lear* (iii, vii, 64–5), but with Mr. Furness I seek shelter under Dr. Johnson's dictum, that in a case as puzzling as this anything may be tried. Mr. Furness devotes a page of his *Variorum* to the discussion of this passage, without, it seems to me, bringing forward any convincing elucidation of Shakspere's exact meaning. The reading of the First Folio is—

> Thou should'st have said: 'Good Porter, turn the key,
> All cruels else subscribe.'

The Quartos differ only in substituting 'subscrib'd' for 'subscribe.' Retaining the Folio

reading, I would interpret—"Good Porter, turn the key, approve of or assent to all other cruelties I may command, but do not be guilty of this cruellest of all cruel acts by barring the door to any living creature." 'Subscribe' should thus be addressed to the Porter by Regan, and its use with this meaning may be paralleled in *T. of S.* i, i, 81, "Sir, to your pleasure humbly I subscribe," and *T. and C.* ii, iii, 156 "Will you subscribe his thought, and say he is?" The use of 'cruels' as 'cruelties,' 'cruel acts,' though the substantive use of the word is not found elsewhere in Shakspere, may be justified on the analogy of 'sours' in *Lucrece*, l. 867:

The sweets we wish for turn to loathed sours.

This interpretation gives a greater intensity to Gloucester's speech than any of the others I have seen. Regan in barring the door to wolves on such a night would have been guilty of extreme cruelty; how inconceivably greater is her cruelty when she treated her father so. The objection that Gloucester would not likely put into Regan's mouth words authorizing "all other cruelties" may be met by the consideration that his mind is so fixed on the awful cruelty she has shown her father that he is willing to consent to all other cruelties rather than allow this one to be perpetrated.

JAMES W. TUPPER.

*Bryn Mawr College.*

## *ON THE PRONUNCIATION OF THE GERMAN ch.*

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—Many English-speaking students of German find the greatest difficulty in pronouncing *ch*, and not a few seem to be utterly unable to do so.

It is commonly supposed that the sound of this *ch* has no equivalent in English. Now is this a fact? What is *ch?* The answer is: An aspirated iotization. Have we no aspirated iotization in English? If not, how do we pronounce *Hugh*, *hew*, *here*, *hear*, *humane?* Can we not express by means of English characters *Koerbchen* and *Maedchen* thus: *Curbhyen* and *Madehyen?*

Can we not express in German characters *Hugh* or *hew*, *here* or *hear*, *hewn*, *humane* by: *Chuh*, *chehr*, *chuhn*, *chuhmehn?*

It is possible, nay probable, that most teachers of German are not sufficiently familiar with English to be aware of the existence of sounds in that language which could be used with advantage to illustrate the sound of the German *ch*.

ALBERT B. LYMAN.

*Baltimore, Md.*

## *SPANISH LITERATURE.*[1]

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—With this little prose drama the American student is introduced to that writer whom Mr. James Fitzmaurice-Kelly chooses to call "delightfully middle-class." A brief introduction, mentioning the leading events of Echegaray's life, and giving a chronological list of his works, is followed by well-chosen and adequate notes. The whole book, typographically excellent, forms a welcome addition to the rapidly increasing number of carefully-edited Spanish texts.

I note the following misprints: *la* for *ya*, p. 22, l. 11; *ne* for *no*, p. 44, l. 1; *sabeza* for *cabeza*, p. 45, l. 3; *aceptastes* for *aceptaste*, p. 101, l. 27; also omission of the accent in: *lágrima*, p. 10, l. 13; *mío*, p. 11, l. 25; *está*, p. 63, l. 6; *energía*, p. 85, l. 9; *Inés*, p. 86, l. 26. A uniformity of spelling is also desirable in such words as *bohardilla*, p. 14, l. 19, and *buhardilla*, p. 60, l. 7; *obscuro*, p. 23, italics, l. 5; and *oscuridad*, p. 55, l. 12.

GEORGE GRIFFIN BROWNELL.

*University of Alabama.*

## *THE ETYMOLOGY OF Big-bug.*

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—The second element of the American slang word *big-bug* meaning 'an aristocrat, a swell' is in the *New English Dictionary* re-

1 *Ó Locura ó Santidad*, por José Echegaray, with introductions and notes, by J. Geddes, Jr., Ph. D., and Freeman M. Josselyn, Jr., Docteur de l'Université de Paris, Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1901. 16mo, pp. ix, 115.

ferred, though hesitatingly, to the English word *bug*, 'a ghost, a hobgoblin' (cf. bugbear) from Welsh *bwg*, same meaning. It is then identical with the word *bug*, 'insect,' which is only a later and at present the only common meaning of the word. This explanation is also suggested in Barrere and Leland's *Dictionary of Slang* (London, 1897) in support of which conjecture an anecdote is quoted. This anecdote is, however, admittedly, of recent origin and has undoubtly been manufactured by some one for the purpose of explaining a popular phrase. In Aasen's *Norsk Ordbog* is given the word *bugge* 'a rich and influencial man (en mægtig mand).' Ross, *Norsk Ordbog, Tillæg til Aasen*, gives the noun *bugge* and also the adjective *bugga*, 'rich, prominent.' The use of the Norse *bugge* agrees perfectly well with that of the English word and is undoubtedly the source of the latter. It can have nothing to do with *bug*, 'insect' from Welsh *bwg*. The English dialect word *bug*, 'proud, conceited' probably comes from Norse *bugga*, 'rich, prominent.' Is the adjective *big* the same as dialectal *bug* and hence a variant that prevailed in the literary language?

GEORGE T. FLOM.

*University of Iowa.*

## *LEWIS AND ZSCHOKKE.*

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—In reading "Monk" Lewis' *Bravo of Venice* the other day I found it to be an adaptation of Zschokke's robber-drama, *Abellino*. It did not occur to me but that this was commonly known, until I saw that Mr. Henry Morley evidently considered it a work of Lewis' own.—"Lewis professed to have translated this romance out of the German," he says (Introd. to Reprint in Cassell's Nat. Libr. 1895), "very much, I believe, as Horace Walpole professed to have taken *The Castle of Otranto* from an old Italian manuscript." The *Dictionary of National Biography* fails to mention Zschokke as Lewis' source, likewise Mr. Beers (*Engl. Romanticism, 18. cty.*, p. 409, note), although the latter has just mentioned Schiller's *Kabale und Liebe* as the source of Lewis' *Minister*, and Kotzebue's *Spaniards in Peru* as that of *Rolla*. The fact is then evidently worth noting.

Abellino the play led as charmed a life as Abellino the play-hero: it simply could not die. Told as a story one evening in a gay company of Frankfort friends, when the turn had come to Zschokke, it was written down at their request in dramatic form. This done, to the present surprise, and future disgust, of its author, the play conquered the German stage, and came to later presentation in Italy, Spain and France. After some thirty years of this, Zschokke could endure no longer, but rewrote it, and in this later version it was taken up in his collected writings (Aarau, 11th edit., 1874). Abellino's great cultural importance is, of course, that it united with Schiller's *Robbers* to form the beginning of the Robber-Novel in Germany, of which immortal species Vulpius' *Rinaldo Rinaldini* still stands as the supreme expression.

PHILIP ALLEN.

*University of Chicago.*

## *THE GARDENS OF ADONIS.*

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—A writer in *New Shakespearana* calls attention to an alleged discovery of a parallel allusion to Adonis's Gardens (*First Henry VI*, l. vi, 6) in the *Fairie Queene*, book iii, stanzas 34 *seq.* of canto i, and stanzas 46 *seq.* of canto vi. The statement is made that the garden is first mentioned in stanza 39 of canto vi, book iii. The inference drawn is to the effect that Shakespeare's line

"That one day bloomed and fruitful were the next."

is a condensation of Spenser's description.

Spenser first mentions the Gardens of Adonis in the *Fairie Queene*, book 2, canto x, stanza 71. They are also referred to in *Colin Clouts Come Home Again*, l. 804, but the date of this poem, 1591, is, I believe, disputed. To call the reference to book iii a discovery overlooks the suggestive paragraphs in M. Gollancz's editions of *First Henry VI* and *Venus and Adonis*. Furthermore, the study of Adonis's Gardens in Mr. J. G. Frazer's *Golden Bough* leads one to suspect that the Shakespearean simile had a colloquial vitality quite independent of the *Fairie Queene*.

W. P. REEVES.

*Kenyon College.*

## BRIEF MENTION.

J. P. Dabney has entitled his book *The Musical Basis of Verse: A Scientific Study of the Principles of Poetic Composition* (Longmans, Green, & Co., 1901), and in doing so has given a specimen of the 'fine writing' to be found in his treatise of more than two hundred and fifty pages. It is known that when grammar represented the prevailing type of learning the name of that comprehensive department of knowledge gradually became debased to the meaning of 'glamour,' 'magic,' and things most ungrammatical. Will not the Trench of the future find a similar text for moral reflections in the decline in dignity of the word 'science' in an age when knowledge was most scientific? That Mr. Dabney, when framing the sub-title of this book, had in mind a misleading notion of 'science,' this is our chief quarrel with him. In method the book is unscientific, and even as a popular treatise (which is not its professed character) its style is too loose and wordy to be attractive.

In the most incoherent and complex manner the treatise rambles far away from the announced intention of the author

"to state, rationally, coherently, and simply, what seem to me to be the principles of verse-technique, these principles being, finally, purely a matter of *vibration*" (p. ix).

Even in the musical notation of the simple rhythms one cannot always agree with Mr. Dabney; for example, in the scansion of *beauties*, (p. 36), *traces*, *faces* (p. 37) *garments*, *cerements* (p. 38), *clothing loathing* (p. 39), *western* (p. 41), in which the proper distribution of 'time' is inverted. Special originality is claimed for the treatment of the quality of verse named "*motion*, and the dynamic relation of verse-motion to its theme" (p. ix). One of the comprehensive conclusions reached in this department of the treatise is thus stated: "Generally speaking, we might, therefore, characterize the 2-beat rhythm as the medium of the *Poetry of Reflection;* and the 3-beat rhythm as more specifically the medium of the *Poetry of Motion*" (p. 66). Less commonplace is the suggestion that imperfect rimes may be compared (and in the comparison justified) with the musician's 'imperfect authentic cadence' (p. 106).

*Words and their Ways in English Speech.* By J. B. Greenough and G. L. Kittredge (The Macmillan Co., 1901). In four hundred pages, (indexed in thirty more) two distinguished scholars discourse on the "commonplace miracle" of articulate speech. The book is in all respects thoroughly well done. In a style that is clear, graceful, and appropriate, and with a pleasing seriousness of purpose, linguistic phenomena are set forth in a manner that is both truly scientific and in the best sense 'popular.' More than three thousand illustrative words (as shown by the index) are employed to give effective view of various processes in language. Everything is brought up to date, and occasional suggestions go beyond the recorded present: the 'goo-goo theory' of the origin of language is suggested to make amends for the shortcomings of its predecessors, the 'ding-dong,' 'bow-wow,' and 'pooh-pooh' theories; on the other hand the *N.E.D.* may be corrected, as in the case of *cousin* (p. 67). The authors' philosophic restraint of expression is always aglow with a zeal that would impart a sense of the real depth and truth of things, and at times the warmth of something like a personal interest in a topic is felt, as in the passages dealing with 'Latin as a second vernacular' (pp. 23, 94, 100); one is also impressed by the opportune reflections at the top of page 53 and at the bottom of page 116. The paragraphs on the word *passion* (p. 38 f.) and *education* (p. 231) are representative of the best manner of tracing the history of words, and very Trench-like is the comment elicited by *forlorn hope* (p. 227). When it is observed that "Language develops by the felicitous misapplication of words" (p. 217), or that "the studied elegance of one gereration becomes singularity in the age that follows," we have examples of good style crystallizing into apothegm. The most profound reader will here find "the great movements which brought the English language to pass" (p. 124) discriminatingly defined, and he will wish to follow the leading ideas of the book which underlie the entertaining illustrations of the deep philosophy according to which "the history of language is the history of mankind" (p. 158). The book is remarkably free from even the minutest errors. One might at most suggest some change in the grouping of the material, as for example, the transferrence of the closing paragraph on page 343 to page 182 f.

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

**Baltimore, February, 1902.**

## *THE USE OF EPISODE IN THE TEACHING OF FICTION.*

WITHIN the last decade the study of narrative fiction has won its way to an assured place in the English work of our schools and colleges. Instructors have come to recognize not only the especial force and value of ethical teaching when carried in the story-form, but the chance for original thought which is offered by the technical analysis of great novels. The very keenest interest can be aroused in students by the discovery of æsthetic principles in narratives hitherto thought of simply as narratives. In conducting my course in Fiction Analysis in this University I have devoted almost my entire attention to this aspect of narrative, and have applied to a number of English novels the sort of tests usually applied to Shakspere's plays, for instance, when their dramatic construction is under discussion. Such points would be the plot outline, the character grouping, the expression of theme, the function of characters, the reason for each episode, the method of character-presentation, the position and value of pause, the use of retard, contrast, and restraint, the distribution of monologue, dialogue, and group-scenes, the intermixture of dramatic, epic, and lyric in the presentation of the story,—and so on. A pamphlet of questions drawn up by me on such lines, and published by our University Press, is used by my classes. The novels thus analyzed are, at present, *Emma*, *Guy Mannering*, *Martin Chuzzlewit*, *Vanity Fair*, *Adam Bede*, *House of the Seven Gables*, *Put Yourself in His Place*, *The Egoist*, *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*. A twelve-weeks' course is occupied in the discussions, of which the first two weeks are given up to lectures on the development of English narrative; during this time the class is supposed to get fairly started in the reading necessary for the course. Thereafter one novel is discussed each week, the work on each closing with a lecture by the instructor, on that author. The class is also required to write weekly papers, beginning with the third novel studied, when some degree of familiarity with technical analysis has been gained. These papers are, at present, on the following topics: —The American Episode in *Martin Chuzzlewit*,—The Brussels Episode in *Vanity Fair*, —The Coming-of-Age Celebration in *Adam Bede*,—The chapter entitled "The Flight of Two Owls," in the *House of Seven Gables*,—A comparative study of these four episodes,—The Creation of a Central Figure in *Emma* and in *The Egoist*, compared,—The Treatment of Subordinate Figures and of Background in *Adam Bede* and in *Tess*, compared.

Any teacher will observe the gradual increase of difficulty in this series of problems; but no teacher who has not attempted to conduct such analysis with a class can realize the value of the first four subjects, and the way in which each selection so epitomizes the peculiarities of its author as to permit of generalizations and comparisons theoretically impossible on so limited a basis. Take, for example, the five chapters, 28 to 33, of *Vanity Fair*.

Like the American Episode in *Martin Chuzzlewit*, the Waterloo episode is a sudden and great enlargement of the background. By Dickens a new country is opened before the reader, by Thackeray the events and issues of world-history are drawn into the story. Observe, however, the different treatment by the two authors of this enlarged scene. Dickens loses sight of his main purpose and diverges to satirize the follies and vices of American society; Thackeray does not permit the thought of even Napoleon or Wellington to tempt him from his chosen path. Near as is the field of Waterloo, we see and hear it only at a very few moments. Its presence and its pressure are constantly felt, but are recognized by us through the emotions we see excited in the group of characters we are watching. Twice we see the dismay caused by the sound of cannon coming from the unseen struggle; between these two waves of fear comes the wounded ensign's report of the earlier encounter; and twice the curtain goes up to show to us a single figure on the field,—first Rawdon wrapped in his cloak under the rain, and then after a brief description of the

Guard's last charge, the single dead figure of George, lying on his face with a bullet through his heart.

From one point of view, the episode exists mainly to accomplish this last-named fact,—the removal of George Osborne from the story. So with Dickens' episode, its plot-purpose was the effecting of one thing, the change in Martin's nature. But in Dickens' case not only was that change effected abruptly, crudely, forcibly as it were, but nothing else was done for plot or theme or main characters; on the contrary, we were distracted by a panorama of new characters unrelated to the story, who eventually disappear with the suddenness of a Harlequin.

With Thackeray all is different. First, the transition to Brussels is natural and expected; all the main characters are here, and our attention is centred unwaveringly on them, with no sudden changes to England. Again, the relation of the Brussels episode to the Becky plot is as distinct as its relation to the Amelia-George-Dobbin plot. Here Becky first finds real scope for her social and dramatic powers. The affair with Lady Bareacres preludes her later struggles with her own sex; General Tufto is the forerunner of the Marquis of Steyne; and the success of Becky at the Duchess of Richmond's ball heralds the theatricals at Gaunt House. The Brussels episode is a link in the chain of Becky's social successes and failures,—Russell Square, Queen's Crawley, Brighton, Brussels, Paris, Curzon Street, Gaunt House,—and each episode is an integral part of the plot, picaresque though the succession of episodes may be. With Dickens we can trace episode within episode; for example, the Elijah Pogram levee within the American Episode; and in the smaller case as in the larger there is a total lack of correlation of episode to theme and plot of the main story. In Thackeray, however, look at a bit like the dinner which George gives the Earl of Bareacres' family. Small though its scale is, episode within episode though it is, it not only illuminates the character of George and the weak devotion of his wife, but it is made a part of the plot in that it shows how the Osbornes got their invitation to the Richmond ball, where the entanglement of George with Becky becomes serious, and it echoes the keynote of the book,—the vanity of human wishes.

Indeed, the whole Brussels episode not only advances plot, but even more markedly illuminates character and theme. Waterloo and Napoleon are utilized by the novelist to bring the tremendous pressure of fear on to the personages of Vanity Fair, and "turn upon them the searchlight of great events." The moment at which Thackeray chooses to show us the inmost heart of his men and women is a moment at which the destiny of empires is in the balance. Yet of that destiny he does not choose that we shall think; we are to see only his little circle of characters. This use of the great to illuminate the less is markedly Thackerayan. When he says: "Napoleon landed at Cannes, and the funds fell, and old John Sedley was ruined,"—this is not an anticlimax, it is the normal movement of Thackeray's thought, which is centred always on the poor little, peeping, anxious, human face behind the mask of dignities and ceremonies and sounding events. Thus Waterloo is not for him the Waterloo that appeared to Victor Hugo; it is the fire by which to test his characters. He uses the great world-event not only to emphasize the main note in each personage,—Becky's heartless egoism, Amelia's absorbed devotion, Jos's cowardice,—but also to bring out the possibilities of other traits. Mrs. O'Dowd is brave and unselfish; the most commonplace and absurd of the three women becomes a heroic and generous figure standing between two extreme types of selfish courage, Amelia and Becky; Amelia flashes out once in unexpected spirit; Becky is, for one of the few times in her life, "touched in spite of herself;" and Rawdon shows for the first time those qualities that are later to bring him up in our sympathetic esteem. Thackeray here as elsewhere loves to touch on the contrast between the outward appearance or character and the inward feeling. As he has elsewhere said of Becky that an unexpected kindness "brought tears into the eyes of our resolute little adventuress," so he here says of Rawdon:

"And this famous dandy of Windsor and Hyde Park went off on his campaign with a kit as modest as that of a sergeant, and with

something like a prayer on his lips for the woman he was leaving."

Contrast, in character and in situation, is everywhere in these chapters, done by touches or *in extenso*. Thus, when the wounded ensign tells his story, it was George who cut down the French lancer that speared the boy, but it was Dobbin who, though wounded himself, carried the lad in his arms to a cart bound for Brussels, and promised the driver two louis if he would find out Mrs. George Osborne's hotel and tell her that her husband was unhurt and well. We see Rawdon, bivouacking under the rain and thinking with all the force of his heart of the little wife he had left behind him, while she, having counted her valuables and felt sure of looking her widow's weeds steadily in the face, is asleep dreaming of perhaps becoming Mme. la Maréchale in the event of French victory. Earlier, there were the three partings; Mrs. O'Dowd's practical wifeliness contrasted with Amelia's helpless agony and with Becky's calculating heartlessness. And there are also contrasts on a larger scale; the comedy action of Jos' cowardice is before our eyes while the tragedy of other men's bravery is going on out of sight. Situations are contrasted,—George's shame as he looks at his innocent wife and thinks of his folly a few hours before, Amelia's temporary triumph over Becky with the defeat of the night just past,—and many others. Lastly, when the episode closes with Amelia on her knees praying for George, and the curtain rises to show us his dead figure even while she prays, we remember a ball and a bouquet, and feel that the great artist who wrote this story within a story never for one moment forgot his theme,—the Vanity of Human Wishes,—never forgot the eternal contrast between our immortality and our mortality.

The same unity of total impression, every detail made "eloquent of one idea," as Stevenson says, gives *Adam Bede* the first place among George Eliot's works. In studying the episode chosen from *Adam Bede*, the class is at first puzzled by the great length at which minor events and background characters are presented; the plot scarcely moves, and no further development of the principal personages takes place. But a closer examination shows the function of these chapters in the plot,—an emphasizing summary of all the happy past, a pause just before the climax, an ominous stillness before the storm breaks; and all the more tragic in its lightheartedness, all the more ominous in its calm because of the optimism of the unsuspicious group on which the blow is to fall. The whole episode is a study in ironic contrast. There are the details of Hetty's vain hopes, of Arthur's confident eagerness, of Adam's proud pleasure, of Mr. Poyser's serene trust in his young Squire, expressed in his dinner-speech and in the final touch of bitter mockery with which the episode closes—"It'll serve you to talk on, Hetty, when you're an old woman, how you danced wi' the young Squire the day he come o'age."

The episode, like those from Dickens and Thackeray, is an expansion of the background; both social classes are together on the stage. No very different light is however thrown upon the main characters; George Eliot's purpose seems to have been the emphatic restatement, just before the fatal discovery, of her constant thought, the solidarity of society, the awful burden of human responsibility when complicated with class-responsibility, the socially destructive consequences of individual sin. Her treatment of the story of Hetty and Arthur is remarkable for this persistent view of the *social* aspect of the crime. When Hawthorne treats the consequences of a crime, as he does in his *Seven Gables*, the retribution is personal or hereditary only; the conception, intenser than George Eliot's, is narrower. And when we look at Hardy's treatment of a situation resembling that chosen by George Eliot, we find him handling it not with the constant thought of social consequences but with the central idea of the position forced on Angel Clare and his wife, the feeling for the *individual* situation.

In George Eliot the treatment of the episode resembles the treatment of the whole book in its emphasis upon the framing background. The atmosphere of rural peace is so pervasive in *Adam Bede* that in asking a class, as I often do with regard to a novel, what their most permanent visual impression of the book is, I receive almost invariably the reply—a green

country landscape, with the Poyser homestead. Behind the tragedy of the central story, enveloping it as it were, there is a broad tranquil sunny background of everyday human life, of rural calm. We must realize the enormous value of this background for the artistic effectiveness of the book. It emphasizes the temporary nature of the passing tragedy, it constitutes the norm to the central distortion of wrong and pain. George Eliot has made her story universally true and pathetic in that she has framed the agony of the few in the enclosing phlegmatic calm of nature. In such a book as Hardy's *Tess* the tension becomes over-great by the absence of adequate background; in a book like D'Annunzio's *Triumph of Death* the whole countryside is made to share the spasms of the protagonist. D'Annunzio is the less an artist, George Eliot is the more an artist, because the one disregards, the other aims at, one of the larger truths of life,—the ever-present tragic contrast of a serenely moving world-law with the fevers of humanity. This thought for the framing background, human and natural, is especially clear in the episode from *Adam Bede*. In fact, as I have said, the four episodes selected are very fair examples of the work of their authors; and if taken up in the order named they offer a steady increase in difficulty to the student, from the almost ostentatious crudity of Dickens' work to the microscopic attention to symbolic detail seen in Hawthorne. The interest taken by a class in interpreting this symbolism, in connecting Chapter 17 of the *Seven Gables* with the earlier chapter called "The Arched Window," for example, is extraordinary, and carries them over the difficulty which they invariably experience in adapting their visual range, after working in Thackeray and George Eliot, to the minuteness of the *Seven Gables*, where plot is transformed into protracted situation, and where details take the place of episodes.

ELEANOR P. HAMMOND.

*University of Chicago.*

## *THE DEVELOPMENT OF TAINE CRITICISM SINCE 1893.*

### I.

AN attempt was made in 1899 by Wetz in *Zts. Spr. Litt*, xxii, pp. 114-251, to give an estimate of later Taine-criticism. This article is largely analytical, and does not attempt any résumé of the progress or development of Taine-criticism, to show how the opinion of critics in general, and of some individual critics in particular, has changed during the short time between his death in 1893, and the present day. The article does not include some of the more important works, confining itself to only eight critics. The present review proposes a discussion of the value of the important articles and works on Taine, and a statement of the progress criticism has made, in regard to the value, significance and importance of Taine's work.

The latest work on Taine, Giraud's *Essai sur Taine*, Hachette, 1901, by far the most complete and satisfactory treatise on the subject, gives an almost complete bibliography of his works in chronological order (published in *Rev. Hist. Litt. Fr.*, July, October, 1900), and of books and articles on Taine. The statistics of this bibliography show more than one hundred and seventy-five references before 1893, and over two hundred and twenty-five from 1893-1901. It is but natural that the criticisms before his death are mainly personal differences of opinion on the function and method of criticism, on the possibilities of the application of his system to both the natural and physical sciences. Many deal with his conception of the world, and among these some are extremely bitter and pessimistic, showing him to be a rank pessimist, destructive materialist, as Caro; absolute determinist and positivist, as Scherer; a firm sceptic, a Spinoza pantheist, as Planche. Such articles, however, emanate from the opposite school of philosophy or from close sectarians. Among all these criticisms there are very few that show an appreciation of the wider scope and significance of Taine's work. Mahrenholtz, Wetz, Pellissier, Sorel, Bourget, Brunetière, and a few of the English and American critics have given the broadest and most liberal estimates of his system and position in the history of literature; but the true meaning of Taine's work was not generally realized in France until after his death. The later critics, Deschamps, Monod, Barzellotti, Faguet, Giraud, and Wetz, are able to treat him from a more liberal and broader, yet at times individual point of view, showing more perspective, comprehension, and appreciation of his work as a whole, than

the earlier critics do. This has largely been made possible by the magnificent biographical essay of Monod, and all critics acknowledge their indebtedness to this work. Among these, Giraud is the first to apply Taine's own system to both himself and his work, and yet Giraud only partly succeeds in holding to this plan of study. This result is largely due to the fact that he introduces the individual religious conception of the universe. Many critics deplore the fact that Taine did not develop his system further, that the first notions of his early youth have remained the same; for the same system and doctrine are found in every work, whether it be a practical illustration of his system, as is his *English Literature*, or a theoretical treatise, as is his *Intelligence*. They failed to see that the only development lay in the accumulation of facts, and through these a broader interpretation of phenomena. This has been corroborated by science.

The present article will be confined to a discussion of Taine's later critics, rather from the standpoint of literary criticism than from that of pure philosophy. In 1893 alone over forty articles of various lengths are noted by Giraud; the more important, giving information on his life especially, are those of Vacherot, de Vogüé, Faguet, Larroumet, Barrès, Berthelot, Deschamps, Mahrenholtz, Boutmy, Barzellotti, Wetz, and Monod, and a series of estimates in the *Rev. Encycl.* 1 April, 1893, by Castets, Pellissier, Pillon, and Petit.

Boutmy, an intimate friend, has left one of the best general impressions we have and has come very near the truth when he states that Taine will not fully be understood and appreciated, that his importance and significance in the history of literary criticism will not be known for half a century; that many of his statements have been taken separately and have thus given a false impression; that his work should be analyzed as a whole. This was written in 1893 and still holds true to-day. Boutmy is the first to acknowledge and reveal that Taine was himself aware of the fact that his system could not be applied to all phenomena with impunity. According to him the danger lay merely in showing the natural complexity of phenomena too simply, and in the fact that the evolutions did not have their full development. Taine has given us on all the confused masses of literature and history, etc., a point of departure, a mastery and possession, astonishingly profound perspectives and general views and these are really the end of all his speculations.

Hence his desire to transform all abstract notions to concrete ones, to accompany every idea by a sensation and clarify it by comparisons, by facts which he possessed *ad infinitum*.

The general objection to the Anc. Reg. (constant repetitions of disorders and crimes, thus becoming monotonous) is shared by Boutmy, Colani, Margerie, Barzellotti, but the reason assigned for this is to stir up the people's patriotism. The article ends with an admirable estimate of Taine, the man and his character.

In the first article in the *Rev. Encycl.* Castets reveals *Taine in time*, in which we gain quite a different view from that which is usual; there we find him receiving his friends at dinner every Monday: Berthelot, Boutmy, G. Paris, Renan, De Heredia, de Vogüé, but never accepting invitations. Pellissier calls Taine and Renan the great apostles of positivism; they have contributed more than any others to its triumph in all provinces of thought. The articles by Pillon and Petit on Taine, the philosopher and historian, are among the few really broad and appreciative estimates we have.

The first large book devoted entirely to Taine is written by Margerie—*H. Taine*, 1893. This work is variously estimated, according to the critic's attitude toward the Church. It is the result of thirty years of the study and teaching of Taine and his philosophy. His aim seems to be to show in what respect Taine is false and destructive of all morality; by what vices of method, by what unconscious prejudices, by what positivistic illusions he has been led to a philosophy which is the negation of philosophy from the speculative summit to its poetical application, from metaphysics to morality. According to Margerie his doctrine is so incoherent and inconsistent that it causes surprise to find such a vigorous and clear mind back of it, p. 68; no philosophy is less complete and less scientific, p. 75;

Taine contradicts himself continually and does not carry out his plan in his *Intelligence*, p. 158. The greater part of the four hundred and sixty-eight pages is an analysis of his works. At every point where Taine bears on the religious organizations and their development, methods and power, Margerie attacks him vigorously, because, according to him, all the defects in Taine's works are due to his strong determinism. Taine cannot speak authoritatively and feelingly on religious matters; he speaks as an outsider, as a man in whose eyes the interior principle, the central heart of religious life has no subjective value, none of truth, none of reality.

The religious interests concern him as a Christian, which he is not, being not even a theist; therefore, the most intimate in religious life escapes him, p. 471. Margerie, however, gives him credit for many fine qualities, a wonderful style: he paints as an analyst, and analyzes as a painter, p. 214.

An article unique in its kind, and possibly the most intimately sympathetic of all, was written by M. de Vogüé near the death-bed of Taine, and published in *Devant le Siècle*, 1896, pp. 289–297. We must know Taine personally, the man, the soul; however high his intelligence, it must be measured by his soul; a life without a stain, hidden too much from life to be known by the crowd. In the eyes of this old man, who had read all and knew all through books, one saw the divine look of a child. No one ever possessed more delicate sentiments for every human creature; more fear of saddening or wounding an honest faith; incapable of the slightest falsehood; he was the living conscience of his friends, who, when about to undertake something new, always asked: What will Taine think of it?

"I have just knelt before the bed of a Saint. If the abnegation of terrestrial things, if the abandonment of a life to eternal truths and to practicing good, merits this name, then no one has merited it more than this Benedictine, astray in our age. In him France lost the head of the literary and thinking world; this was recognized by all Europe."

In a short article in the *Zts. Spr. Litt.*, xv, 141–45, 1893, Mahrenholtz shows a deep appreciation of Taine, especially the historian. He was more of a philosopher and naturalist than an accurate, painstaking scholar, and he must be judged according to his works and to what he has done; the petty and unimportant must be overlooked. Mahrenholtz claims, and probably rightly, that it must remain the task of the Germans to judge him impartially, and interpret him in the broad light necessary for a full appreciation. This task is yet before them.

The next important work is by Monod: *Renan, Taine, Michelet*, pp. 51–173. All critics acknowledge their indebtedness to this essay for an intimate acquaintance with his life, the relation and connection between his work and his life, and the development of both. It will remain standard until all of his correspondence and posthumous works are published; even then it will continue to be consulted by every Taine student.

The principal points that are new, or at least that were not generally known or appreciated enough, and are brought into prominence by Monod, are his firm convictions and honesty, his fearlessness and courage, his incapability of any personal attack, his opinion that any official system of philosophy or religion was a hindrance to liberty of thought; how Taine was condemned for wanting to apply scientific classification, methods and formulas to literary criticism and history, or for applying scientific methods to the moral sciences; that from the very beginning he refused to reply to any of his critics, because he believed that disputes that transfer questions of doctrines to personal quarrels only obscure the questions, p. 106; the influence of his system upon the young generation of rising writers, p. 108; the various letters Taine wrote to his friends, while yet a young man, explaining his ambitions and the pretentions of his doctrines; especially his letter to M. Havet, pp. 115–117; the influence of his married life and the change it brought about in his attitude toward the world, p. 199 sqq.; the effect of the war of 1870; the work he had planned. According to Monod the *Intelligence* forms the center of his work, all others are mere illustrations. From 1848–1850 he created his method and system; 1853–1858 he gathered particular cases and verifications of his system, *La Fontaine, Livy, Essays;* 1858–1868 he applied them to large literary and artistic generalization; 1870–1893

he applied them to a vast historical generalization. The study of Taine must depart from this classification, and Monod is the first to outline this plan. He is also the first to describe the state of French thought during this time, pp. 135–141, and to show Taine as the product of race, environment and time. Monod, as many later critics, has analyzed Taine and found his salient quality to be powerful logic, in which lies his weakness and grandeur, the secret of his power and of his defects, a wonderful mathematical mind, with a remarkable gift of visual imagination.

This combined faculty, according to Monod, explains the whole phenomenon of a Taine-system, imagination, style, p. 157. He is the first to insist upon the fact that in the study of Taine his method cannot be separated from his theories, and to explain why this cannot be done by giving an accurate account of his life and character which form part of his work. Monod is possibly the most impartial of Taine's critics, never hesitating to unveil his defects; for example, he simplified complex phenomena too much; exaggeration and incompleteness. This essay has made it possible for later critics to write or develop a complete study of Taine, the man and his work.

Pellissier, in his *Nouv. Ess. sur la Litt. Contemp.*, 1894, has a most suggestive article on Taine, analyzing his method, system and their result. According to him he must be studied under three heads: as a literary critic, as a historian, as a philosopher, and the necessary relation among them. The difference between his system and that of Sainte-Beuve is especially well brought out. Taine is the coordinator of knowledge; Sainte-Beuve studies the individual only; literary productions are mere documents and criticism an art; he is the initiator of the natural method of criticism, while Taine is the organizer.

According to Taine there is no difference of nature between the moral and natural or material world, human and natural history; both undergo the same organic laws; hence the same method is applied to the study of both.

Pellissier's article is one of the best to analyze Taine's method, or rather to interpret it, giving a clear exposition of the laws of dependencies, salient quality and primordial forces; the advantages and objections of the system, pointing out how often Taine either neglects the traits that cannot be applied to his formula, or forces minor traits too much in order to explain and prove his formula, thus being often very unreliable; constantly preoccupied with philosophy and the finding of laws, Taine overlooked the importance of individuality. As a whole, his system is no longer used; it remains what it was with Sainte-Beuve. His place is fixed in modern criticism by the force of his reasoning and the beautiful symmetry of his constructions, and yet his influence is still great. He has stated precisely and put in order and grouped the ideas that had been floating about for years, more or less vague, in the contemporaneous atmosphere; he has so put his stamp on them, grouped them with such vigor, that we really look upon them as his own; so that, were we to seek a name that would embody the truest character of the intellectual movement of the last fifty years, we must name Taine.

In February, 1895, Taine's successor to the French Academy was installed, and in his *Discours* (published in *Nouv. Ess. d'Hist. et de Crit.*, pp. 119–144) M. Sorel has given an admiral portrait of Taine the man, and a splendid critical penetration of his work. To study the soul in itself, in the man of genius, in the history of human society, to see man as he is, neither monstrous nor abortive; to put him in his place in nature; to show that all in him and about him leads to a union of laws, and that the ideal towards which all aspirations tend is also the end of all the forces of nature and the universe, this is Taine's aim and purpose.

The report of this installation is made by M. G. Paris, in the *Débats*, February 8, 1895, (published in *Poètes et Penseurs*, pp. 340–348). Taine he considers as one of the five or six men that have represented intellectual France before the world; the most serious, the moral nobility, the sentiment of the beautiful, the power of work and love of truth. His glory shines brighter than ever. If, according to Taine, man is a "théorème qui marche," his life and works are certainly a "théorème qui évolue." This is growing evident more and

more, the more he is studied the more his grand life penetrates us by its example of honor, uprightness and industry; it expands as his works.

Barzellotti's book, *La Philosophie de Taine*, 1895, 1900, pp. 440, is from a philosophical point of view the most profound and penetrating work published; those parts treating of his literary qualities and his system as a whole have been treated with more literary penetration and knowledge by others; the work is really of much more importance to the student of philosophy than to the student of literature, although it does treat at length of Taine as a writer, and of his influence.

The first aim of the book is to examine the principles on which his doctrine is based, and the method that governs it, to show what there is elevated, durable, fruitful, defective, exclusive, contradictory and artificial; but the principal aim, and this is entirely new in Taine criticism, is to examine whether Taine can be defined, *au fond*, as a French intellect, fructified by ideas of Germanic origin and tradition. A secondary aim is to put Taine under the light of contemporaneous culture, proving that the motives and inspiring intentions of his genius and art respond to the intellectual exigencies of the time. Barzellotti, in a most admirable, clear manner shows the development of Taine's system, due especially to the intellectual need of research, demonstration and truth; the position he occupies towards philosophy, simply seeking a path to follow in the wake of ideas; his originality lies in his deep sympathy for all previous systems, his deep appreciation and exact interpretation of them; but, the author adds, his work somewhat surpassed this pretention.

His salient quality lies in a logical power of abstraction, of conceiving by means of general ideas and of deducting from these. His contact with the German spirit gave birth to and developed the most original part of his doctrine, the conception of the great law of the unity of things and their necessity; this he owes to Spinoza, Hegel and Goethe, pp. 31–35. It lies rather outside of the limits of this paper to state what Barzellotti has so clearly done, with regard to Taine's debt to Spinoza, Herder, Hegel and Goethe; in this field he has done more than any other critic. Taine's originality lies in having created a species of comparative psychology of the primitive varieties of the organism and systems of human culture, which must be for their history what comparative anatomy of animals and plants is for zoölogy and botany, p. 101. It is interesting to note how opinion is gradually changing on the merit of Taine's *English Literature*. All later critics are coming to consider it as one of the most powerful and vigorous books of the latter half of this century. Barzellotti says the introduction is the most vigorous piece of historical philosophy written in France in our day; some of the pages of the work, for example, on Milton, Byron, etc., are enough to preserve the memory of any writer, p. 114.

Another new point he brings out is that Taine's works are lifelike and living, because of the ardent sympathy with which he has known how to find the most hidden vibrations in the hearts of eminent men; also, that Taine saw clearly that there was a limit to his own mind, but not to the human mind, which must be considered in the application of his method, and which accounts for the sympathy with which he knew how to transport himself into the products of the culture, thought and art of three peoples, for the continual research along the path in which the ideas and forms of literary invention can pass from one people and race to another, and take on a new impress; this brings him out as the greatest of modern French critics, p. 160.

An interesting study would be to examine the various judgments critics passed upon the nature of his studies of individuals, as Racine, etc. According to Barzellotti, in point of *finesse* and truth of historical and psychological examination, they have no equal; other critics denounce them utterly, refusing them any truth or life.

Taine's sociological-historical theory, studying in the work of art above all the sign of certain hereditary aptitudes and the necessary product of a certain moral temperament is not accepted by many historical scholars; Guyau is possibly the most prominent among those who uphold it; it may be stated, however, that many of the later scholars are leaning toward this theory. Hennequin opposes it; Barzellotti does not oppose it altogether.

To accuse him of having suppressed all

morality from history, by applying this theory, as Margerie does, is going too far. Few books breathe such a high moral sentiment and a more noble indignation against evil, p. 290.

According to Barzellotti all of Taine's comparative studies on the past of literature, art, and the social life of Europe can be looked upon as an introduction or preparatory study to his *Origines Contemporaines*, and this is a psychology of the mind and soul of his country, an anxious clinical diagnosis of his beloved patient, La France, p. 344. The work must be judged from the large aspect of art, as the last result of a literary elaboration to which a writer arrives in giving us his conception according to the plan he has traced and the aim he has proposed. Judged from this point of view, it impresses our author as a work which presupposes another or others to which it replies; it is the reply of an accuser to a defense already presented, of the partisan of the Revolution and Empire, p. 346. This attitude is entirely new. Barzellotti's conclusion is: As for the entire work, the grandeur of the enterprise seems to have surpassed the measure, if not of his talent, at least of his forces and his physical vigor; but the monumental and what is new will endure and those who cover this field by a different road will never lose sight of the profound traces which Taine has left, p. 350. This view is of great interest, coming from such a profound and trustworthy authority. From him the spirit of Taine's work is one of the vastest inquiries into facts and moral data on man and life ever undertaken in aid of historical investigation; no one before him has known better how to study souls, crowds, peoples, races, instead of soul, individual, race, p. 405.

In giving a general estimate of this work, it may be called the most comprehensive, profound, appreciative and satisfactory study on Taine that has appeared up to 1900, in some respects up to the present day.

The essay of Salomon in *Études et Portr. Litt.*, 1896, first appeared in the *Gaz. de France*, 1894; it hardly deserves a place among the more important works on Taine.

Wyzewa, *Nos Maîtres*, 1895, makes the statement that Taine is hardly a scholar or philosopher, but a method, a prodigious *ensemble* of formulas and operations, the most complicated, harmonious, perfect literary machine. This article, and those of Rod, Tissot, Colani, Lemaitre, Renard and Biré, are all rather short, and more or less interesting reading, but they have added nothing new to the study of Taine.

Hugo P. Thieme.
*University of Michigan.*

## *THE SOURCES OF ROMEO AND JULIET.*

A comparison of Arthur Brooke's version of the story of Romeo and Juliet with that of Paynter shows that they are absolutely identical in plot. There is not an incident in one that is not in the other, nor in the order of incidents is there to be found any variation. One of two things must be true—and the first is mentioned only as a bare possibility, and to be at once dismissed as altogether unlikely: either Paynter made a metaphrase of Brooke's poem, or both followed pretty slavishly the same original. Boisteau's translation—or rather paraphrase—of Bandello's novel is not easily accessible. But if one postulates that paraphrase as the original of Brooke and Paynter, one may be absolutely certain what its plot is. There is no conflict in the testimony of two witnesses about it.

Boisteau took large liberties with his Italian original. Besides the important difference of not having Juliet wake before Romeo dies, there are several minor differences, one of which will serve by way of illustration. In Boisteau Romeo buys his poison of an apothecary whom he tempts by a handful of gold to break the law, for selling poison was a capital crime. Romeo is careful to put the name of this apothecary in the post-mortem letter he writes his father, and the poor fellow is promptly apprehended and tortured to death. It is difficult to see why Boisteau went out of his way to make the hero of his story do so unspeakably mean a thing as to tempt a man to wrong-doing by taking advantage of his poverty, and then report him to the authorities. The Bandello Romeo takes a vial of deadly poison and goes to Verona, but nothing is said about where he got it.

The Bandello story is so different from that

of Boisteau as to suggest that it was probably not an Italian stage on which Brooke "saw the same argument lately set forth;" for it may be fairly supposed that an Italian play-wright would have stuck pretty closely to his Bandello. This, of course, has some bearing on the question as to whether there was an old English play on Romeo and Juliet which Shakespeare may have had before him.

One feels pretty certain that Shakespeare never saw the Bandello story, though in two or three not very important particulars Bandello is nearer Shakespeare than Brooke and Paynter are. For example, there is a rather more suggestive outline of the character of Mercutio in Bandello than is to be found in either of the English versions of the story. Then, too, the movement of the story is rapid and does not give one the impression of covering much time. But these particulars have not much significance. One cannot help feeling that if Shakespeare had read Bandello it is more than likely he would not have allowed Romeo to die without a farewell from Juliet, and would have had them breathe out their lives together.

If ever Shakespeare saw the Paynter version he must have made merry over it. Without being at all familiar with the original, one does not hesitate to say that Paynter's translation is one of the wretchedest attempts at that sort of thing to be found anywhere in the world. It is as frigid as an Eskimo classic. A stupid schoolboy could not be more stiff and awkward and bungling. Here is Romeo's greeting just after the death of Tybalt:

"Mine owne dearest friende Julietta, I am not nowe determined to recite the particulars of the strange happes of frayle and inconstant Fortune, who in a momente hoystethe a man up to the hyghest degree of hir wheel, and by and by in lesse space than in the twynckling of an eye she throweth hym downe agayne so lowe, as more miserie is prepared for him in one day, than favour in one hundred years."

Brooke's version of Romeo's speech shows passionate feeling and some attempt at natural utterance that shall have both strength and grace. The Boisteau figure of the wheel is piously retained but mercifully modified. Bandello manages the entire scene much better than his adapter did. As to the question of Shakespeare's use of Paynter as a source, what has already been said furnishes plain indications of the nature of the answer, though judgment may well be held in abeyance for the moment. A little later in the discussion a more emphatic answer may be made.

As was said at the outset, a comparison of Paynter and Brooke shows identity of plot; but such a comparison shows, too, several interesting differences and one of very great importance. In a way these differences are all of the same sort: they concern themselves with characterization. Brooke does a good deal towards making the personages of the story real and their conduct plausible. In two cases, at least, under Brooke's hands Romeo is greatly improved. Paynter devotes two pages to describing the perturbation and grief in which Juliet wore away the night after meeting and falling in love with Romeo and then finding out that he was a Montague. Barely two lines are devoted to describing Romeo's feelings under circumstances that are exactly parallel. Romeo shows a philosophic coolness that does him no credit, and is entirely out of keeping with his temperament. Brooke comes to the rescue and gives nearly a page to showing that the night was a sleepless one for Romeo too, and prepares us for his appearance bright and early next morning under Juliet's window.

Again, Paynter dilates at length on the misery of Juliet after Romeo's banishment, but says that Romeo, with books and boon companions, passed the time very pleasantly. Take men and women by and large and Paynter's contrast is pretty near the truth, but it will not do for the Romeo and Juliet of this story. So Brooke has left out the books and boon companions altogether, and shows us Romeo every bit as unhappy in Mantua as Juliet is in Verona.

But let us consider the most important addition Brooke made to the Boisteau story. It is the Nurse. In Brooke's poem the Nurse is a really fine piece of characterization. She is not Shakespeare's creation at all. She does not show a single trait of character in the play that she does not show in the poem. Her garrulousness—so tantalizing to the lovers—her free and familiar speech, her graphic

homely phrase, her sordid ethics and quick transference of allegiance from the banished lover to the one at home—all this is admirably brought out in Brooke, and more besides. Shakespeare, with Peter and Mercutio as accessories, has not given us a better Nurse than Brooke's. So far from the Nurse being notably Shakespeare's creation, it would be difficult to point out another person in all the Shakespeare multitude that came so nearly ready-made to his hand.

If it were not for the possible existence of an Old English play having for its subject the story of Romeo and Juliet, one could say unhesitatingly that Shakespeare used Brooke as his chief source. There could be no doubt that he wrote his play with Brooke before him. Perhaps this is the place for the promised emphatic answer to the question as to Shakespeare's indebtedness to Paynter. Why would he need Paynter's paraphrase before him? There is everything in Brooke that there is in Paynter and a good many things besides. Can one imagine Shakespeare tolerating the unnecessary presence of Paynter's story? That Shakespeare owed nothing to Paynter is a practical certainty.

But to return to this Old English play. There may have been such a play, which furnished Brooke with his characterization of the Nurse. In that case, Shakespeare may have had access to it also, and so owe nothing to Brooke. The fact that Brooke shows considerable skill in characterization all through the poem, and especially in situations with which it is not at all likely any play ever dealt, as in the Romeo examples already cited,—leads one to think that the characterization of the Nurse, as good as it is, was not beyond Brooke's powers, and that it is not necessary to postulate the existence of an old play to account for anything in Brooke's poem.

In passing from The Sources of *Romeo and Juliet* to the play itself, it may be worth while to notice the variations in Juliet's age as she appears in the four stories. In Bandello she is eighteen, in Brooke sixteen, in Paynter eighteen, in Shakespeare fourteen. In Boisteau she is eighteen, one argues. Brooke could feel that eighteen was too aged to suit the Elizabethan public, and so made his heroine a couple of years younger. Shakespeare, understanding his public better, put her at fourteen. Paynter, utterly impervious to publics, follows his Boisteau.

Attention has already been called to the fact that Boisteau's most notable change in the Bandello story is in the scene in the tomb of the Capulets. Curiously enough Shakespeare's most important variation from Boisteau's version is in the treatment of this very scene. It is hard to see what artistic end the introduction of Paris subserves. His presence there is an intrusion. His death at Romeo's hands is not at all a dramatic necessity. Shakespeare has quite robbed the scene of all the pathetic dignity and appealing sense of unavailing woe which it has in the Italian original, or even in Brooke's poem. Throughout the play we see so little of Paris—he appears but three times, and for only a moment each time—and he is so colorless when we do see him, that it is with a start that we are reminded of his existence when he comes into the tomb. Boisteau marred Bandello, and Shakespeare marred Boisteau.

Among other minor variations one or two may be noted. It is not easy to see why the play should end with the Friar and Romeo's servant still in custody. Evidently the Prince in saying that "Some shall be pardon'd and some shall be punished," meant that these two should be pardoned; but who should be punished? the "poor 'pothecary?" Romeo writes in his letter to his father that he bought his poison of a poor apothecary; but after reading Romeo's interview with the apothecary one feels nothing but pity for the poor wretch whom Romeo's gold and eloquence overcame, and one cannot help feeling sorry that Romeo should have spoken even vaguely of a poor apothecary at Mantua. Even that would serve as a clue for the police. Who else shall be punished? the Nurse? But she does not appear in this last act of the play and seems to have dropped quite out of consideration.

All this may seem like making a good deal of stir about a trifle; it is a trifle, but it goes to show Shakespeare's occasional carelessness in the handling of material. Probably when Shakespeare wrote the line "Some shall be

pardon'd and some punished," he had in mind not his own play but Brooke's poem. There the Friar and Romeo's servant were pardoned, the Nurse banished, and the Apothecary put to death. It seems as if in winding up his play Shakespeare clung too closely to the ending of a rather different story. To have wound up the play—as Bandello did his story—with the Prince's pardon of the Friar and the servant, and saying nothing about punishing anybody—for who indeed is there to punish?—would have made a more fitting close.

In managing the death of Tybalt Shakepeare has greatly improved upon his original. In Boisteau's version of the story Romeo comes upon a street fight between partisans of the rival houses, with the help of bystanders tries to part the combatants, is savagely attacked by Tybalt, and partly in sudden anger and partly in self-defence kills him. It is a rough and tumble affair, and the part Romeo plays is rather vulgar and unheroic. In Shakespeare, Romeo, though he has shown himself patient under the insults of Tybalt, when he learns that Tybalt has slain Mercutio, in noble rage dares him to combat, and kills him in really heroic fashion. And, too, Shakespeare has substituted the distinctness so absolutely necessary in dramatic action for the hopeless confusion of the original quarrel.

In comparing Shakespeare with his original the most noticeable difference in plot is that of order. In Boisteau Tybalt does not come into the story until it is time to be killed; Paris, until it is time for Juliet to marry. In Shakespeare these two men and Mercutio—all of whom are so necessary to the progress of the play, and do so much to keep it going—are introduced at once. And they are brought before us often enough to prepare our minds for the parts they are to play. Thus the first time we see Tybalt he is trying to pick a quarrel with the pacific Benvolio. Then at Capulet's party it is Tybalt who is eager to fight Romeo for having presumed to come, but the master of the house insists that there shall be no disturbance. By this time we are properly prepared for Tybalt's doing the thing he is in the play for, namely, getting into a quarrel that shall result in his death at the hands of Romeo.

ARTHUR J. ROBERTS.

*Colby College.*

## *AN EARLIER WAVERLEY.*

SIR WALTER SCOTT, in his introductory chapter to *Waverley*, gives a pleasant account of the motives that led him to choose his title. After discarding "the chivalrous epithets of Howard, Mordaunt, or Stanley" and "the softer and more sentimental sounds of Belmour, Belville, Belfield, and Belgrave" as too familiar, he goes on to say

> "I have, therefore, like a maiden knight with his white shield, assumed for my hero, WAVERLEY, an uncontaminated name, bearing with its sound little of good or evil, excepting what the reader shall hereafter be pleased to affix to it."

Though the passage as a whole is whimsically vague, Scott evidently expected his public to infer that Waverley was a name hitherto unknown in English fiction. Such, however, was not the case. In 1792, thirteen years before Scott began his romance, Mrs. Charlotte Smith published a novel called *Desmond*, containing a family of Waverlys [*sic*]. The father has died sometime before the opening of the story, leaving a comfortable fortune to his wife Elizabeth, two daughters named Geraldine and Frances, and a younger son known as Mr. Waverly. Geraldine, already married to a Mr. Varney, survives her disreputable husband, and falls to the lot of the hero Lionel Desmond. Frances finds her happiness in the possession of a French nobleman who has lost his title as a result of the Revolution. And Mr. Waverly plays the part of friend to the hero. The novel made considerable stir, owing to its emotional defense of the French Revolution. Burke was answered and Paine was eulogized. If Mrs. Smith lost in consequence some of her friends, she had the pleasure of seeing a quick second edition of her novel and a version in French. That Scott read the novel before beginning *Waverley*, there can be no reasonable doubt. And yet direct proof of the fact is wanting. For a collection of his prose miscellanies (1827), Scott pieced out with critical remarks a memoir of Charlotte Smith written (but not published) by her sister Mrs. Catherine Dorset. In his additions, he speaks of the deep impression that Mrs. Smith's works made on his mind at "a distant date" and analyzes several of her novels from memory, but he is curiously silent on *Desmond*. In his *Journal*, however, under the date 16 Mar. 1826, he records: "In the evening after dinner,

read Mrs. Charlotte Smith's *Desmond*—decidedly the worst of her compositions." And the next year (18 Jan.), he was at work on the "critique of Charlotte Smith's novels," for which, notwithstanding his assertion in the critique itself, he had been refreshing his memory. That Scott, who was usually so ready to talk about his "conveyances," did not at this late day remark the "coincidence" in name of Mr. Waverly and Edward Waverley must be ascribed, I think, to whim rather than to prick of conscience. He preferred to leave the discovery to the curious.

The discovery was made by Leigh Hunt in his delightful "A Novel Party" (in *Men, Women, and Books*, 1847), where appeared Mr. Waverly inquiring "after his celebrated namesake." The two novels are far apart in subject and in aim; and yet one characteristic of the earlier gentleman passed into the second. Critics who have thought it worth while to strip Scott's Waverley of his armor and romantic surroundings that they might see what was left, have found as a residuum a strange vacillation in temperament which leads him hither and thither. Vacillation was likewise the ruling passion of Mrs. Smith's Waverly. His sister Geraldine says of him:

"It is not his youth, or the expensive style in which he sets out, that disquiet me so much as that uncommon indecision of mind, which never allows him to know what he will do a moment before he acts."

On this line his character is unfolded until he eventually marries a "fair aristocrate" chosen for him by his mother, and the "fluctuating lover" retires with his bride to Bexly Hill. When the curtain is rung down on the scene, his mother-in-law is striving to procure for him an Irish peerage, which his sister Frances thinks should be under the title of "Baron Weathercock." Scott's Waverley is much more than a weathercock, but he is that too.

If popular fiction of Scott's youth were closely examined, very likely other Waverleys would be found. One other I recall. In 1790, James White, a graduate of Trinity College, Dublin, published a preposterous historical romance named from its hero *The Adventures of John of Gaunt*, which was soon turned into German. Here we read of a certain Sir Humphrey de Waverley "better known . . . by the appellation of the knight who affects to be unaffected." He is said to be

"of an ancient house, and a person of a valiant mind; but, finding that affectation was accounted a defect which obscured, or at least distorted the most admirable virtues, he hath determined to pass through life with an unparalleled simplicity."

Scott has left no record of having read this romance in which the name Waverley is spelled after his own heart.

WILBUR L. CROSS.

*Yale University.*

## *SCHILLER'S WALLENSTEIN.*

I.

*Schiller's Wallenstein.* Edited with introduction, notes, and map, by MAX WINKLER, Ph. D. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1901. 8vo, lxxvi+446 pp.[1]

*Wallenstein. Ein dramatisches Gedicht von Schiller.* With an introduction and notes by W. H. CARRUTH, Ph. D. Second edition, revised. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1901. lxxxvi, 456 pp.[2]

LACK of space prevented me from adding to my previous general review of Prof. Winkler's edition some further remarks on a few individual points. Hence, they are published now as a second instalment of that review.

INTRODUCTION. P. xvii. "King of the Romans" should be omitted or explained.—P. xxxi. The brevity of the language used in describing the second *Revers*, "to remain loyal to him to the last," is rather misleading and hardly consistent with the second next sentence, "Wallenstein hoped thereby to convince the emperor of his continued loyalty." As a matter of fact, while the above quoted expression of the first *Revers* was reiterated, the second document was far more cautious and guarded than the first and placed the main emphasis on the saving clause concerning the rights of the emperor. It has been correctly characterized as an *Abschwächung des ersten.*—P. xlvi. The passage from the letter to Goethe of Dec. 12, 1797, is inaccurately rendered. *Der übrigen Handlung* is not a genitive dependent on *Zwecken*, but a dative governed by *entgegengesetzt.* The passage means: "love,

1 Cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, June 1901, xvi. 368–375.

2 Cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, March 1895, x, 162–172.

by its freedom from all aim, stands in contrast with the rest of the action. . ."—In the quotation from the letter of Nov. 9, 1798, *der übrigen Staatsaktion* is not "the rest of the political action," but "the rest of the action, which (rest) deals with politics."—P. xlix. The discussion of the *Oedipus Rex* in connection with Schiller's letter of Oct. 2, 1797, produces a wrong impression, in so far as Schiller distinctly deplores the fact that Wallenstein is *not* of the Oedipus type and that he has in vain tried to find a tragic plot resembling it.—P. li. "The cause of this new division was due to the fact . . ." is an impossible tautology.—P. lix. "*William* Slawata" looks odd.—P. lv. Heide's article in *Z. f. d. U.*, viii, 497 ff., might well have been mentioned, since it is easily accessible and sufficient for a first rapid orientation. Of Liliencron's article the first instalment (pp. 212–235) is omitted.—P. lviii. Why "Sesyma," since "Sesin" is used in all other instances?—P. lxxii ff. The character sketch of Octavio is, on the whole, not to be called satisfactory. It is not free from inconsistencies and impresses one as if the editor's heart was but little in his efforts more or less to exculpate Octavio. In the end we hardly know what estimate we are to place on Octavio's conduct.—The *map* is exceedingly *unübersichtlich*. It contains a host of unnecessary names in tantalizing type, while of places mentioned in the drama we miss, for example, Frauenberg.

TEXT. *Picc.*, l. 840. "*Die* Goten," as far as I know, is the reading of all editions.[3] And yet it must be an error. The emphasis on *Die* and not on *Goten* is illogical, even though, in my opinion, the latter term is not contemptuously used. In fact, Prof. Winkler's own reference to Schiller's *Gesch. d. dreissigjähr. Krieges* shows that Schiller, in imitation of his sources, used the term without any derogatory force. See also Dr. Breul's note.—*Tod*, 16. Is the dash, which all editions[4] seem to have after *senkrecht*, not perhaps a traditional error for a hyphen? A hyphen would be natural to indicate the omission of the inflectional *-er*,[5] while a dash seems quite uncalled for, especially if we consider that the next line although expressing the same contrast, has no punctuation whatever (see Goedeke). A good example of the practical identity of dash and hyphen is furnished from Lessing in Könneke, first ed., p. 169, ll. 15–16. Whether for *Wallenstein* the same confusion is plausible I cannot now determine. But the point seems worth while looking into.—*Tod*, 1078, 1108, and elsewhere, the comma at the end of the line seems hardly to be sufficient punctuation according to modern usage.—*Tod*, 3393. Read *euch* and *ihr*. Evidently the Swedes are meant, not the Swedish captain.

NOTES. *Prol.*, 131. *Ihr altes deutsches Recht* refers primarily to *des Reimes Spiel*, which is in apposition with it, only indirectly to the *Knittelvers* as such. If later on the editor says "The German public was then so unaccustomed to the use of metre in the drama," "metre" is undoubtedly a misprint for "rhyme." As to the *Knittelvers* used by Goethe in his Storm and Stress period, its apparent differences from Hans Sachs's verse seem to me to deserve more consideration than they generally receive at the hands of editors of *Faust* or *Wallenstein*. Cf., for example, Sommer, *Die Metrik des Hans Sachs*, p. 2 ff.; Helm, *Zur Rhythmik der kurzen Reimpaare d. 16. Jh.*, p. 99 ff.; Belling, *Die Metrik Schillers*, p. 244.—*Lager*, 14. Rhymes like *führen : probieren* every student of German has met by the dozen long before undertaking *Wallenstein*. If the matter was to be mentioned at all, *ö*: *e* and *eu*: *ei* rhymes should have been included. (Compare, for example, 179–181, 314–315, 497–498, 640–641, etc.) The statement that such rhymes are also found "in Goethe, as in *Faust*, Pt. 1, ll. 62–64, 231–234" has a strange ring to it, considering the fact that they occur not only in all works of Goethe (Compare Belling, *Goethes Metrik*, ii, pp. 11–12; Vischer, *Kleine Beiträge zur Charakteristik Goethes*, *Goethe-Jb.*, iv, p. 7; and Hildebrand's excellent article on this subject in *Z. f. d. U.*, vii, 153 ff.), but in almost every German poet since the days of Sebastian Brant and Hans Sachs. Off hand I could mention only the purist Platen as a striking exception to this rule; and a glance into, for example, Tille's *Songs of To-day* will convince one that even of the most modern poets the majority still follow the same usage.—*Lager*, 70. *Gemunkei* and

3 Whether the change in Prof. Carruth's text (first and second editions) is intentional or not, I do not know. His notes do not call attention to it, although it involves a deviation from Goedeke.

4 I now notice for the first time that Bellermann prints *mit senkrecht oder schräger Strahlung*, without however making any reference to the change in his notes or variants.

5 Cf., for example, *Faust*, 279, *Sonn- und Welten*, etc.

*Geschicke* cannot be said to form alliteration.—*Lager*, 181. Refer to *Lager*, 14.—*Lager*, 263. Read "passieren lassen, *tolerate*."—*Lager*, 271. Is *Soff* here not rather 'liquor' (so, for example, Sanders) than *das Saufen?*—*Lager*, 420. This pleonastic use of the possessive in modern colloquial speech, to my knowledge, is more common with the dative (south and midland) and accusative (north) than with the genitive. Compare Blatz, ii, 365.—*Lager*, 454. The *dazu* in the quotation from Sanders is meaningless. In Sanders it refers to *ein Ziel*, immediately preceding.—*Lager*, 479. The remark is quite correct, but rather ill-placed in view of Churchill's excellent rendering "bottle . . . . battle."—*Lager*, 500. For "assonance" read "rhyme."—*Lager*, 554. The unusual *auf niemand lügt* requires a note. Compare, for example, Sirach, 19, 15.—*Lager*, 846. For *Beding* refer to *Faust*, 1, l. 3001.—*Picc.*, 82. In discussing the use of the pronouns of address, the rather unusual *du* in *Tod*, 1857 ff., and 3228 ff., should not have been overlooked. —*Picc.*, 858. The unusually pleonastic form *hätt' auch geschehen sein können*, for either *hätt' geschehn können* (metrically acceptable) or *könnte geschehen sein* seems thus far to have escaped the attention of the editors. Compare the similar expression in Lessing's Emilia Galotti, ii, 4, *Du hättest mir das sogleich sollen gemeldet haben.*—*Picc.*, 995 ff. The poetic import of this passage, as of *Tod*, 1 ff., can hardly be claimed to be dependent on an exact understanding of the astrological points involved. If, however, an attempt is made to elucidate the matter, the explanations should not be more enigmatical than the text itself. Prof. Winkler's note bears comparison with those of Breul and Carruth, but, unless my own astronomical obtuseness is at fault, none of these notes represents the matter intelligibly. If the heavens (that is, day and night heavens, of course) are divided into twelve houses, six above and six below the horizon, and if the house just below the horizon in the east is counted as the first and called 'rising,' I am unable to see how the last, that is, twelfth house (so Breul and Carruth) or one of the last four (so Winkler) can possibly be called 'setting.' The last house by necessity is the one adjoining the first, and the seventh, that is, the one just above the horizon in the west, would be the setting one *par excellence*. (Cf., for example, the diagram in Brockhaus, *Konversationslexikon*, s. v. *Horoskop*.)[6] The numbering, by the way, does not proceed toward the zenith (Carruth), but in the opposite direction, that is, in the order in which the signs of the zodiac follow upon each other. As to the *Ecken* of l. 997, I am inclined to consider this expression merely as a metaphor for an out-of-the-way place, suggested by *Häuser;* for I cannot see how neighboring houses can 'intersect' and form 'corners' or 'angles,' except possibly at the poles of their common axis. Or are we to think of the *Eckhäuser* mentioned in the omitted passage after *Tod*, 21 (cf. Goedeke's edition, p. 209)? At any rate, *seinen* in l. 997, literally interpreted, refers to corners of the heavens, not of the houses. These brief remarks are more intended to raise a question than to settle it; for what has been stated is sufficient, I believe, to prove the desirability of a thorough revision of our current notes on this point on the basis of the astrological authorities most likely to have been consulted by Schiller. Düntzer, who so often delights in treating extraneous matter at great length, merely refers in this instance to Schleiden's *Wallenstein und die Astrologie*, Lpzg., 1855, to which I have no access.—*Picc.*, 2124. Refer to *Götz*, Weimar ed., p. 40, l. 2, *Bei Tisch geht alles drein.*—*Tod*, 2. If Bellermann's interpretation (in his *second* edition!) is correct, something should be said about the meaning of l. 30.—*Tod*, 161. *Der Doppelsinn des Lebens* has a wider significance than 'his equivocal conduct.' Compare Breul's full note. —*Tod*, 164. The remarkable frequency of this construction (due to the style of one of the sources?) in certain portions of the *Gesch. d. dreissigjähr. Krieges* might have been mentioned. The parts edited by Prof. Palmer contain numerous examples.—*Tod*, 234. The statement "*Euer* is monosyllabic" (so also Breul) must be called in question, if we con-

6 Cf. the still different explanation of Bellermann in his edition, where *cadens*, without reference to 'setting,' is taken to mean 'ominous.' Bellermann's explanation, indefinite as it is, tallies fairly well with the statement in *Enc. Brit.*, 9th ed., ii, 742, (s. v. Astrology): "The four ages of man had each three houses in the Zodiac. Each of this triple series was composed of a cardinal, a succeeding, and a declining or cadent house."

sider the relative frequency of anapests in *Wallenstein*. While less frequent, they are not unheard of in even the first foot. Cf., for example, *Picc.*, 1205 and 2647. Also Belling, *Die Metrik Schillers*, p. 193.—*Tod*, 342. *Sonst* with transposed order, used as a subordinating conjunction (compare Sanders, s.v., *widrigenfalls*) deserves comment.—*Tod*, 491. Refer to *Picc.*, 772.—*Tod*, 652. *Unter ihrem Herzen*, in its technical sense (*ein Kind unter dem Herzen tragen*) is not likely to be understood without a note.—*Tod*, 1242. Refer to l. 1338.—*Tod*, 1807. As plural *Läger* persisted far longer than as singular, so that in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries *Läger* was felt as a secondary plural of *Lager*. Cf. Grimm and Sanders, where examples for the plural are quoted from authors like Becker, Rückert, Klinger, Freiligrath and others, who would never have used it as a singular.—*Tod*, 1843. *Gewehr in Arm* calls for a note; for the exact meaning does not seem at all clear. Compare Buchheim, Breul, Flügel, Muret-Sanders. In some way or other, as the context suggests, it must mean "stand at ease."—*Tod*, 2619. As to *diesen Abend*, as far as I can see, neither interpretation (the natural "this evening" or the unheard of "last evening") establishes a satisfactory chronology for the events concerned. Why then try to put an impossible interpretation on a plain everyday expression? If *diesen Abend*, spoken fairly late on a certain evening in February (cf. *Tod*, 2818 and 2825!) can refer to the evening of the preceding day, it might just as well refer to almost anything else. On the other hand, I agree with Prof. Winkler in not accepting Kettner's explanation, which certainly is not so much of a panacea as Dr. Breul seems to think. It is not only unwarranted by fact, but it fails to explain. One needs to consider only this one point: Max leaves Pilsen 'in the early afternoon' and yet gets to Neustadt (at least sixty miles off) in time to open battle 'at nightfall' (that is, about five o'clock for February. Cf. l. 3020)! But the Swedish courier leaving Neustadt in the morning does not reach Eger (barely one-half that distance) until the evening! It is true, Dr. Breul in his table, assigns *Tod*, iv, 1–8 to the 'afternoon.' But if Wallenstein heard the firing in the evening or possibly late in the afternoon, and was then as far away from Eger as ll. 2621–2622 naturally suggest, he cannot have entered the city before night. Those, on the other hand, who explain *diesen Abend= gestern Abend* (as Winkler and Carruth) are obliged not only to credit desperate Max and his Pappenheimer with a feat of sixty miles in from four to five hours, but also to expect Wallenstein *with all his troops* to have traveled fully thirty miles (Prof. Carruth compromises on twenty eight) in about the same length of time! In short, to my mind, the chronology is hopelessly confused and furnishes a rather interesting and instructive parallel to the well-known *übermorgen* in *Faust*, 3662, which likewise has been twisted into a never-heard-of meaning.—*Tod*, 2628. *Joachimsthal* does not seem to refer primarily to the city but to the locality in general, hence *im* instead of *in*.—*Tod*, 2840. Should there not be a note on *Burg*, as compared with *Schloss* (2831 and 3210), *Festung* (2839), and *Stadt* (2841)?—*Tod*, 3060. The phrase "to cut his way through to Frauenberg" is rather misleading, considering that Frauenberg is on the direct road from Pilsen to Neustadt so that Max could hardly have helped passing through it.—In the "index to persons and places," besides Biblical names, I miss Wismar and Znaim.—In the bibliography, the dates given for Buchheim's edition refer neither to the first nor to the last edition. Bellermann's *Schillers Dramen* should be marked as a second edition. Of the correspondence with Goethe it would have been better to quote Vollmer's fourth edition of 1881 or the cheap Cotta edition of 1893, which contains several letters not even in Vollmer's last edition. Boxberger's edition in the Collection Speemann is based on Vollmer's far less complete edition of 1870.

In conclusion I take pleasure in giving renewed expression to the feeling of obligation under which Prof. Winkler has placed us by what he has done for the critical study of *Wallenstein* on the part of both students and teachers. The preceding suggestions, as a partial liquidation of my individual obligation, are offered in the hope that they may prove of benefit to the editor in the eventual revision of his work and to other scholars in the preparation of subsequent editions.

II.

As compared with the first edition of 1894, Prof. Carruth's second edition exhibits a sufficient amount of change and revision to justify a few additional remarks.

In the introduction there is some expansion in "the list of persons" (*Kammerfrau*, no reference; *Konig; Liechtenstein;* on p. lxxxi, l. 8, "*Picc.* 619," instead of 680), in the remarks on "the text" (the wording suggests that the Rues manuscript contained a complete text), and in the chapter on "bibliographical suggestions" which, however, is not particularly accurate now (Ranke, 4th. ed. 1882, instead of 4th. ed. 1880, or 5th. ed. 1895; Liliencrohn, instead of Liliencron; Gödeke 1867, instead of Goedeke, 1867-76; Bellermann, 1891, instead of 1888-91, 2nd. ed. 1898; Friedrich, instead of Fraedrich. Accuracy is the soul of bibliography!). A list of "subjects for themes" has been newly added. Generally, however, the introduction is practically unchanged, as indeed it did not call for any considerable changes.

The principal labor of revision the editor has bestowed upon the text and notes. The former is now as excellent, as before it was unsatisfactory. The type is large and clear, and numerous "Stichproben" proved it to be practically free from inaccuracies (Prol., l. 111, "er" should be spaced; l. 120, read "mit *einem* Mal," cf. *Picc.*, l. 2642, where, however, the spacing is wrong; *Tod*, l. 2194, read "meiste"). As to the notes, there has been a considerable amount of revision of the old material, although not every inaccuracy of the first edition has been removed (Brieg, for example, with its twenty thousand inhabitants is still 'a small town,' while Gitschin with its less than ten thousand is 'a large city'). On the whole, however, the revision and expansion seem to have been done with considerable care. The new edition contains about sixty-nine pages of notes as against the forty-seven pages of the first. This increase is commendable not only from a scholarly, but also from a pedagogical standpoint. For sixty-nine fairly open pages of notes should not be liable to the charge of "over-editing" in case of a text of seven thousand six hundred lines, that is, a text about four times as long as *Hermann und Dorothea*, twice as long as *Nathan*, and by one-half longer than the *First Part of Faust*.

Prof. Carruth's second edition, in many ways, is a great improvement on the first. In its present form the book will well answer the needs of all who do not intend to study the drama as extensively and critically as those whom Dr. Breul and Prof. Winkler have had in mind in the preparation of their editions.

A. R. HOHLFELD.
*University of Wisconsin.*

## *FRENCH LITERATURE.*

*Huit contes choisis par Guy de Maupassant.* Selected and edited with notes by ELIZABETH M. WHITE, Teacher of French, English High School, Worcester, Mass. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1900. vii, 94 pp. With portrait.

*Dix contes modernes des meilleurs auteurs du jour.* Edited by H. A. POTTER, A. B., Master of Modern Languages in the Commercial High School, Brooklyn, N. Y. With notes and English paraphrases for retranslation. Boston: Ginn & Company, 1900. iv, 95 pp.

COLLECTIONS of *contes* still commend themselves, it would seem, to most teachers of French. During the last decade a goodly number of these editions have been offered us, and not a few of them have proved most attractive and satisfactory aids in the earlier courses of our college schedules. The two volumes to be noticed here have points of merit which render them fully as valuable as many that have come before, and they are thus to be cordially welcomed and added to our available material for effective work.

Of the *Huit contes choisis* by Maupassant it may be said, first, that it is a well printed and handy little book which adapts itself excellently to second-year work. The collection is —as the editor remarks in a brief, but pointed and adequate introduction—not intended for elementary classes, and accordingly but few notes are inserted. Those which are given, however, are, for the most part, peculiarly appropriate, especially so in case of a few words of possibly doubtful import, which, if the student were left to himself, might receive an unfortunate interpretation. Two similar cases

where no aid is given, and which also (as it seems to the present reviewer, after having just used the book with a class of second-year students) might well have received attention in the notes are: p. 61, ll. 10–11, "Quelque enfant d'amour dont la pauvre mère, etc.," and p. 71, l. 13, "Il est ce qu'on appelle, en souriant, un noceur." In the annotation upon the word "Yvetot" the insertion of the first six lines of Béranger's poem appears unnecessary.

The eight stories of the edition are well chosen in that they offer good examples of the peculiar power and temper of the author. The editor's own words upon the qualities of Maupassant's tales are so pertinent that they may be quoted in this connection. She says:

"In Maupassant's short stories, no word is wasted, no incident unnecessary; they have interest, color, the bustle of life, the charm of movement, but leave an impression of sadness."

Sad, indeed, they do tend to be; and, as we know, it is very hard for French naturalism to be gay, or even cheerful. It may be added that these stories often leave not only an impression of sadness, but a feeling of dissatisfaction, almost of disaffection toward the author, as well. It is disappointing to have our interest aroused, and to be carried on willingly through an ingeniously contrived tale, only to have the writer pull up suddenly at the end in an unrelenting and pittiless fashion which chills our enthusiasm and deadens our sympathy. Maupassant is powerful, but cold, and we can not but feel that, had he only now and then more of the genial Daudet spirit, we could enjoy him much more unreservedly. Of the eight stories selected, six have an unsatisfactory, pathetic, or tragic close. The editor begins her collection with *la Parure*, one of the first of the author's *contes* to become known in this country, one which has been made to do considerable service in textbooks, and which has attained a success that the reviewer, for one, considers ill-deserved. That the unhappy experiences of 1870–71 have suggested fruitful themes to writers of *contes*, to Maupassant as well as to Daudet and others, is illustrated here in *Deux amis*, a cleverly told tale with a chilling conclusion. The author's native Normandy with its shrewd and artful peasants furnishes the setting for *la Ficelle*, an excellent piece of writing, and enjoyable till we reach the last few lines. *Le Bonheur*, "a simple story of true love," and perhaps the most attractive one of the collection, takes us to Corsica, where the wild scenery affords an opportunity for an artistic bit of description, a feature which always adds to the beauty of a *conte*. The edition has no table of contents, a convenience, no matter how brief the volume.

The ten *contes* brought together by Mr. Potter are new, and, as a whole, quite interesting. A number of them are cheerful in tone and do not terminate unhappily, which is a good thing. The reviewer believes decidedly in cheerful stories for the classroom, and has always remembered the impression made upon him a few years ago, when, while using in class a certain volume of *contes*, a student came up at the close of the hour and asked if all French stories were as sad as those which were then being read. The *contes* of the present collection are adapted, according to the statement of the editor, to first-year students in the higher institutions. The book has been used recently in this university in an elementary course, and, in the opinion of the instructor in charge, the stories as a whole were found rather too difficult for first-year work. At least it is evident that some of them contain unusual terms and colloquialisms quite beyond the range of the first-year student, and upon which no help is given in the notes. For example, in the *conte* entitled *Pour le ruban* the phrases "A la vôtre, messieurs!" (p. 62, l. 12), and "et lui donna du 'Monsieur' gros comme le bras" (p. 63, ll. 30–31), which are perhaps over the heads of even second-year college students, remain unexplained. It should be added, however, that a good many expressions of this sort do receive satisfactory comment in the notes.

Of the authors who are drawn upon for Mr. Potter's edition, the best known are the Daudet brothers and Guy de Maupassant. From the last writer is taken *l'Aventure de Walter Schnaffs*, perhaps the best story of the editor's volume, and certainly—in its brightness and humor, its entertaining vein of light satire, and its pleasant ending—one of the most agreeable that Maupassant has written, and a welcome

contrast to his many sombre tales. It takes us back again to the time of the Franco-Prussian war, and is another illustration of the willingness of French short-story writers to revert to the events of that period, which furnish either the theme or the background for six of the editor's ten *contes*. The English paraphrases of the French text for retranslation, which are given at the end of the volume, are a commendable feature. They are well planned and should add materially to the usefulness of the book.

B. L. Bowen.

*Ohio State University.*

## *GERMAN LITERATURE.*

*Henri de Kleist. Sa Vie et ses Œuvres. Thèse Présentée à la Faculté des Lettres de Paris par* R. Bonafous. Paris, 1894.

While gathering the bibliography of Heinrich von Kleist, I was struck by the absence of any adequate review of the book of R. Bonafous. This detailed treatment by a foreign scholar, of a poet who is attracting so much attention in his own country, seems to deserve some notice. Even at so late a date, therefore, an analysis of the work may not be without value.

Bonafous' book contains four hundred and twenty-two pages, of which one hundred and seventy-three are devoted to a description of Kleist's life, the other two hundred and forty-nine to a careful analysis of his work. An introductory chapter is devoted to a bibliography up to 1894, omitting all mention of special researches, which are inserted as foot-notes later on. To Bonafous' list might be added: Wolfgang Schmidt, *Von und über H. v. K.*, Berlin, 1890; Karl Biltz, *Zum Gedächtnisz H. v. Kleist's*, Potsdam, 1871; also two works by foreigners, which show Kleist from a new and interesting point of view: S. Friedmann, *Enrico di Kleist*, Milano, 1893; J. Le Fèvre-Deumier, *Celèbres Allemands*, Paris, 1892.

The general plan of the book is to show Kleist in relation to the great literary and political movements of his time. We cannot feel that this effort has been crowned with entire success. The best description is that of Berlin (pp. 32 and 115). But, though Bonafous draws a vivid picture of the literary war waged here in 1800, he fails to make clear Kleist's position in regard to the contending elements. He falls short in like manner in the chapter pertaining to Kleist's visit in Weimar (p. 99), by neglecting to give an adequate idea of the contrast which the immature young enthusiast presented to the calm self-control of the literary people whom he met here. This is the more important, since Bonafous shows a misapprehension of the situation when he attributes Goethe's unfavorable impression to *une jalousie secrète* (p. 102).

The catalogue of Wieland's works (p. 103) is inadequate, if the author desires to determine the older poet's position in literature at the time of his meeting with Kleist, and gratuitous if he takes the knowledge of that position for granted on the part of the reader. The tracing of the awakening interest in patriotism on the part of the Romantic school on page 146 is excellent in itself, but needlessly repeated on page 278.

The paragraphs devoted to the development of the German novel (p. 369) and the German comedy (p. 392) are somewhat shallow. They might well have gone into a short analysis of the characteristic features developed at this time, thus giving a background on which to throw into relief Kleist's contributions.

When naming over the various periodicals extant at the time of the *Phœbus*, in 1808 (p. 135), it would have been well to speak of the spirit of investigation and propagation of knowledge which gave rise to the great increase of periodical literature at the beginning of the century, and to show in what measure Kleist took part in this movement.

On the whole, this important portion of the work is marred by a rather superficial treatment and by the author's failing to show how Kleist stands related to the movement which he describes.

The detailed account of his life contained in the first thirteen chapters is clear and sympathetic. Especially well traced is the mental struggle which led to his withdrawal from the army (p. 15 ff.), and the havoc which the study of Kant caused in his ideals (p. 50 ff.). We miss here a comparison of Kleist's disgust with science with the same feeling in other men of his time and temperament—Stolberg, Schlegel, Fouqué. Years later, Lenau, a man

of far less virility than Kleist, expressed views almost identical.

Bonafous devotes six pages to a discussion of various theories concerning the object of the Würzburg journey, omitting, however, Bormann's article in *Unsere Zeit*, 1886, iv.[1] This lengthy treatment of unfruitful theories contrasts painfully with the hurried and inadequate handling of the real results of this journey, which appears in truth as the first great crisis in his life as a poet. Kleist's awakening to the beauties of nature (Biedermann,[2] *Briefe an seine Braut* pp. 87, 103, 104), the exuberance of his spirits which breaks out in figures sometimes fanciful, sometimes sublime (Biedermann, p. 88), the power of poetic description (Biedermann, pp. 57 and 73) the graphic portrayal of men (Biedermann, p. 73), and finally the increasing confidence in himself and his talents (Biedermann, p. 113) find no adequate consideration.

In treating of the Königsberg period, Bonafous passes over slightingly Kleist's first prose composition, *Über die allmähliche Verfertigung der Gedanken beim Reden*, a work important for the development it displays, of his facility in handling his material—his apt use of figures, his complex, carefully built up sentences, and his power of concise description.

The last chapter is devoted to the final year of Kleist's life. Following closely in the path of Brahm and Zolling, it has since been rendered worthless by Steig's investigations (Cf. *Berliner Kämpfe*, 1901).

Of the second part of the book, by far the best chapter is that devoted to an analysis of the *Amphitryon*. This is adequate in every way, particularly in the careful comparison made with the play of Molière.

The least satisfactory is the *Der zerbrochene Krug*, which is classified as a farce. As an observer of human nature and a writer of a Comedy of Manners, Kotzebue is placed above Kleist (pp. 319 to 321). Bonafous considers this comedy *pas une peinture de caractère, une comédie d'intrigue tout au plus* (p. 333). In comparing the work with Zschokke's novel, he fails to bring out Kleist's healthy realism.

In the chapter on *Robert Guiscard*, the treatment of sources is meagre, compared to Minor's article of the same year (*Euphorion*, vol. i, pp. 564 ff.). Following Brahm, Bonafous is determined to see in the fragment nothing but a drama of destiny, and therefore neglects the human side, failing entirely to see the importance of Abälard, as the representative of the hostile forces raised by his own acts. His treatment of the style of this play is general and superficial. He does not compare it with the current pseudo-Classic plays, nor does he sufficiently appreciate the power and dignity of the language, nor the lucid terseness of the exposition.

*Käthchen von Heilbronn* he considers *l'imitation pure et simple de Shakespeare* (p. 264), and from its appearance he dates Kleist's formal entrance into the Romantic school. He criticizes the play from a purely rationalistic standpoint, not giving sufficient importance to the fact that it bears all the signs of having originally been intended for a dramatized fairy-tale. In 1805 Kleist had read widely in the French literature of the eighteenth century, as is shown by his translations and his prose tales. Doubtless the *Contes de Fées* did not escape him, nor their weak imitations in Germany. In this play we find every character pertaining to fairy lore: the wicked fairy, the guardian angel, the prince and the disguised princess. The solution, therefore, is in harmony with the general tone. Bonafous institutes no comparison with the various treatments of the Griseldis story in other literatures (Boccaccio, Chrétien de Troyes, Tennyson, Scott, Percy, and others). He seems not to have read the article on *Käthchen* in Friedmann (*Das deutsche Drama d. xix. Jh.*, Milan, 1893, p. 38).

In treating of the scene in the *Prinz von Homburg*, in which the hero shows an abject fear of death, he enters with acumen into the psychology of the hero, showing that a vivid imagination was the cause of the young man's emotion (though he might have drawn the evident parallel with Macbeth). But when he sums up the entire development of the Prince as the change from a *man* to a *soldier*, he seems not to have grasped Kleist's meaning. For it was a mature, self-controlled man that

[1] These ideas have since been carried out more fully by Morris, *Heinrich von Kleist's Reise nach Würzburg*, Berlin, 1899.

[2] *H. v. Kleist's* Breslau u. Leipzig, 1884.

he developed out of a dreamy, self-willed, passionate boy.

His treatment of the novels is short and perfunctory. He ranks *Kohlhaas* lowest in the first series because of its lack of unity. He does not enter into the peculiar value of Kleist's prose style, its deviation from that of the Romantic school in terseness of form, firmness of characterization and realism of description.

For the sake of completeness, he should have treated the poems and the prose articles of Kleist. He has mentioned some of these, but has not sought to determine their value as exponents of his genius or character. The only one that he has discussed at all is the "Prayer of Zoroaster," of which he says that it contains *rien qui pût satisfaire ou même éveiller la curiosité du lecteur* (p. 162).

Summing up, Bonafous ranks Kleist high in the second order of writers, considering his talent chiefly imitative—first, of Shakespeare, then of the Classics, last, of the Romanticists, with whom he finally classifies him. He seems to have missed the one point of Kleist's peculiar genius which separates him from both the Classic and the Romantic school, with each of whom he shared certain tendencies—his persistent effort to paint life as he saw it, the ugly and grotesque, as well as the harmonious and beautiful. In this he is not a Romanticist, but the progenitor of our modern school, to which, through Grabbe and Hebbel, he handed down his art.

On the whole, this book, without pretending to any originality of material or treatment, gives a good picture of the poet and his *milieu*. If the author does not rank Kleist as high as Germany is at present inclined to place the long-neglected poet, this may be due to the fact that Kleist is so deeply rooted in his native soil that it is difficult for a foreigner to comprehend the various phases of his complex individuality. By long and excellent translations from the letters and careful abstracts of the works, he has done much to bring Kleist himself before his readers.

A few slight mistakes may be pointed out in closing: His account of the trouble Kleist and Dahlmann met after the battle of Aspern, differs in detail from Schmidt's quotation (Intr. xcix). Bonafous says (p. 151): *Kleist se tira d'affaire en récitant quelque poésies patriotiques de sa composition.* Poor Kleist! His poems never did him such service.

Percy's ballad is "Childe Waters," not "Count Watters" (p. 253)—probably a contamination with Bürger's "Graf Walter."

On page 247 he misses a fine point in Käthchen's character when he says of her consent to return home (iii, 1): *cédant aux prières de ceux qu'elle aime.* She yielded, touched by their sacrifice, not their prayers.

HENRIETTA K. BECKER.
*University of Chicago.*

## *FRENCH LITERATURE: PEDAGOGICS.*

a. *L'Enfant Espion and Other Stories*, edited with notes and vocabulary by REGINALD R. GOODELL, M. A., University of Maine. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: American Book Co., 1901.

b. *Mon Oncle et Mon Curé*, par Jean de la Brète, abridged for class use and edited with notes by T. F. COLIN, Head of French Department, Miss Baldwin's Preparatory School, Bryn Mawr. Boston: Heath and Co., 1901.

c. *A Selection from the Comedies of Marivaux*, edited with an introduction and notes by EVERETT WARD OLMSTED, Ph. D., Assistant Professor of Romance Languages in Cornell University. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1901.

d. *Die Reform des Neusprachlichen Unterrichts auf Schule und Universität.* MAX WALTER. Marburg: 1901. 24 pp.

a. MR. GOODELL, now at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, makes his début as an editor with this excellent collection of modern short stories. At the first glance the selections seem too difficult for first year students, for whom the work is manifestly intended, but by full and careful notes and a fairly complete vocabulary, this apparent drawback has been eliminated. On the other hand, the actual interest and beauty of the stories themselves recommend the book immediately to those teachers who are heartily weary of the fairy stories and insipid tales usually found in text-books for beginners. The writer has just finished reading the book with a collegiate class and the results have been highly satisfactory.

The plan of editing followed by Mr. Goodell is to be particularly commended; there is first a brief introduction, consisting of very short

biographical statements concerning the authors of the various stories; namely, Alphonse Daudet, Coppée, de Maupassant, and Mérimée. Then follows the French text with full explanatory notes at the bottom of each page. Thirdly, comes a set of twenty-seven English exercises to be put into French with the aid of the preceding texts; and the book closes with a French-English vocabulary. A most commendable feature in the foot-notes is the almost entire absence of translations, when there seems to be need for aid in this regard the student is referred to the word in the vocabulary under which the expression is to be found. But one error in the statements in the notes has been observed, on p. 44, l. 3, the *Chardin* referred to is undoubtedly the famous painter of still life, *Jean-Baptiste Siméon Chardin*, 1699–1779, and not the merchant and traveler mentioned. We might expect, too, some explanation of *Mauvais-Philibert*, p. 47, l. 10.

The vocabulary, unfortunately, is not up to the high standard set by the rest of the book; one would think that the editor had taken some school dictionary and simply jotted down the first meaning that he found after each of his French words. There are numerous cases where words are used in a special sense in the text without sufficient explanation in the vocabulary, and in addition to this there are several cases where words are entirely omitted. A list of such cases follows, the numbers referring to the page and line where an example may be found: *avant*, before, 14, 2; *venir de*, to have just, 15, 16; *fier*, proud, 17, 3; *bailli*, bailiff, 19, 21; *intérieur*, interior, 34, 18; *fromage d'Italie*, Italian brawn, 38, 5; *se coller en*, to jump into (of dress), 40, 20; *jambonneau*, small ham, 40, 27; *kirsch* for *kirschwasser*, cherry bounce, 41, 19; *baraque de toile*, show-tent, 42, 2; *buter*, to stumble, 43, 17; *caniche*, poodle not spaniel, 45, 20; *d'occasion*, chance (second-hand), 49, 26; *s'emporter*, to run away (of a horse), 52, 13; *tiens*, the exclamation equivalent to 'look,' 'see,' 54, 18; *telle quelle*, just as it is, 57, 13; *en avoir pour*, to take one (of time), 58, 28–9; *fade*, musty, 61, 10; *dossier*, back (of a chair), 63, 28; *affolements*, mad attacks, 64, 31; *trancher de*, to border on, 67, 23.

The typography of the text is very clean and the vocabulary is easy to refer to. The following misprints occur: *joyeuse* for *joyeuses*, 41, 9; *abondonnant* for *abandonnant*, 44, 11; *étais* for *était*, 68, 33; *dédia* for *délia*, 73, 14; *aurait* for *serait*, 75, 1; *derrère* for *derrière*, 77, 11; *ordinance* for *ordonnance*, 127, 21; *spadessin* for *spadassin*, 137, 10.

b. Mlle. Colin edits this charming little story to put it in reach of American students preparing for the examinations of the College Entrance Examination Board. The abridgment has been so carefully made that one who had never seen the original would not know that anything had been omitted, and the text has been so well edited that there is really no adverse criticism to be made upon it. The notes are as complete and full as one need ask, scarcely an uncommon idiomatic expression is passed by. In reading over the text but two misprints have been found, *par* for *pas*, p. 9, l. 16, and *chair* for *chaire*, p. 49, l. 10. The little book seems admirably well-adapted for use in secondary schools and in coëducational institutions; there is nothing whatever objectionable in the matter, and the text is bright and interesting and replete with the well-turned, apt phrases which form the great charm of the French language.

c. In his edition of selected plays of Marivaux, Dr. Olmsted has given us a very attractive and handy little text of this author, who is only too little known and read by American students. The three comedies chosen are *le Jeu de l'Amour et du Hasard*, *le Legs*, and *les Fausses Confidences*, which, while not wholly representative of the various sides of Marivaux' dramatic genius, yet, as the editor states, are considered the most popular of his dramas, and have the distinction of being entirely free from the dialect forms which make other of the plays unsuitable for college reading.

The text of the comedies is preceded by an extensive introduction, of sixty-nine pages, in which is narrated the life of Marivaux, his trials and successes as an author, as a member of the Academy, and as a frequenter of the literary salons so famous in his day. There is further an analysis of several of the plays and a classification of the whole body of the author's drama into a six-fold scheme. At the end of the introduction (pp. lxxxii–xc) is a chronological list of all the writings of Marivaux, and a bibliographical note. The introduction is fairly complete and contains the in-

formation needed by the reader for a proper appreciation of the plays presented, but the interest of its perusal would be much increased had the author paid closer attention to the principles of English composition. A curious omission occurs on p. lxxx, where, in giving the date of Marivaux' death, the year, 1763, is entirely left out.

For the French text of the three comedies, the editor has wisely adopted the orthography of the Hachette edition of the *Grands Écrivains*, for, as he says, the spelling of the original would be too confusing for the average student. The explanatory notes which follow the French text are excellent, the editor has not only carefully explained all obscure constructions, but has given in full the modern French forms for every eighteenth century phrase which has disappeared from the usage of to-day.

The general appearance of the publication is attractive, the typography is excellent, and the French text is printed in large, clear characters. The following misprints have been noticed: p. lxxxi, the two foot-notes bear the numbers *3* and *4* and are inverted in order; p. lxxxvi, l. 6, *a'un* for *d'un;* p. lxxxviii, l. 13, insert *Études* after *Nouvelles;* p. 49, l. 4, first *le* for *lu;* p. 135, l. 2, *orders* for *ordres;* p. 155, l. 19, *mois* for *mais;* p. 246, l. 5, *appeller* for *appeler;* p. 302, l. 18, the reference to Martial's Epigrams should read *I, xlvii*, instead of *I, 1, xlviii.*

d. This pamphlet contains the paper presented by Direktor Max Walter of the *Realgymnasiums Musterschule* in Frankfurt a. M., before the *Congrès international de l'Enseignement des langues vivantes*, held at Paris in July, 1900. Direktor Walter briefly considers the history and spread of the so-called 'New Method' of teaching modern languages. He mentions the opening of the question of reform in modern language teaching by Prof. Vietor's article: *Quousque Tandem: Der Sprachunterricht muss umkehren!*" published in 1882, and the subsequent development of the 'New Method' together with its introduction into the schools of Germany. The chief features of the system are concisely stated; namely, oral drill for learning both the pronunciation and the signification of the forms of the foreign language, reading in the foreign tongue, with oral interpretation therein of difficult passages, after this, only, comparative study of the grammar of the foreign and native languages, composition in the foreign tongue based on a text in the same language, and finally a thorough study of the literature, history, manners, and customs of the foreign people, and of the geography of their country. Somewhat further on Direktor Walter gives the results of his personal experiences in teaching French and English by the 'New Method;' his students, after finishing the secondary school course, can fully understand the spoken word, can make themselves understood in ordinary conversation and in the speech of everyday life, they can read and explain texts in the foreign tongue or translate them into their own language, they can write from dictation, explain passages read to them but once, or compose original matter in the foreign tongue. The writer further speaks of the greater responsibilities and labor required of the instructor, and the consequent necessity of an increase in the teaching force properly to handle the 'New Method,' but he also mentions the great enthusiasm for the reform shown by the instructors throughout Germany. In conclusion, Direktor Walter expresses the hope that the mutual study of one another's language may tend toward peace and friendship among the nations. The last four pages of the pamphlet are taken up with a note by Prof. Vietor, of Marburg, on the progress of the reform movement in Germany, with mention of its especial needs.

MURRAY P. BRUSH.
*Johns Hopkins University.*

## *THE LANGUAGE OF SHETLAND.*

*Det norröne sprog på Shetland, af* JAKOB JAKOBSEN. Köbenhavn, 1897. x+196 pp.

As early as the beginning of the ninth century Shetland was colonized by vikings from Norway. It had already in the last part of the eighth century become a station for vikings on their expeditions to Scotland, the Southern Isles (the Hebrides), and Ireland. When political centralization took place in Norway under Harald Harfagr vast numbers of the younger men of the country emigrated westward, and the Shetlands, which are only a little over two hundred miles from the outlets of the fjords of Hardanger and Sogn, received their share of viking settlers. When Harald

had made secure his rule in Norway he made an expedition to the West, subdued the isles, and made Sigurd, son of Rognvald Möre, Earl of Shetland and Orkney. They remained an earldom attached to Norway for centuries. The language spoken was a dialect of Norse not very different from that spoken in the Faroes and Iceland, which had been settled after 825 and 870 respectively. Politically and commercially, the Shetlands always remained in the closest union with the mother country. The name Hjeltefjorden (the old name for Shetland was Hjaltland), a little fjord running into Bergen harbor, testifies to the frequency of the visits of Shetlanders to Norway. By the Union of Calmar, in 1397, Norway and its dependency Shetland became united with Denmark under Margaret of Denmark. In 1469 King Christian I of Denmark transferred Shetland and the Orkneys to the crown of Scotland as the dowry of Margaret of Denmark upon her marriage with King James III. The great distance between Shetland and Scotland was not favorable to unifying the two. Though Scotch politically now, commercially, linguistically and in every other way they continued to be Norse long afterwards. The Norse language, or "Norn" as called in Shetland, was spoken almost unchanged for two centuries more. Even as late as the beginning of the present century there were those among the older generation, especially on the outlying isles, who could speak the old Shetland-Norse tongue, and the author of *Det norröne sprog på Shetland* found in 1894 several who remembered some "Norn" words and phrases.

With the financial assistance of the Danish ministry of culture, the author spent two years (1894–95) in Shetland for the purpose of studying the Old Norse elements that still remain in the new Shetland dialect. *Det norröne sprog på Shetland*, which was publicly defended for the doctorate in the University of Copenhagen, in June, 1896, was printed in Copenhagen in 1897 as an introduction to a larger work which is to contain the results of Dr. Jakobsen's investigations on the dialect of Shetland. The latter is to be in the form of a dictionary of Norn, and will contain some ten thousand words of Norse origin found in the Shetlandic dialect of Scotch. In an introductory chapter of fifteen pages, the history of Shetland is discussed politically and linguistically. Although King Christian had stipulated that no changes were to be made in the laws and institutions of the islands we find that by the year 1600 the old laws had been replaced by new ones, the former lawthing done away with, and the Shetland peasantry had lost their allodial possessions and these had passed over into the hands of the earls of the islands appointed by the Scottish crown. This condition of affairs was not calculated to strengthen the Shetlander's loyalty to Scotland, but had the opposite effect, that of making them hold so much longer to the old, and to cling so much more firmly to their Norse associations. As late as 1774 George Low in his *Tour thro' Orkney and Shetland*, says:

"Most of their (the Shetlanders') tales are relative to the history of Norway; they seem to know little of the rest of Europe but by name; Norwegian transactions they have at their fingers' ends."

The breaking down of inflections and the introduction of Scotch words from the official language into that of the rest of the population must have begun by the year 1600. Political separation from Norway brought with it linguistic isolation, the power to resist continued Scotch influence became weaker and weaker. After the antipathy to Scotch had been overcome the change from Norn to Scotch became more rapid. Gradually it came to be regarded a sign of culture to be able to use Scotch words. A verse which is said to belong to the middle of the eighteenth century runs

De var gue ti
when sone min guid to Kadaness
han kan ca' rossa mare
han kan ca' big bere
han kan ca' eld fire
han kan ca' klovandi taings.

The author concludes that while influence of the one language upon the other was constantly increasing throughout the seventeenth century, it was not until the eighteenth century that extended changes took place sufficient to finally change the language of the isles during the course of the century from a Norse dialect to a language Scotch in general character. The two islands that seem to have preserved the old speech longest are Foula and Uust, the former on the west, the latter on the north. In 1850 Norn was still spoken in Uust, and somewhat after the middle of the century in Foula.

"The part of the language that first suffered breaking down were the inflectional forms and the grammatical endings, along with which assimilation of consonants became more and more common. Then the particles of the language disappear, conjunctions, prepositions, pronouns, numerals and the common adverbs, likewise those adjectives and verbs in most common use and abstract nouns. Concrete nouns remained longest, especially those that are associated with the daily life and work of the people" (p. 13).

The force of the postpositive definite article was early lost sight of. Examples of this are numerous, for example, *de bjadni* (ON. *barnit*), 'the child;' *de ildiun* (ON. *eldrinn*), 'the fire;' *de kroppinn* (ON. *kropprinn*), 'the body.' The author quotes a number of words (p. 101) in which the ON. nominative ending *i* has apparently been preserved. It becomes difficult, however, in such cases to determine in any given case whether we have the real nominative ending or the Scotch diminutive *-ie*, since both are pronounced the same way, and the latter is so common as to be applied to almost any noun, and not always with diminutive force. In, for instance, *biti*, "en lille skabning af usædvanlig omfang," the ending *may* be the Scotch diminutive. The Scotch diminutive *-ock* is very common in Shetlandic, and has in a great many cases replaced older Norn endings: so *æringr*>*ærek*, *silungr*>*silek*, *visa*>*visick* or *visek*, etc. By analogy with English adjectives in *-ous* a number of Norse adjectives have taken this ending, for example, *ugjövous*, ON. *ugæfr*, 'unfortunate;' *unsondious* (p. 111), ON. *úsýniligr* 'repulsive,' etc. The past and past participle of verbs are regularly Scotch, but *fin*, 'to find,' has retained the Norn past *fan* and past participle *fon*. A large number of Norse idioms and turns of expression are still heard, for example, *to bear aff*, to excuse one's self; *to have jöl*, to keep Christmas; *to mak ill*, to cause trouble, cf. Norwegian *at gjera ilt; to say fae onything* (ON. *segja frá*) to tell about anything, etc. The Norn elements are fast disappearing, many words that seem to have been in common use a few decades ago are no longer understood by the younger generation. A large number of words formerly common are now found only as parts of compounds and others again with highly specialized meanings often very different from the original one. ON. *dagr* remains in *dagali*, 'the end of day,' twilight; and ON. *dalr* in *dalamist*, 'dalefog,' etc. ON. *andi*, 'breath,' is Shetlandic *ändi*, strong odor; ON. *eyðr*, folk, is Shetlandic *lö*, mob, and ON. *granni*, neighbor, has become *grani*, friend. In the same way ON. *bjartr*, which means "bright" lives in the Shetlandic *a bjart sky*, 'a dark, cloudy sky.' The intercourse between the various islands was at first very limited and thus dialectal differences very easily developed. When Scotch influence became more pronounced it was not always the same words that were replaced by new ones in the various islands, or even in different parts of the same island. Many words continued in use only in certain localities and again the same word developed a variety of meanings according to the locality, all of course more or less closely related to that of the original word.

The Norn elements in Shetlandic are oftentimes so changed and distorted that the Norse word can be recognized with difficulty in the present Norn form. Add to this the great variety of forms a word may take in regions far removed with little or no intercourse between them and the very divergent meanings of entirely a different form of the word in, for instance, Whalsay, Unst, and Dunrossness the problem of collecting words and language elements of Norse origin in the Shetland dialect became an exceedingly difficult one. A prerequisite for such an undertaking could be nothing less than a knowledge of Scotch and Norse in all its stages together with an extended knowledge of the Scandinavian languages and Germanic dialects in general. The author has handled the difficult subject in a manner that leaves almost nothing to be desired. He has carried on his investigations with untiring energy and with a well-nigh remarkable acuteness of observation. His knowledge of Feroese (Mr. Jakobsen is a native of the Feroes), closely related to the Norn dialect, has sometimes assisted him in tracing the etymology of words that offered special difficulty. One special importance that attaches to Mr. Jakobsen's study is that it forms a valuable contribution to our knowledge of Old West Scandinavian. In the large body of Norn words the author has collected having no parallel found in Old Norse or Old Icelandic literature many have been derived from a starred ON. form, the existence of which in ON. times is proved by the Norn word in the Shetland dialect. The author has, however, disregarded the possible presence of Danish

influence in certain cases where the form of the word would suggest it. Danish was the official language of the island from 1397 to 1469. While the period was too short to permit of any considerable Danish influence on the speech of the bulk of the population the possibility of the introduction of some Danish elements cannot be overlooked especially in view of the fact that Danish intercourse with the Shetlands during these seventy-two years seems to have been rather intimate. The word *kjōb* 'recompense,' is certainly nearer to Middle Danish *kjōb* than to ON. *kaup*. And so the Uust word *voker* (as also Feroese *vakur?*) probably come from Danish *vakker*. These words, however, together with two or three for which Danish parallels are cited, and which are probably of Danish origin, only show how slight the influence of Danish on the language of the islands was. Mention has already been made of the distorted form in which many Norn words have come down, and the variety of meanings the same word has taken on in the different isles. ON. *fok*, 'fog,' 'something drifting,' becomes *fjāg* in western Fetlar and in part of Yell. It is *fjok* elsewhere in Fetlar, *fog* in Delting, *fǫg* in Northmavine and Dunrossness, and *fjog* in "de Herra" in Yell. In Delting and in western Fetlar the word (*fog*, *fjāg*) means 'foggy clouds.' In Uust *fjōg* means 'mist-like rain or snow,' while in Fetlar (except the western part) *fjag* means 'everything collected in a loose heap.' The varied development of the vowels is, in the author's opinion (p. 115), due largely to the different stages of Scotch influence in the various cases. A chapter is devoted to the interesting subject of the taboo-names used by the Shetland fishermen. This practice of giving taboo-names is the outgrowth of a superstition that it was unlucky to call some things by their real names at certain times. And so a number of "haf-words" or "lucky words" came into use—words that are intelligible everywhere in the Shetlands—to take the place of the real names of certain things at such times. In time the practice developed until the result was a systematically carried out seaman's language, differing considerably from the ordinary daily speech. A very large number of Norn elements have been preserved in this haf-language otherwise crowded out of the daily speech by Scotch or English words. Very often they are of a more or less poetic character, figurative designations for the objects they stand for. Usually some prominent characteristic of the thing gave rise to the paraphrastic name. The mast is called *de streng* ('the pole'); the whitefish is called *de hwida* ('the white one'); the flounder is called *de baldin* ('the obstinate one'); the bottom of the sea is called *de dek* (from ON. *dǫkk*, 'depression'); the sun is called *de foger* ('the beautiful one'); the gun becomes *de smeller* ('the thing that sounds, cracks'), etc. There are left of these "haf" or "lucky-words" in Shetlandic forty-nine terms for the boat and the various parts of a fisherman's outfit, eighty-five for animals, birds and fishes, and eighty-seven for other objects.

In chapter vii the author discusses the phonology of the Norse loan-elements. With the breaking of *e* to *ya*, *ja*, spoken of on page 131, in for example, *yach* from *ek*, *whar an yaar* from Norse *hvor hān er*, may be compared a similar process in the dialects of Southern Scotland, discussed by Murray in *The Dialects of the Southern Counties of Scotland*, page 105. In these dialects *ac*, 'oak,' has become *yak*, and English *earth* appears as *yirth*, etc. In the consonant combinations *hj* and *hn*, *h* usually becomes *s*. ON. *hjarl* is in Shetlandic *sjarl*, and the original name of the isles, *Hjaltland*, has become *Shetland*. ON. *hneppa* has become *snep* (*knep* is also heard). *Hw* appears as *hw* or *kw*, rarely *sw*. In eastern and southern Shetland, especially Unst, Yell, and Dunrossness, the sound is *hw*. On the west, especially in Foula, Inarf, and Coningsburg it is *kw*. So ON. *hveppa* becomes *hwop* on the East, but *kwop* on the West, and so on in all words having this consonant combination. In dealing with Norse elements in Shetlandic the question of secondary borrowing through Scotch also presents itself. A large number of Lowland Scotch words in most common use which themselves are of Norse origin have come in from Scotland, but in dealing with Norn elements such words in the Shetlandic dialect must, of course, be classed as Scotch words and not as "Norn." The word *bann* in the expression 'to curse and bann,' the author regards as a Norn word from ON. *banna*. Its immediate source, however, seems to me to be the Scotch *ban*, itself from ON. *banna*. Shetlandic *ban* is then not one of the remnants of

the Old Norn, but a word introduced along with Scotch speech. The word *ber* (*bor*), ON. *byrr*, has also come in from Scotland. In the case of *spör*, 'to court,' we probably have a meaning borrowed from Scotch. *Bigin* in a *bigin of hooses* is not a Norn word but the Scotch *biggin*, but this latter is probably from ON. *bygging*. The use of the word *bigin* in Shetland shows that this is the source of the word. Shetlandic *bigin* is a group of houses built closely together. This meaning the word developed in Scotland. The Norse *bygg(n)ing* always refers to one single building. So *goul* is a later borrowing from Scotch. ON. *gaula* appears in Shetlandic as *gjöl* (p. 78). The author presents his material in an interesting way, orders his topics well and discusses the various phases of the subject, the nature of the loan-material, and the phonology of loan-words with scholarly thoroughness. The fragments in Norn, however, might better been collected in one place. Barring the few cases in which possible Danish or Scotch influence has been overlooked it would be difficult to take exception to any of the conclusions drawn with regard to the history of Norn words. Mistakes of quantity or ending which might very easily creep in where such a large number of Norse and Icelandic words are cited are exceedingly rare. On page 20 Shetlandic *Goit a taka gamla mana rō* is referred to ON. *gott at taka gamla manna ráð*, where *gamla* should, of course, be *gamalla* (Gen. pl.).

A chapter on the exact Norse provenience of the Shetlandic loan-elements would have been welcome. From a comparison of a list of Shetlandic words with Norse dialect words Sophus Bugge concluded that the original settlers of Shetland came from the counties of Lyster and Mandal in southwestern Norway. Dr. Jakobsen emphasizes Agder in southwestern Norway as probably having contributed most toward the Shetland settlements. This conclusion is based on the comparison of a rather small number of Norn words with Norse dialect words as given in Ross's *Norsk Ordbog*. Ross's dictionary, however, is especially complete for the dialects of Agder and Mandal while some of the dialects of western Norway, for instance, are not treated with equal fulness. The Shetlandic words that are common to Agder, and on which Dr. Jakobsen's conclusion is based, then, are nearly all of them common to Sogn, Hardanger and Telemarken also, though Ross's dialect dictionary fails to show it. Shetlandic *to hwop*, ON. *hveppa* appears according to Ross in Agder and Telemarken, Norway. But the word *kveppa* is as common in Sogn as *kveppe* is in Agder. Shetlandic *jema*, ON. *eimr*, Ross locates in Mandal in the form *eim*. The word also occurs in Telemarken (*æim*) and in Sogn (*aim*); *kuna*, 'wife,' appears as *kaana* in Sogn though not so recorded in Ross; *lönihus* is from ON. **löynihus*. The first element is found in the verb *löyne* in Telemarken, also omitted in Ross; to *öus* is the same as Sogn *æusa*, Telemarken *æuse*, Shetlandic *sjoden*, (ON. *tjǫrn*, 'tarn'), is the Sogn word *tjöddn*. The word also occurs in Telemarken in the form *tjönn*, (in Shetland also *sjön*). Shetland *swäit*, Norse *skvetta* Ross locates in Agder and Telemarken. The word is as common in Sogn. The author's conclusions, then, on the question of the dialectal provenience of Norn elements and the locality in Norway from which the emigrants to Shetland came are based on insufficient data, indeed the arguments would seem to be stronger for Sogn and Hardanger than for Agder or Mandal. Such Shetlandic words as *gild*, *munnka*, *mældren*, *sjoden*, *hent*, *hwop*, *swäit*, *jema* and *ælt* have a peculiar Sogn flavor about them that suggests Sogn origin, on the other hand the word *usjuna* immediately calls up the Telemarken word *utjön*. It would seem that Mandal, Agder, Sogn, Hardanger, and Telemarken have all contributed their share, Sogn possibly most, something that would seem natural when we bear in mind that vast numbers of vikings sailed out from the Sognefjord. We have, however, no means of knowing what the "Wortvorrath" of these various dialects was in the early viking age. Because a word is common to only two or three of these dialects now we have no right to suppose that was the case in the eighth or the ninth century. The word may have existed in several other dialects in those early times. And finally we have to deal with the question of inter-dialectal loans or the migration of words from one dialect to another, all of which only shows how complicated the task is and how unsatisfactory all conclusions are with regard to the exact source of Norse elements in Scotch if based on the distribution of words in the modern dialects.

GEORGE T. FLOM.

*University of Iowa.*

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### *ENGLISH POETRY.*

To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes,

Sirs:—In E. P. Whipple's criticism of Christopher Marlowe's play of *Dr. Faustus* occurs the following passage:

"The characters of Faustus and Mephistopheles are both conceived with great depth and strength of imagination; and the last scene of the play, exhibiting the agony of supernatural terror in which Faustus awaits the coming of the fiend who has bought and paid for his soul, is not without touches of sublimity. There is one line, especially, which is loaded with meaning and suggestiveness,—that in which harboring for a moment the possibility of salvation amid the gathering horrors of his doom, Faustus exclaims:

'See, see where Christ's blood streams in the firmament!'"

The comment on this line by Whipple is the only attempt at its interpretation that I have found among Marlowe's editors and critics, and this gives us no key to the meaning of the figure 'Christ's blood streams in the firmamament.' Saintsbury quotes the line as 'one of those phrases and passages of blinding and dazzling poetry that flash out in Marlowe,' and its imaginative quality has been noted by other critics. I have been so fortunate as to find an instructive parallel in the Old English poem, Cynewulf's *Christ*. In the 'Doomsday,' Pt. iii, of the *Christ*, ll. 1082 seq. of Mr. Whitman's translation is the following:

"Then (that is, at the Judgment Day) shall sinful men, sad at heart, behold the greatest affliction, Not for their behoof shall the cross of our Lord, brightest of beacons, stand before all nations, wet with the pure blood of heaven's King, stained with his gore, shining brightly over the vast creation. Shadows shall be put to flight when the resplendent cross shall blaze upon all peoples. . . . For all this will he rigorously exact recompense when the red rood shall shine brightly over all in the sun's stead. Fearfully and sorrowfully shall they look thereon, those black workers of iniquity, fordone by sin. . . ."

This apparition of the blood-stained cross shining in the heavens at the Judgment is accounted for by Prof. Cook in his edition of Cynewulf's *Christ* through numerous parallel passages drawn from early Christian writers. The vision of Constantine recorded by Eusebius in his *Life of Constantine*, is noted as one of the original sources of the conception, and from there it is traced into the services of the Church. I include one note which is of especial interest in this relation:

'As affording indications that the Church, recognized a connection between the vision of Constantine and the Sign of the Son of Man, we may refer to the Feast of the Invention of the Cross (3 May) and of the Exaltation of the Cross (14 September). At the First Vespers of these Feasts, the Hymn is 'Vexilla Regis prodeunt' and the Antiphon of the Magnificat begins: 'O Crux splendidior cunctis astris.'"

At the Second Nocturn of the Invention is a direct reference to the vision of Constantine, and

"at the end of the Third Lesson occurs the Respond: 'Hoc signum crucis erit in cælo cum Dominus ad judicandum venerit; tunc manifesta erunt abscondita cordis nostri' (cf. 1036–8, 1045–1056). The beginning of this is likewise used at the First Vespers, the Third Nocturn, Terce, and Nones of the Invention, and at First Vespers, First, Second, and Third Nocturns, Terce and Nones of the Exaltation . . . . Stories of the apparition of a cross in the heavens (see Brewer, *Dictionary of Miracles*, pp. 72–3, 282, 314), were related by Cyril of Jerusalem (A. D. 386), by Gregory Nazianzen concerning the Emperor Julian, by others concerning St. Ouen (646), etc. Cf. Alban Butler, Lives of the Saints, September 14, note."

This being established, we may turn again to the line in question in Marlowe, and considering with it the well-known adaptation from Scripture which follows:

> "Mountain and hills come, come and fall on me,
> And hide me from the heavy wrath of God!"

there seems little doubt that to Faustus in his agony there started up this flaming Middle-Age image of the cross set in the firmament, whose light at the last day should make manifest the secrets of men's hearts. Certainly Marlowe, who was well educated, being a graduate of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, might have acquired his knowledge of the tradition from any of a variety of sources,—either from the early Christian writings, or from contemporary ecclesiastical and literary sources. Also, it is noteworthy that Marlowe was an active atheist, and on this account he might have been fully acquainted with the history and traditions of the church which he attacked.

Herbert B. Brougham.
*Yale University.*

## *SCOTCH tyne.*

To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes,

Sirs:—In an article on *Some Derived Meanings*, Mod. Lang. Notes, Vol. xvi, No. 1 (1901), Francis A. Wood cites Sco. *tine*, to lose, along with OE. *téon*, injury, suffering, insult, verb *tienan*, to irritate, revile. Inasmuch as Sco. *tyne* (so usually written) is not from OE. *tienan*, the example is ill-chosen and cannot be used to illustrate derivational meanings in the English group. The form of ME. *tine*, to lose, which I believe occurs exclusively in Midland and Northern texts, M. Sco. *tyne*, Northern dialectal *tine*, id., shows *i*- mutation of Teutonic *eu*. So also West Saxon *tīenan* (<*téonian*), cf. *tēona*, sb., injury, and ON. *týna*, to lose, (primary meaning), with which cf., *tjón* (older *téon*) loss, destruction. As *i*- mutation of *éo* (Teutonic *eu*) did not take place in Anglian, see Sievers-Cook, *Grammar of Old English*, § 159.4, the corresponding Anglian verb would be *téona(n)* which would not have resulted in Northern English, M. Sco. *tine*, *tyne*. This form is, however, easily accounted for by accepting Norse loan. The wide divergence in meaning between the OE. and the Sco. word is thus accounted for. The Scandinavian origin of the NE.-Sco. word has already been claimed by Wall, *Scandinavian Elements in English Dialects*, *Anglia* xx, p. 125, and by myself in *Scandinavian Influence on Southern Lowland Scotch*, Macmillan, 1900, p. 67. For a discussion of ME. *tine*, and other words of this class see pp. 116–117 of Eric Björkman's scholarly treastise on *Scandinavian Loanwords in Middle English*, Upsala, 1900.

George T. Flom.

*University of Iowa.*

## *ENGLISH AND GERMAN PRONUNCIATION.*

To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes,

Sirs:—In the interests of phonetic science, I should like to make a few observations on certain statements in the January number of Mod. Lang. Notes, by Mr. A. B. Lyman.

It is a well known fact that, in native German words, the digraph *ch* may represent two quite distinct sounds, about as different from one another as are English *z* and *ð* (as in the word *those*). Mr. Lyman's article ignores this, apparently assuming that the sound written *ç* in the International Alphabet is the only one represented by German *ch*.

The definition of this sound as an "aspirated iotization" is rather peculiar. English *p* is commonly aspirated; the final consonant of the Russian word meaning 'seven' is an iotization (of *m*); yet neither of these has any especial similarity to the sound in question.

As to *Hugh*, *hew*, *humane*, it may be true that some persons begin them with *ç*, or a very similar sound, but this can hardly be considered the common pronunciation. The treatment of *here*, *hear*, I do not profess to understand; but there is apparently something wrong about it. Perhaps *chehr* was intended for *chihr;* if so, is it safe to assume that the English letter *h* before the sound *i* (German *i*, our so-called "long *e*") is pronounced *ç* by any considerable number of English-speakers?

Without entering upon a discussion of the popular belief that the sounds of one language can be represented in the orthography of another, I should like to ask if there is any good authority for pronouncing the letters *b* and *d* in *Körbchen*, *Mädchen* as *b*, *d*? There seems to be a general consensus of opinion among phonetists that they are pronounced as *p* and *t* respectively.

Edwin H. Tuttle.

*New Haven, Conn.*

## *ANGLO-SAXON GLOSSES.*

To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes,

Sirs:—*The Century Dictionary* gives as second meaning of the noun *lead*[1] 'a following,' quoting from Child's *Ballads*, v, 108,

> Take fyve of the best knyghtes
> That be in your *lede*.

*Lead* in this sense is already on record in the oldest English glossaries. We find Aldhelm's (*Epist. ad Eahfridum*, Giles p. 94, 27) *catasta* glossed by *geleod* in the *Erfurt*, which appears as *geloed* in the *Corpus* and as *gloed* in the *Epinal*. The latter has given rise to the assumption of an A.-S. *glōed* 'instrument of torture' (so still says Kluge in the glossary to his *Angels. Lesebuch*[2]), but a glance at *WW.* 201, 16 *catasta* . . . . *uel geled quadrupalium* shows that reference is had to the string of hounds mentioned in the above Aldhelm passage. A.-S. *ōst* is according to Kluge and Sweet on record only in the sense of 'knot, knob,' but in the *Old English Martyrology*, ed. G. Herzfeld, p. 48, 25, *ostum* undoubtedly answers to German *Æsten*. In the same book, p. 92, 1, there occurs *cristnere* as epithet of Peter.

The word is absent from Sweet's *Dictionary*, as is *clæsmungdrenc*, ibid. p. 72, 27; *worulđfægernes*, ibid. p. 34, 6; the anglicized (form of Latin *fullo*) *fulwa* (*þæt* is *webwyrhta*), ibid. p. 26, 26 *wīdsæ̆*, ibid. p. 24, 22; *hanasang*, ibid. p. 4, 16. *Frēon* in the sense of 'love' is according to Sweet only poetical; but in the nearly related sense of 'caress' it is twice on record in prose, once in the glosses and another time in the *Martyrology* p. 216, 29. The gloss in question is, to be sure, absent also from Sweet's edition of the *Epinal-Erfurt-Corpus* glossaries in his *OET*. We read in the *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* v, 373, 8 *mulcet friad=friað* (*Erfurt*). *Epinal* concurs with *Corpus* in exhibiting *friat*. I was the first to draw attention to the A.-S. character of the interpretation in the *American Journal of Germanic Philology*, but I erred in trying to connect it with Scotch *fleech*.

A puzzling passage at first sight is the A.-S. paraphrase of Thorpe's *Ps.* 68, 3, *byð me æt þam earon/eagon wiðgangen*, rendering Latin *defecerunt oculi mei*. The psalmist is apparently made to say that eye-sight has gone from him because of his 'ears.' But, somebody may object, there is no necessity for charging the paraphraser with such an evident absurdity. Do you not know that there is an A.-S. *ēar* 'sea,' and that consequently it is possible to translate 'because of the salty floods eyesight has gone from me?' I would immediately accept this explanation, were it not for the *gehhero* glossing *lacrimas* in the *Durh. Rit.* p. 40, § 8, l. 2. That *gehhero* is a phonetic change of *ţehhero*, as Bouterwek (Introduct. to the *North. Gosp.* p. L.) would have us believe, is of course out of the question. The initial *g* can be nothing else but the short form of the prefix *ge-*, and *ehher* may answer to Skt. *açrám* as *ţehher* presupposes a not recorded **daçrám*[1] (cf. Noreen, *Urg. Lautl.* p. 209). The corresponding common A.-S. form of *ehher* 'tear' would then be represented by the *ēar* 'tear' we meet with in the above passage of Thorpe's Psalter. If I be correct in this assumption, then an *ēar* 'tear' will have to appear by the side of *ēar* 'sea' in our A.-S. Dictionaries.

OTTO B. SCHLUTTER.

*Hartford, Conn.*

1 Kluge, *Etym. Wtb.* sub *Zähre* gives *açru-*daçru* as respective Skt. forms.

## *SUMMER SESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GRENOBLE.*

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—The idea of establishing vacation courses for teachers of French in foreign countries was proposed to the rector of the University of Grenoble four years ago by an American who was spending his summer there, and Americans have ever since been liberal patronizers of the enterprise. The report for the session of 1901 shows in a total enrolment of two hundred and eighty-four, no less than twenty-six from the United States, which number is surpassed by only one other nationality.

Grenoble is but one of four French Universities which offer summer classes for foreigners, but in some respects the organization of the work there is unique and worthy the consideration of teachers of French who seek to combine study with summer vacation. Its location, at the base of the French Alps, has its advantages for summer residence. The session comprises four consecutive months, from July to October inclusive, but the work of each month is independent of that of the others so that the student may arrange his stay to suit the length of his vacation.

The courses are varied. Besides such classes in the language and literature as might be expected, there are lectures on French history, geography, law, economics, art and sociology, which furnish a vivid acquaintance with French business and social life, a knowledge which is scarcely less important to a teacher of French literature than the language itself.

The University of Grenoble is also unique in that it offers during the scholastic year supplementary courses in the French language for foreign students regularly matriculated. During the year 1900–1901 five Americans were enrolled for these courses.

EDGAR EWING BRANDON.

*Paris, France.*

## *I AND we.*

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—From the reference to Prof. E. T. Owen's work, *A Revision of the Pronoun*, in the leading article of the last issue of MOD. LANG. NOTES, it would naturally be inferred that Prof. Owen was totally unaware at the

time of its publication that any one before him had held that *we* is not the plural of *I*. As a matter of fact, he distinctly disclaims priority of "discovery." On p. 120 of his work, where this subject is discussed, he says: "Since reaching this view, I find it adopted by Kern and others."

Lucy M. Gay.

*University of Wisconsin.*

## BRIEF MENTION.

In 1898–1900 a "Catalogue of the Dante Collection presented by Willard Fiske" to the Cornell University Library (Ithaca, N. Y.) was published. This catalogue consists of two royal octave volumes, of six hundred and six double-column pages, with a Subject Index, and is one of the most important aids ever issued for the student of Dante literature. The Compiler of this catalogue, Theodore Wesley Koch, again places indications of valuable material before the special American worker in Dante science in "A List of Danteana in American Libraries, supplementing the Catalogue of the Cornell Collection."[1] We have, here, twenty public libraries of the United States and one private library (that of Prof. Charles Eliot Norton of Cambridge) represented, with the text of sixty-one pages, followed by an Index of five pages. To facilitate ready reference, this supplementary collection is divided into two parts: Part i, "Dante's Works" covering the *Divina Commedia* (texts, translations, etc.), and the *Opere Minori;* Part ii, "Works on Dante," which naturally constitute the bulk of the collection. It is most gratifying to note among the special Italian texts the unique and well-known copy of 1472 (Mantua), belonging to the Lennox library of New York.

"No books exist," says the Quaritch *General Catalogue* for 1874, "with the imprint of Mantua of an earlier date than this—an undeniable fact, although the title of *Editio Princeps* of Dante may be claimed with equal right for the editions printed in the same year at Jesi and Foligno. It is, however, the rarest of the three. . . ."

Let us hope that Mr. Koch may soon be able to give us the second of his promised lists under the suggested title: "Additional list of Danteana supplementing the Cornell Collection; being titles gleaned from European libraries."

Emil Koeppel contributes the eighty-ninth number of *Quellen und Forschungen* (Strassburg, K. J. Truebner, 1901), and entitles it *Spelling-Pronunciations* (cf. *Englische-Studien*, xxx, 120). Let phonetic law and analogy work as they may, there is in the graphic appearance of the word, in its spelling, an influence that produces permanent changes in speech. The linguist has every right to insist on laws, but he is constantly learning to dispute less about the 'invariability' of one or two obvious ones, and to admit into the processes of language-change many new laws, or many old ones to places of new importance. 'Social conventions,' we are now told with a fresh emphasis, 'may influence the phonetic character of speech' (Wundt, Oertel), and what limit may be set to such conventions! Not wholly unrelated to them is the fashion to pronounce occasionally as one spells. The greatest wonder of all is that even an occasional lapse into rectitude is possible in a language that has allowed an uncompromising estrangement between the spoken and the written word. If, after having learned to spell the English language, there is still left a trace of an active impulse to reason from sound to symbol, does it not argue the persistence of the age of miracles? But this trace of an elastic power does not only survive in sporadic manifestations, but it is also supposed by some thoughtful people to furnish the best means for the inauguration of an orthographic reformation. 'Let us stop quarrelling with our spelling,' they would say, 'and let us begin to pronounce as we spell.' The suggestion has value, for this rule has always to some extent been observed; Koeppel would otherwise not have had occasion to write his book. But, on the other hand, Koeppel's pages show the inevitable restrictions of the rule. Only in the case of a short list of words could the 'common consent of mankind,' be gained to favor 'spelling-pronunciation;' the list would hardly pass the present limits of permissible variations in pronunciation (either standard or provincial). Many common words have come to be pronounced in conformity to the letter, such as *theatre*, *language*, *banquet*, *corps*, *fault;* and the history of such facts is here carefully presented. This history is instructively interest-

[1] Ginn and Company (for the Dante Society), 1901. Octavo, pp. 67.

ing and surprisingly entertaining, but it should not be read by the pedantic teacher lest he may believe that he has found vindication of his teaching such atrocities as the 'spelling-pronunciation' of *soldier*, *literature*, *says*, *mountain*, and (*procul o*, *procul!*) *England*, *English*.

*Milton's Prosody*, by Robert Bridges, and *Classical Metres in English Verse*, by W. J. Stone, are brought together, in revised form, into one book (Oxford, 1901). The first of these essays, comprising a detailed exposition of the prosody of the *Paradise Lost* and of *Samson Agonistes*, has in the past eight or nine years become widely known. Its last revision has affected only minor matters of arrangement and expression, but there has been added to the eight appendices a ninth, giving "an anaysis of stress-prosody and a chapter on the structure of the English hexameter," and here, the author assures us, are to be found *nova praecepta*. There is indeed a new foot-name, *britannic*, and there is also a new appeal to 'grammar,' from which one might expect increased precision of method; Mr. Bridges, however, continues to maintain his characteristic indefiniteness of doctrine, which is so well shown in his second chapter in the very argument by which the validity of the treatise must stand or fall. Mr. Bridges knows something of the power of the argument from historic grammar, and he always writes in an attractive style; one must therefore continue to regret that his essay is marred by errors that are fundamental. He has overlooked those phenomena of accentuation that have at all times determined the rhythm of our verse, and inadvertently he has postulated differences between 'syllabic' and 'accentual' verse, which may be set aside by the simple denial of the evidence at any time of syllabic verse in English. This essay has recently been thoroughly considered by Dr. G. D. Brown, in his dissertation entitled *Syllabification and Accent in the Paradise Lost* (Baltimore, 1901).

The purpose of Mr. Stone's essay is to explore the possibility of introducing Classical rules of prosody into English. "I know too," it is confessed, "that my thesis is likely to become distasteful to many, the further it proceeds to its logical conclusion" (p. 118). Mr. Stone's death has left Mr. Bridges to commend the essay, not so much for its direct applicability (Mr. Bridges is not an areopagite) as for its discriminating analysis of the elements of rhythm.

Attention should be called, here, to two works: *Voyages en Zigzag par Rudolphe Töpffer*, edited by Ascott R. Hope, Holt & Co., and *Balzac's Cinq Scènes de la Comédie Humaine*, edited by B. W. Wells, Heath & Co. The first is interesting from the fact that we have had nothing of Töpffer's vast amount of interesting writings in a convenient form. This edition gives us one hundred pages, closely printed, of choice selections from his travels, with very satisfactory notes and a vocabulary, which makes a most useful book for the second semester of the first year, or the first semester of the second year. These selections are especially convenient for conversational purposes and rapid reading.

The second book contains five happily selected short stories of Balzac; they seem to be especially well chosen, for they contain an *ensemble*-view of Balzac and his philosophy of life. They show clearly that the editor is familiar with Balzac, the man and the writer. The value of both books, however, lies more in the selection of material than in the work found in the notes or the introduction.

## PERSONAL.

### *PROFESSOR HERMANN COLLITZ.*

Our readers will please notice that Professor Hermann Collitz, of Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania, has assumed the editorship of the Germanic Department of MOD. LANG. NOTES. All material, such as articles, new books, and correspondence, relating to the special Germanic field, or to Comparative Grammar of the Teutonic languages, should be sent directly to Professor Collitz, not to the Managing Editor of the NOTES. This suggestion should be followed, particularly for contributions and new books, as both delay and additional expense are thus avoided in handling the material sent in for publication and for review.

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

**Baltimore, March, 1902.**

## *THE NINETEENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA.*

THE nineteenth annual meeting of the Modern Language Association of America was held, at the invitation of Harvard University, in Cambridge, Mass., December 26, 27, and 28, 1901. The Cambridge welcome was a cordial one, and the University did all in its power for the comfort of the visiting members. The weather was such as only a New England city could offer, giving the guests samples of everything from rain and snow to the pleasantest sunshine. With becoming courtesy, the preponderance was given to fair weather.

The first session was called to order Thursday afternoon, and President Eliot gave the formal address of welcome. He congratulated the Association on the wonderful progress made by colleges and universities in developing modern language study, illustrating this by a practical example in the case of Harvard, which had one professor in the department about seventy years ago, while now its teaching force numbers nearly seventy. He noted with pleasure, also, that the modern language department is gaining a firmer hold upon educational life by its growing connection with industrial and commercial activity.

The work of the Association this year was marked by scholarly papers, so specialized, naturally, as to lead to little general discussion. The majority of them presented the results of careful investigation of sources and "influences" in literature. In fact, this convention reached the high-water mark in scholarly specialization.

The address, however, on "Practical Philology" delivered at the special session of Thursday evening by Prof. E. S. Sheldon of Harvard, president of the Association, covered a field of wider interest and was in effect a reply to the criticism so often raised that philological studies have no practical value. The dictionary is usually regarded as a collection of warnings against the wrong use of words rather than a means of enlightening the student on the history of language. The philologist, however, as the man who writes the dictionary, or acts as critic upon it, knows that it is not infallible. As to pronunciation, the philologist is more inclined to depend upon what is good usage among educated people than upon the spelling of the word or what this or that dictionary commands. He knows how sounds change in the course of years, and the historical reasons for apparent irregularities in spelling, and hence sees the folly of arguing that, since a word is spelled in a certain way, the pronunciation should follow, especially in a language so irregular and inconsistent as the English, in its written form.

Prof. Sheldon, after giving advice to dissertation writers, in which he called attention especially to the need of literary value as well as of the mere cataloguing of facts, emphasized the point that, in the study of literature, linguistic training is of the greatest importance in giving power to grasp detail. It is not right to set the literary side on a higher plane than linguistic study, because the relative position depends upon the student himself. The two phases are not exclusive of each other, but interdependent, and no separation of the two can develop the perfect student.

Of the other papers presented, the following division will serve for a rough grouping: i. Literature,—including in its various subdivisions nearly all the work of the Association; ii, Linguistic Study; iii, Pedagogical Discussion.

In the large amount of material under i. a territorial subdivision will suffice for convenience of arrangement.

### I. LITERATURE: *a. German.*

As is always the case, German Literature inspired its full share of careful investigation, especial attention being given to the modern period. Dr. Albert Haas of Bryn Mawr, in his paper on "Lessing's Attitude to the Sources of his Dramas," showed that Lessing's three masterplays are neither representatives of the Classical drama nor do they belong to the new sentimental school. In them Lessing has created a new *genre*, characterized by

symbolical representation and discussion of national problems.

In a similar line was the paper by Prof. Henry Wood of Johns Hopkins on "Literary Adaptations in Gerhart Hauptmann's *Versunkene Glocke*." He emphasized the frequent occurrence in literature of a bell with supernatural powers, and pointed out that Hauptmann drew his motives from the novelist Möricke, but adapted his material to his own purposes, infusing it with his own genius. This study, he remarked, traces only the literary lineage of Hauptmann's work and accounts for nothing of its power, which is due to the author alone.

Dr. J. F. Coar of Harvard in his study of "Friedrich Hebbel and the Problem of 'Inner Form'" illustrated a very subtle method of exposition. Hebbel undersood by "inner form" a quality of poetic vision and, only indirectly, in so far as a particular poem embodies such a vision, a quality of poetic phrasing as well. This quality results whenever a poet has deducted the content of his poetic vision from environing life or particular personal experience, and then has imaginatively reproduced it. To Hebbel's mind, true poetry presupposed this visualizing of the reality as completely expressing an idea suggested by the reality visualized.

In "A Discrepancy in Several of Schiller's Letters," Prof. J. B. E. Jonas of Brown offered as a possible solution of the conflicting statements the suggestion that there were at first two versions of the letters extant. Prof. Jonas also presented, to be read by title, a paper on "The Life and Works of Heinrich der Teichner."

Dr. E. A. Bourcke of Michigan gave a scholarly discussion of "Goethe's Idea of Polarity and its Sources."

Two articles which held a place upon the program were, on account of the writers' absence, read by title only—"The Influence of German Opera upon Grillparzer" by Dr. E. S. Meyer of Western Reserve, and "The Dramatic Guilt in Schiller's 'Braut von Messina'" by Prof. W. H. Carruth of Kansas.

An entirely different line was followed by Dr. J. A. Walz of Harvard in his "Three Swabian Journalists and the American Revolution," which presented the attitude of the Swabian political journalists toward the struggle of the American patriots.

Friedrich Schiller, Ludvig Weckhrlin, and Christian Schubart were chosen as representative of the various phases of this attitude.

Schiller is generally considered to have been in sympathy with the Americans, but, from the nature of the articles in his journal, it is quite impossible to determine whether the sentiments were those of Schiller, or of the exchanges from which they were drawn. Unquestionably, however, although he had a hearty admiration for England, he may be accredited with much sympathy for the American cause.

Ludvig Weckhrlin, on the other hand, left no doubt as to his position. He hated America, satirized liberty as an impossibility, and, though at one time he prophetically lauded the future of America, he was ever after heartily ashamed of his "folly," as he called it.

In Schubart an interesting change of sentiment was traced. From an ardent admirer of England and its government he became a firm supporter of America in her struggle for freedom.

I. LITERATURE: *b. French.*

In this department, again, the tendency toward investigations in the modern field is noticeable. "The Literary Influence of Sterne in France" by Prof. Chas. S. Baldwin of Yale showed that, in common belief, Sterne's influence has been greatly overestimated. Literary influence must affect form, and mere borrowing does not necessitate this. Diderot, for instance, has tried some of Sterne's stylistic gymnastics, but he is not a disciple of Sterne's. Sterne's *Sentimental Journey* has one child in French literature in Maistre's *Voyage autour de ma chambre*, which has borrowed the literary form, showing especially the tricks of expression, delicacy of transition, and fullness of gesture, which belong to Sterne. The *Voyage* has no more narrative unity than has the *Journey*, but the author maintains the unity of description of which Sterne is master. This shows true literary borrowing; the writer drew from Sterne as one painter draws from another. This one book of 1794 sums up all Sterne's real literary influence in France.

In "Conflicting Standards in French Litera-

ture at the Opening of the Twentieth Century." Dr. A. Schinz of Bryn Mawr brought the discussion to questions of present moment. As France has always been the battle-ground of artistic ideals, so now, of course, the conflicting elements of the twentieth century are there contending.

The social and political phase of literature, which finds expression in the *Revue des deux Mondes* is now drawing to itself, in the interests of political unity for France, the best writers of the time, but, from the nature of the movement, its influence can be but temporary. The real struggle is between the democratic and aristocratic tendencies. The issue of the conflict will be in favor of the greater force,—democracy. That this result is for the best in literature is to be doubted, because the basis of the democratic tendency demands an appeal to *all*, and this gives less promise of high ideals than in the case of the aristocratic school. The artist who works by appeal to the public cannot accomplish so much for his art as he who strives only toward a high ideal.

"Augier's *L'Aventurière* of 1848 and 1860" by Prof. A. Rambeau of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology gave a careful investigation of the relation between the two editions of this drama.

I. Literature: *c. Italian.*

Dante afforded the inspiration for the two papers presented in this field. "Cato and Elijah" by Prof. C. H. Grandgent of Harvard was read by title.

Dr. C. E. Osgood of Yale in "Classical Mythology as an Element in the Art of Dante" defined Dante's position to be that of one who conceived the old mythology as included in the conceptions of Christianity—not existing side by side with it. Vicissitudes and operations of nature show that the world is governed by some unseen agency, and the realization of this led to the belief in *gods*. Christianity considers these operations not as gods but as celestial ministers who manifest God's power.

The myth elements in the *Divina Commedia* are in the nature of allusions to the greater gods and of stories of mythical heroes and places. These allusions are used by Dante metaphorically with application to the forces of nature and to phases of human life. He treats the greater deities from the Christian standpoint and does not invest them with the petty human qualities seen in the Classics. Punishment, for instance, is not the revenge of the gods, but the inevitable result of breaking God's laws for man. The use of Classical mythological allusion increases the authority of the poem, adds universality, and broadens the meaning by drawing upon Greek culture. Dante keeps the poem strongly unified, and free from the discord which a similar use of mythology produces in Milton's work.

I. Literature: *d. Spanish.*

This field has thus far received little of the scholarly attention which the growing interest in modern languages is destined to give it. The only paper presented this year was that of Dr. Rudolph Schwill of Yale, "The Comedias of Diego Ximenez de Enciso." Much of real value is often forced into oblivion by excess of dramatic production, and this was the case with Enciso in the early seventeenth century. Contemporary criticism accredits Enciso, however, with lyric gift and dramatic power, even after all allowance has been made for the undiscriminating character of such testimony. Less than twelve plays of Enciso's have been preserved, and only three are generally accessible. In these is shown the conception of that historical drama which should keep closely to the facts of history. Enciso's ability is seen in his skillful employment of rime, his freedom from bombastic exaggeration, and his true dramatic insight. His work inspired many followers, and Calderon, even, shows his influence in a marked degree.

I. Literature: *e. English.*

The Anglo-Saxon period was represented by two papers. Prof. A. S. Cook of Yale in his "Notes on the Ruthwell Cross" gave briefly the sources of information regarding the Ruthwell Cross, near Dumfries, and showed that, since the inscription lacks many marks of antiquity, and, since it must have been later than the *Dream of the Rood*, it is probably to be brought down as late as the tenth century, especially as the inscription supposed to attribute the work to Cadman has no certain foundation in fact.

"Literal Repetition in Anglo-Saxon Poetry"

by Mr. W. W. Lawrence of Harvard read by title, was a study of the occurrence of such repetitions and the reasons for their use. The question involved has particular importance in its relation to certain processes of the higher criticism, especially that of *Beowulf* by Müllenhof and Ten Brink.

The Metrical Romances furnished topics for two papers on related subjects. Dr. W. H. Schofield of Harvard presented a paper upon "The Home of *King Horn* and of *Sir Tristrem*"—an interesting investigation promising at last an explanation of the place-names of the *Horn*, which have so long baffled students of that romance. Mr. P. C. Hoyt of Harvard in "The Legends of Beves and of Horn" contended for an Anglo-Saxon origin for the *Beves saga* by reason of the close resemblance between the central story of the *Beves* and the *King Horn*.

The period of modern English literature received its full share of attention. The dramas of Shakespeare and his immediate followers formed the subject for three of the four papers of this group, though two were presented by title only—"The Relations of *Hamlet* to Contemporary Revenge Plays" by Prof. A. H. Thorndike of Western Reserve, and "The Date and Composition of *The Old Law* (Middleton, Rowley and Massinger)" by Prof. E. C. Morris of Syracuse.

"The Relation of Shakespeare to Montaigne" by Miss Bessie R. Hooker of Vassar pointed out a significant parallelism between passages in Montaigne's essays and those in certain of Shakespeare's plays, especially *Measure for Measure*, *Much Ado*, and *Hamlet*. These parallels are numerous and show close similarity, or a development upon a consistent basis of difference. From these it is reasonable to infer that Shakespeare used Montaigne as a storehouse of material from which to draw at will. There is, of course, no possibility that he accepted Montaigne as a master in any sense. Their views, for instance, regarding right and wrong are too unlike for that.

Of a kindred nature, though in a different field, was the paper read by Prof. Emerson in the writer's absence—"Chaucer and Milton" by Prof. W. H. Hulme of Western Reserve.

Dryden's thesis that Milton has followed Spenser in his lighter work and in many elements of graver value has been generally accepted. Spenser's influence even on the earlier work is, however, not proved. Chaucer was well known to Milton, as his many references show. *The Squire's Tale* was a favorite of Milton's and possibly he learned it through his association with John Lane, the obscure poet, whose admiration for the poem led him to try to complete it. It is difficult to point to any definite influence in Milton's work. His description of the sun and its courses may be compared with Chaucer's in the *Troilus;* his fondness for antiquated words is more a reflection of Chaucer than of Spenser; his general astronomical system seems to be modeled after Chaucer's in the *Parlement of Foules*. In matters of meter Milton shows a fondness for Chaucer's rime royal, and also the same ability to express rhythmically a long series of proper names. Some of Milton's later pamphlets quote Chaucer freely, while there are only two allusions to Spenser and a casual reference to Gower. In the light of such evident familiarity with Chaucer, it can hardly be questioned that Milton drew and assimilated material from him.

II. Linguistic Study.

"Biblical Names in Early Middle English" by Prof. G. H. McKnight of Ohio and "The Origin of Negro English in the United States" by Prof. Geo. Hempl of Michigan were read by title. Prof. F. A. Scott of Michigan aroused special interest by his "List of Hated Words," which was practically a report, compiled from the testimony of two hundred and fifty reliable informants, as to the effect of words upon them. The majority of words are merely *hacks*, used without producing pleasure or aversion. A small number are, either by their sound or association, a source of delight to the speaker to be rolled as a sweet morsel under the tongue. A third class—that especially dealt with in the paper—is composed of apparently inoffensive words, which, however, were disliked by the persons examined. The causes of dislike were varied and often conflicting, but may be grouped generally as follows.

Words unpleasant in sound may be represented by *program*, *drunk*, *flung* (preterite),

*women* (which was considered weak, while *woman* was felt to be a strong word), *succinct*, *gamut*, *goitre*, *squalor*, *squalid* and *got*. Many words were regarded as unpleasant on account of their spelling or their appearance on the page—usually because they were haunted by the ghost of a more vulgar form—for instance, *victuals*, *beau* and *dowager* (haunted respectively by "vittles," "bō," and "dwowager").

*Cuddle*, *gurgle*, *gargle* and *settle* are examples of words which produce incongruous images by their sound, while others are unpleasant by association, as *melancholy* (suggesting *melon*), *surreptitious* (suggesting *syrup*) and *mediocre* (suggesting *yellow*).

A fourth class give rise to unpleasant feelings on account of early impressions. *Swab* is to some always "a stick with a filthy rag on it," *relish* always suggests the picture of a darky eating a melon, and *snarl*, a mass of silk threads clinging to the hands. Incorrect meanings kept from early childhood are seen in *cuticle*—a disease of the skin—and *deceased*—one who died of a loathsome disease.

The reports naturally showed little agreement, except perhaps in the case of a few words; *victuals* seemed unpleasant to fully a third of those questioned. Each word trails behind it an old misshapen context, and the influence of this must be recognized in the study of the use of words.

The report offered by Prof. O. F. Emerson, of Western Reserve, on "The Work of the American Dialect Society," may be considered here. Prof. Emerson called attention to the work already accomplished by the society, complimenting especially the investigations of the late Prof. Child of Harvard on the metre of Chaucer.

Prof. Emerson urged the great need of intelligent students to collect dialect peculiarities for future use. Graduate students could give important aid to such work by noting local dialect variations. Our whole country offers an especially good field for this on account of the widely differing dialects within its borders.

III. Pedagogical Discussion.

Prof. W. E. Mead of Wesleyan presented the report of the Pedagogical Section—a resumé of the replies to the proposition published in the Century, that wide reading developes good writers. Various schemes were proposed for testing the proposition, and the reports were naturally conflicting. Prof. Mead showed that reading as a method of cultivating the power to write did not receive sufficient support to shift the burden of proof from the advocates of reading. Reading is an aid to facility in writing, but does not alone lead to good composition. In this report, as well as in the discussion given by Prof. Baldwin of Yale, the fact was emphasized that logical thinking is necessary to composition and that wide reading does not give this power. To accomplish the best results for the student, thoughtful reading should be combined with practice in expression.

The liveliest discussion of the meeting grew out of the paper by Prof. Calvin Thomas of Columbia, suggesting a practical method not for spelling reform but for "The Amelioration of our Spelling"—to quote the title. He alluded to the various schemes which have been suggested for a spelling reform, to all of which the vital objection remains that these sweeping changes cannot appeal to the adult, whose ideas of words have long been fixed, or to the writer, who must necessarily keep in the most cordial relations with his reader. The need of relief, however, is evident when we consider the grievous waste of time and energy required of the child in learning the vagaries of English orthography. The deluge of irrationality which overwhelms the child just seeking the reasons for things should be done away with, to the lasting benefit of the young mind. To furnish a gradual but effectual relief, Prof. Thomas suggested instruction in the history of words, which should be obligatory upon teachers of every grade. A new style of spelling-book might be made, showing the idiocies of our present spelling, and, by letting in light "to those that sit in darkness," preparing the way for a return by our children's children to the "reign of common sense." The discussion following was participated in by Professors Scott, Emerson, Cohn, Babbitt, Sheldon, Bright and others. All were skeptical of the practicability of radical change, and could see no hope of relief unless it were in some such gradual instruction. Prof. Bright added that even the clearing up of the history

of one or two of the more important vowels would be a permanent relief.

Various reports of importance were submitted to the Association. Prof. Todd, of Columbia University, for the committee on Coöperative Bibliography, reported informally the prospective advance in this field, since the new educational gift by Carnegie contemplated offering an opportunity for definite work in bibliography.

The social side of the Association meeting was carefully provided for, and a spirit of heartiest good-fellowship prevailed throughout the convention. Thursday evening, President and Mrs. Eliot welcomed the members of the Association and ladies at their home on Quincy St. Over two hundred guests were present, and the reception by its informality offered a pleasant meeting-place for the visiting members. Friday and Saturday, luncheon was served in the Faculty Room in University Hall. After luncheon on Friday Miss Alice Longfellow opened her house for an informal reception, which gave the guests a much-prized opportunity of visiting the historical Craigie house. Later, from four to six, the members were received at the regular Friday afternoon tea given by the ladies of the Faculty in the Phillips Brooks House. Friday evening the reunion held at the Colonial Club was largely attended. Mr. Bliss Perry of the *Atlantic Monthly* gave an informal talk upon "The College Professor and the Public." Mr. Perry sketched the change which has taken place in the relations of the professor to the world in general. Formerly the professor was a student only, entirely separated from outside interests. Though the scholar must always voyage alone into some regions, and his very absentness means in the end great value to the world, yet a new type of college professor is developing—one which knows all about things. Familiarity with the world may destroy all the old traditional fastidiousness, but this familiarity is of advantage not alone to the public, which receives highly trained and intelligent coöperation, but to the professor himself.

In the political field, the professor is often earnestly and honestly active, but usually at the risk of accusations of fraud and bribery. Wider fields of activity—fields less open to suspicion of unfairness—lie in the social movements for libraries, parks and better tenements. In these fields, the college professor can do the public his greatest service, and in such service alone does he find the noblest moments of life.

President Eliot spoke of Prof. Sophocles, and paid high tribute to Ezra Abbott as a retired scholar, who, in his very retirement, had given benefit to thousands of practical men of busi- by inventing the card-catalogue system.

Throughout the convention, the Colonial Club and the new Harvard Union extended their privileges to the visitors, and added not a little to the success of a meeting of which the characteristic features seemed to be cordial fellowship and scholarly work.

P. C. Hoyt.

*Harvard University.*

---

## *THE DEVELOPMENT OF TAINE CRITICISM SINCE 1893.*

### II.

An article of especial interest on account of its broad, liberal, deep and appreciative interpretation of Taine's work, is that of Wetz, *Krit. Jhrbrt. Rom. Philol.*, I. pp. 157–192, 1895. Wetz first presents the different methods of treating literary history, showing that Taine's system is a broader conception than Herder's. This is one of the clearest and most thorough presentations of Taine's system that we have. In the second part of his essay on Taine's position and significance in literary history, Wetz is the first German, as far as the writer is acquainted with German Taine critics, to give him his just merit. He has drawn, in an entirely new way, a knowledge of the intellectual personality of the author through his work, and he has done this by being the first to apply in his material the scientific method and precise language of psychology. He gives definite data on phantasy, intellect, ideas, feelings of an author, etc., thus offering a psychological explanation for every phenomenon. In the third part of the article we have a concise and terse statement of the difference between Taine's and Hennequin's systems of criticism.

An interesting and suggestive study of Taine

is found in *La Vie et les Livres*, II, G. Deschamps, pp. 99–189. Most ingeniously does this writer work out Taine's salient quality through the power of his exterior vision and intensity of his interior reflection. M. Deschamps becomes very impatient with Taine's great admiration of and preference for England, p. 113. His descriptions are thoroughly naturalistic, and on the deep-seated villainy of man Taine agrees with Zola and Maupassant; his sombre pessimism is even worse than that of Leopardi, pp. 116–117. This study offers many valuable observations, by way of *résumé*, of Taine's aim and purpose. No one has better defined his position in the literary movement of the nineteenth century; he is the natural culmination of it, from Chateaubriand to Loti, he has visited all the places and peoples, and written and thought about them as a Chateaubriand, Hugo, Gautier, Flaubert, but he has reasoned over his melancholy and reduced the *mal du siècle* to syllogisms; he recognized the cause of the incurable melancholy of which he had a vague sentiment—all this he has gathered, accumulated in facts and reasoned and formulated into laws; this is one of the most heroic efforts of human intelligence, pp. 179–180. No one has uttered a truer saying among Taine's critics than Deschamps when he said that it is easier to refute his doctrines than to avoid or escape their action.

Weigand. *Das Elend der Kritik*, 1895, München, pp. 35–101, is not generally known, but contains a great deal of information on Ste.-Beuve and Taine. He shows the importance and influence of birthplace and country on the development of the young Taine, pp. 36–39, the philosopher, pp. 39–40; the artist, pp. 49–54; and then discusses his productions in chronological order. According to Weigand, Taine trusts in himself too much for his material, and thus is hardly scientific enough. He quotes at length from Taine, and adds a few explanatory and critical remarks. Possibly the best part of this essay is that which treats of his philosophy of art. Weigand seems to have interpreted the spirit of Taine, the artist, better than any previous writer; an interesting attempt is made to prove that Taine's system has utterly failed in the description of Greek culture, which views would hardly be accepted generally. Weigand is the first critic who believes that Hegel's influence upon him is often overestimated. So many critics refuse Taine his just portion of originality, maintaining that many of his ideas are derived from Hegel, Herder and Goethe; the general notion prevails that Taine is superficial and unreliable; not until 1895 with Barzellotti's work had this notion been generally abandoned. Credit must be given Wetz and Weigand for their farsightedness in considering Taine to be more than an ordinary figure. The following statement of Weigand is of importance in Taine criticism:

"He served his time; he did not break away from the traditions of the old French spirit; he widened the horizon of French culture and he is the best example to show how deeply the Germanic influence can touch a Latin without becoming dangerous to his nature."

The lectures delivered by Ed. Droz at Besançon on *La Critique Littéraire de Taine*, have been published by Lecène, Oudin, 1895, p. 39. Droz is not an admirer of Taine, but evidently of Ste.-Beuve; he speaks as a moralist and Taine's theory, according to him, excludes all notion of morality; this point of view runs through his entire lectures, and Wetz says it is doubtful whether Droz appreciates Taine as a philosopher, which view would seem true, after reading his essays. The writer has not had access to all of these lectures. In the study under discussion he simply tries to refute a number of Taine's statements which he has selected from his works. His whole theory of information is inadequate; first, on account of the impossibility of knowing all the existing historical documents of a period and the impossibility of these documents including all the life of a generation; secondly, on account of the absence in the moral sciences of precise instruments of valuation and measure, p. 23; hence, his method is only a programme and the results will be as different as the minds that use it. He absolutely denies any relation between a historical investigation and an experiment in physiology or chemistry. The methods are fundamentally different. The essay is of especial interest to a Taine student because it presents so many objections to his system and method, thus offering a splendid basis for a

critical study of Taine and his work. Whether the reader agrees with Droz, or not, will depend largely upon the attitude he has taken as to the relation of the natural and moral sciences.

A very valuable article for the Taine student is Wetz' second study in the *Zts. Spr. Litt.* xxi, 1899, pp. 114–251, giving a critical analysis of the studies of de Vogüé, Monod, Sorel, Margerie, Droz, de Broglie, Barzellotti, and Weigand. Wetz has come to the conclusion that Taine is one of the most difficult of modern writers fully to appreciate; few critics have judged him rightly in the *ensemble* of his work, nearly all lacking a broad perspective necessary to an appreciation of such immense talent. Especially have the critics of his English Literature failed, seeing only the defects, the hasty work, the skillful compiler, but entirely overlooking the *ensemble*, the prodigious intellectual work of the author. Wetz discusses at length his life and works, pp. 114–138. An interesting comparison of the opinion of different critics on his style is presented, pp. 142–154, a general statement of which may be summed up as follows: In spite of the splendor and clearness of Taine's style in his descriptions of nature, he lacks soul; form and color are admirably developed, but the mood of a landscape such as Goethe describes it, is lacking. Taine does not see nature as an artist, who allows it to work and impress itself upon him, but he sees it in the eyes of a scientist who desires to reproduce every sign accurately; his descriptions are not the end in view, but the means to an end. According to Wetz, he has gone too far in attempting to explain all by the salient quality; yet, his study of Shakspeare is one of the profoundest ever written, p. 158. In his analysis of Droz' article, to most of which the writer has had no access, Wetz points out three influences that Droz mentions: Stendhal; Hegel, Comte, Mill; Balzac and Renan. The first influence has been treated more thoroughly by Droz than by any other critic, and yet Wetz thinks that this must be the subject of a separate and exhaustive study; he suggests a number of subjects for special study, such as, the relation of Taine and Stendhal; Taine, Mérimée and Flaubert; Hegel's influence; Planat and Woepke. According to Wetz, Margerie, Barzellotti, and Droz failed to differentiate clearly enough the different *Operationen* that Taine showed in his work of art, literature and history, p. 202. Possibly the most interesting and original part of Wetz' article is his presentation of the influence and relation of Planat, Woepke and Taine. Planat reconstructed social customs according to the theory Taine had adopted; he was a great collector of engravings, some three hundred thousand which were typical of a custom, etc.; Woepke was an Oriental scholar, with a thorough knowledge of Sanskrit, Greek, Arabic and Persian mathematics; these three men exchanged ideas. This is an entirely new subject in the study. Wetz' article is the most stimulating and encouraging for a comparative study of Taine's critics that we have, suggesting quite a variety of subjects for special study, among which a comparative analysis of the differences of opinion of critics on various points would be exceedingly interesting and valuable, such as Taine's style, before and after his travels, (change from the abstract to the concrete); the reliability of his statements; opinions on his English Literature; reason of the hostility of some critics. Wetz' article would form a fine basis for such studies.

Faguet's article in the *Revue de Paris*, 15 July, 1 August, 1899, is the most important written by him, and is of especial interest from the fact that he seems to take a new departure in confining himself almost exclusively to pointing out the defects and combatting the theories of Taine; it treats of Taine the moralist and the effect of this method, in this respect, upon his writings. It has been published in *Polit. et Moral. au xix. Siècle*, iii, 1900. One of the most interesting parts, and one in which Faguet seems to have failed, is his attempt to apply Taine's theory of salient quality to himself, and this he finds to be *La Probité*. The first objection is to his theory of salient quality, a result of collecting, grouping and classifying facts; we thus know man only by the sensation, elaborated by abstraction; he is reduced to a certain quantity of matter governed by inflexible laws; the inner spirit is not taken into account because what is invisible we do not know. Faguet

discusses the pessimistic idea of Taine on man; the question whether literature is the expression of society, showing that it is often not the case, therefore, leading to errors in date and to wrong conclusions. He concludes from this that the object of Taine was precisely that which excluded his method; his method ought to have led him to study everything except that which he took for his object; that is, great writers only.

Taine is wrong, says the critic, in applying the psychology of the people to the individual as this effaces the individuals and makes them common. His system is in vain because it attemps to struggle with the infinite complexity of human nature. M. Faguet maintains that Taine's idea of the world determines all his work; his literary studies are problems, the solution of which is given in advance, as books in which the conclusion is not reached from research, but researches that are derived from conclusions.

These are some of the many objections and criticisms in his study, which is simply a mass of ideas, an emanation from a mind operating in very narrow quarters. The salient-quality theory of Taine, as applied to M. Faguet, most admirably explains his writings. He is possessed of a most powerful interior vision, reflection or apperceptive power, but lacks the perceptive ability or exterior vision entirely. M. Faguet could be given a subject and undoubtedly would be able to argue to and fro on either side and be convincing on both; such is his power of concentrative coördination. He never deviates from his path, therefore does not see the broader perspective of events and facts as Taine perceives it. This article, as everything M. Faguet has written, is highly suggestive and useful.

M. Faguet leaves a somewhat modified impression of Taine in his article in Petit de Julleville's *Histoire*, etc., viii, pp. 381–397, 1900, which, in the main, covers the same ground as the preceding; however, the spirit of it seems to be more conservative and less hostile. In it we have an explanation of Taine's so-called pessimism and misanthropy; an exquisite soul of courtesy, amiability, diligence and delicacy; timid, reserved, a superior man who lived to reason; he knew but little how to make men amiable by showing himself sympathetic to them. As a critic he was really an inventor; his attempt to make of literary criticism a precise science, which will always fail, was singularly honorable.

After combatting Taine's theory of the salient quality and that literature is the expression of society, he concludes that he will be placed along side of Comte and Renan, or perhaps a little below these.

In his history of French Literature, ii, pp 401–406, 1900, M. Faguet makes statements which, when considered with the preceding, will not present a consistent portrait. Taine was a positivist in the sense that he refused man the faculty of knowing anything except through observation; he was especially a critic, and more occupied in stopping others on the brink of rashness than in constructing a hazardous system himself; a logician-critic rather than an artist-critic. His method is the most impossible. His style is a heroic effort of will, but successful; however, one feels the beauty of the effort more than the beauty of success. Throughout M. Faguet lauds Taine, but in a final sentence he offsets what he has said in praise, showing that he is not a deep admirer of Taine. His final verdict is that posterity will find nearly all in his books that has been thought in philosophy, in literature, in morals, in politics by the thinkers from 1860–1885.

The article of Seignobos, *L'Œuvre Litt. de Taine*, in Petit de Julleville's *Histoire, etc.*, viii, pp. 267–279, is interesting from the historical side. Taine is severely criticized; 1. for not giving extensive and accurate bibliography; 2. for not working on authoritative documents; 3. for not controlling the documents he uses. To read these dozen pages leaves the impression that Taine and his work in history are zero, false, inaccurate, unscientific; his work is a historical monument already half ruined; the architect, ignorant of the profession of the mason, did not know how to choose solid materials; this article is the severest ever written in denunciation of Taine, the historian.

M. Brunetière is one of the first French critics rightly to interpret and appreciate Taine's system and his work. His first articles in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1885, 1887, deal

with his method almost exclusively, and in these he severely criticized him on account of his system, which two things are often confounded. Not until 1889, in his review of Pellissier's *Mouvement Littéraire*, does he interpret Taine's system. Without Taine the movement that took place between 1855–1879, would hardly have been possible; one would not have understood the movement of a Dumas and Flaubert without the *Essais de Crit.* and *Hist. Litt. Angl.* His one article on Racine's tragedy revived the literary history of the seventeenth century; one article definitely interpreted Balzac. His theory has reduced to a minimum the part of the author in his work; and his role or function he has reduced to a mediator between nature and the public. A drama of Shakespeare is the expression, or testimony, of the conception that the Anglo-Saxon of the sixteenth century had of the world and life, etc. This brings his theory together with that of impersonality in art. In his *Evol. des Gen.*, M. Brunetière has possibly better analyzed the position, bearing, influence and signification of Taine in the evolution of French literature, criticism and literature in general, in the history of the ideas and art of his time, than any other one critic. The present writer believes that M. Brunetière was one of the very few critics, until the recent Taine revival, who foresaw his greatness and future influence. In his *Disc. de Combat, L'Art et la Morale*, p. 71, 1898, he sums up Taine's aim thus:

"Ce qu'il a cherché pendant trente ans ce sont des moyens de ramener, de réduire à l'unité de la certitude ce que l'on croirait, à première vue, que les opinions littéraires comportent de diversité légitime;—qu'il faut disputer des gouts."

There are classifications in natural history; Taine wanted to show that there are in literary history, in morals, in æsthetics, scales of values and means of determining them. Subordination of characters, balancing of organs, natural selection are scientific principles; his aim was to show that there are moral, æsthetic and philosophical principles as well as scientific principles. Herein lies the unity of his intellectual life and the guaranty of the perpetuation of it. In connecting the moral and natural sciences he tried to make the former share in the certainty or probability of the latter. Taine's aim and system have never been better defined than in this presentation. In estimating the value of the two Taine critics who have written more than any others, MM. Brunetière and Faguet, it might be stated that the former's criticisms are entirely constructive, helpful to an appreciation of his system, importance and signification in the development of literary criticism; while those of the latter are mostly destructive, very helpful to the student seeking the attackable points, exceedingly suggestive of ideas, somewhat inconsistent and not always acceptable.

Giraud, *Essai sur Taine*, 1901, the latest and most complete work, is the first to apply Taine's own system to himself successfully. From the literary standpoint and for the Taine-student it is invaluable. The first part deals with Taine and his work, pp. 1–157; the second gives his bibliography in chronological order (published and unpublished works), pp. 161–207, with a bibliography on Taine as nearly complete as this can be, pp. 209–219; the third part contains extracts of sixty unpublished articles, pp. 221–283; the fourth part, extracts of various articles on Taine, pp. 289–306.

M. Giraud first shows that Taine's native province, the Ardennes, was so near Germany as to have influenced his development; some of Taine's principal traits are German, p. 4. He traces the philosophical mind and love for art and beauty through the whole Taine family-tree; he pictures the state of mind of the youth of 1840–1850, under the influence of science; Taine went through a religious crisis, probably longer and more painful than that of Renan, from which he concludes that in him there is a strain of mystic exaltation, thus differing from M. Faguet and others, who see in Taine a pure positivist without mysticism and any religion, p. 14. The influence of the École Normale is very marked; it was a hot-bed of study, and from it he possibly gained too much confidence in books, p. 18. The various influences on his different works are discussed in quite an original manner (Beyle, Ste.-Beuve, Spinoza, Hegel, Carlyle, etc.), the effect of his travels, his high morality, discrete stoicism. His courteous but firm independence assured him what Ste.-Beuve never

could obtain; namely, authority, and made him the intellectual conscience of his time, pp. 36–37. M. Giraud denies that Taine was greatly influenced by Comte in his conception of literary history, criticism and philosophy because he did not know and appreciate Comte until 1860–1861, after his work on Mill had been published, p. 44. This critic mentions all the sources of his *English Literature;* Taine, he says, was so bent on his system and so imbued with the idea of it that he failed to see the facts that did not fit in with it; he did not purposely omit them, as nearly every critic maintains; thus, for example, he was so convinced of the superiority of Protestantism over Catholicism that he failed to study and note the Catholic movement in England, p. 46.

M. Giraud adopts M. Lemaître's idea of salient quality—poet-logician—and devotes a chapter to each. The most original and philosophical part of this critic's work is the chapter on the logician, in which he explains in a vastly more trenchant and satisfactory way than any other critic, Taine's conception of the universe and the natural result therefrom of a system of morality. In this Giraud has come infinitely nearer to a profound comprehension of Taine in all his significance than any one before him. Yet, he cannot accept his theories because he bases his argument on Christian spiritualism. This writer explains the fine delineations and the normal parts of Taine's work as emanations of the artist mind rather than as definitions of a psychological critic, p. 72; but in this he seems to fail utterly. He maintains that Taine in classifying works of art according to the degree of importance of the character that they express, departs from the method of the scientist or naturalist, and adopts the view of the moralist; but, here, he overlooks what he has so admirably explained before; his main objection, therefore, which, had he followed his explanation, would not be an objection, is that Taine, as a too faithful scholar of Spinoza and Hegel, tried to weld together moral and physical sciences; here is where his system failed him. According to the present writer, this is where the system came to his aid, and is one of Taine's most original and forceful points. According to Giraud he did not possess the faculty of a poet which lies in imagining a character, representing it in traits so clear, so happily chosen, so natural that it comes before the reader as real, living. His characters are all abstract beings, a few lines of Michelet painting better than pages of Taine; his imagination is philosophical, one that sets ideas moving and dramatizes abstractions. M. Faguet calls his style a miracle of will, artificial, but M. Giraud disagrees in this, p. 107. His style is purely classical; a tragedy of Racine is not better constructed than a work of Taine; a scholarly, grave form, powerful, organic and living, with large progressive developments, graduated contrasts, play of light and shade—all this makes him one of the great prose writers of French literature, pp. 111–112. Taine is a great poet by virtue of penetrating the sense of nature, by the instinctive need of drawing from her images and symbols, by virtue of his classical art of coördinating and developing them, p. 120.

As to his influence, Giraud concludes from statistics that Taine has been read and studied by his contemporaries, he has reached the most diversified public and won the most varied readers. Nearly all great writers acknowledge their indebtedness to him, and his influence is probably as great outside of France as within his native land. He shows that Ste.-Beuve, in his later period, was gradually persuaded by Taine of the importance of the psychological interest of works over the mere anecdotal; this is his greatest victory over the generation of 1830. They next hailed him as their chief; yet, many of the realistic works were already written when Taine became famous. His influence on the novelists Zola, Maupassant, Fabre, Pouvillon; on the historians Lavisse, Hanotaux, Sorel, Chuquet; on the critics Brunetière, Faguet, de Vogüé, is very marked. In political and social questions they seem to rival him, to complete and correct and finish his work, p. 144. On Bourget Taine seems to have put the seal or impression of his thought more than on any of his other contemporaries, p. 145. G. Paris, Gebhardt, Sully Prudhomme, Boutmy, Hennequin, Doumic, Lanson, Texte, Barrès and many others show his influence.

As an educator in teaching the *ensemble* of knowledge, where observation and experi-

mentation had brought it in 1870, Taine is incomparable. We owe to him the renewing of literary criticism, physiological psychology, philosophical studies, in a more scientific and substantial sense, the sociological tendency of the present time. M. Faguet says for twenty years he has exercised in France the influence that Spencer had in England. In conclusion M. Giraud observes that the most difficult of his theories to admit is his conception of science; the critic attempts to show that the term science ought to be reserved for the positive sciences, and that science must not attempt to found a morality. In the domain of psychology and history, art, sociology and philosophy positive methods are fundamentally inefficacious, and Taine's philosophy is a striking proof of this; in the moral and religious order experimental and deductive methods no longer have their right; his work in this respect is defective, but the personality and the man himself is superior to his work, for in it he has put his incomparable sincerity, which makes us pardon his grave errors. This last part of the critic's work is disappointing in proportion as the work, in general, is satisfactory. Giraud here departs from the views of a broad and liberal thinker and settles upon biased tendencies. In all domains of research, be it in psychology or in ethics, physiology or religion, the principles of Taine's system are being applied more and more, and can be supplied without infringing upon the domain of religion.

The works of Giraud and Barzellotti have been reviewed by Doumic in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1st of April, 1901, an article which notes the principal points of interest brought out in these two books. It may be worth mentioning that Doumic declares that every man who writes in France to-day owes something to Taine; it is even yet difficult to judge his work in the *ensemble*, as his influence is still too strong and active.

Conclusion: From the present Taine bibliography we gain an almost complete, definite appreciation, if not exact knowledge, of the significance, nature and bearing of his work on literary history. And now, if Mahrenholtz is correct in his assertion that it remains for a German critic broadly to interpret Taine, this is the appropriate time for the German "Aufklärungsartikel" to be written.

Speaking from an unprejudiced point of view, it can safely be said that no other writer in constructive literature as opposed to imaginative literature (novel, poetry, etc.) has aroused so much discussion, has so thoroughly penetrated all domains of literature, left his impress upon his own and future generations in such a marked manner, has had such a wide and universal influence, has been read and studied by so many different peoples, has exhibited such a perfectly logical and artistic style, powerful imagination, combined with sound logic and depth of thought; such a wide range of application of a method to such a broad field of material, as H. Taine. In examining the various objections to his doctrine and system and to its results we find: 1. that nearly all issue from biased writers, who, either point out flaws, which are by their very nature too insignificant to detract from the *ensemble*, or judge and condemn him from the standpoint of Christian spiritualism; 2. that on two points depends a just judgment regarding Taine, and the explanation of his work, and that in these critics differ because of the lack of sufficient knowledge of the recent results of science, and secondly because of the attitude they take as to the interrelation of the moral and physical sciences; these two points constitute Taine's own salient characteristics, which must be explained by psychophysiology and his conception of the unity of the universe. From the Taine criticism at hand we are led firmly to believe, that as science progresses, especially the medical (applied psychology and physiology), Taine will gradually come to be ranked as one of the greatest and most original thinkers of the world.

The following works may be added to the almost complete bibliography of Giraud:

Poitou:—Les philos. fr. cont. et leurs systèmes relig., 1864, Charpentier, p. 402.

Grosse, Ernst:—Die Litteraturwissenschaft, ihr Ziel u. Weg, Halle, 1887, diss.

Godefroy, Fr.:—Prosateurs Fr. au xix. s., 1870, Gaumé Frères, pp. 253-265.

Wetz:—Shakespeare vom Standp. der vergl. Litteraturgesch., 1890, 1897.

Wetz:—Uber Litteraturgesch., Worms, Reiss, 1891.

Mahrenholtz:—H. A. Taine, mort le 5 mars, 1893, *Zts. Spr. Litt*, xv, 2, pp. 141–145, 1893.
Heigel, Th.:—Taine, *Allgem. Ztg.*, München, 1893, Nos. 345–347.
Hoffmann:—Taine's Orig. Cont. rev. by Mahrenholtz, *Zs. Spr. Litt.* xvi, pp. 74–81, 1894.
Weigand:—Das Elend der Kritik, München, Lukasche Buchhdl., 1895, pp. 35–101.
Wetz:—Litteraturwissenschaft, in Krit. Jahrbericht. Rom. Phil. i, pp. 157–192, 1895.
Aftalion, Abbé:—Les theories pol. de T. Giard et Brière; Extr. *Rev. Internat. de Sociologie*, 1896, pp. 22.
Morello, V.:—Tre critici: Taine, Carlyle, De Sanctis, *Revista politica e letteraria*, 1899, No. 2.
Dutoit:—Die Theorie des Milieu, Bern, 1899, diss.
Doumic, R.:—H.Taine, in *Rev. Deux Mondes*, 1901, April 1st.
Menéndez y Pelayo:—Obras Compl. iv, Madrid.
Lévy-Bruhl:—La philosophie de Comte, cf. Introd. on Taine, Alcan.

STATISTICS ON TAINE BIBLIOGRAPHY.

From 1850–59, eighteen articles,
1860–69, thirty-nine "
1870–79, forty-five "
1880–89, forty-three "
1890–99, one hundred and forty-two articles,
1900–01, nineteen articles.

In 1893, the year of Taine's death, about forty-four articles appeared; since his death, one hundred and forty articles have appeared. More than fifty articles have been published without name or date.

Total number of articles and books, more than three hundred and sixty.

HUGO P. THIEME.

*University of Michigan.*

## *NOTES ON THE LIFE AND POEMS OF ANNA MARGARETHA PFEFFER.*

IN Goedeke's *Grundriss*, vol. iii, p. 329, may be found in the list of female writers of religious poems in the eighteenth century the name of Anna Margaretha Pfefferin *née* Spechtin. In addition to the name, Goedeke gives the following note concerning her: "Frau des Generalsuperintendenten Pfeffer in Seesen, geb. 1689, als Poetin gekrönt 1739, gestorben 1742."

This is all that is known concerning a woman, who like many others of her time, imbued with the spirit of religious fervor, poured forth the aspiration, the longings and the doubts of her heart in lyric form. Acquiring no doubt considerable celebrity as a poetess, among her friends and acquaintances of the little town of Seesen, her fame spreads beyond the confines of the town and of the duchy of Brunswick and she is induced to make a collection of her poems and submit them to Prof. Ch. A. Heumann in Göttingen for approval. The result of this attempt, which was made in 1734, we do not know directly but can surmise from the fact, that a few years later, according to Goedeke, she was crowned as a poetess. Where Goedeke obtained this information I have been unable to discover. The manuscript of her poems, which do not seem even to have been printed, passed over from the library of the Gymnasium, where Prof. Heumann, perhaps, had deposited it, to that of the University of Göttingen upon the founding of the latter. It was there that Goedeke became acquainted with the poems and hence the mention of the authoress in his *Grundriss*.

As to the personality and life of the writer, I have succeeded after some little search in adding somewhat to the meagre information given by Goedeke. He tells us that her maiden name was Specht and that she was the wife of the general superintendent of Seesen. From a short sketch of the life of her husband, written by her oldest son and printed together with the funeral sermon preached at the funeral of the said Pfeffer by Caspar Andreas Pfortner, we learn that she was the oldest daughter of Christian Specht, a famous churchman of the time, who had held successively the position of *Prediger* of the Kreuzkirche in Hanover, of *Consistorialrath*, *Hofprediger* and *Superintendent* at Eutin, *Oberhofprediger* at the court of the duke of Brunswick at Wolfenbüttel and finally of Abbot of the rich monastery of Riddagshausen, not far from the town of Brun-

swick. Anna Margaretha was married in 1699 to Johann Georg Pfeffer, who had succeeded to the office of superintendent at Seesen in 1698. Their union was blessed with seven children, four of whom died in infancy. Of the three who lived to attain the age of manhood, two became lawyers and the third followed the profession of his father. *Superintendent* Pfeffer died of pneumonia March 29, 1734, his wife following him in 1742. The date of their marriage 1699, is absolutely certain as it is corroborated by the entries in the church registers of Seesen and of Wolfenbüttel. In that of Seesen under the date of November 1699, we find the following entry:

"*Copulati:* Joh. Georg Pfeffer Superintendent allhier Jungfer Anna Margaretha Spechtin des Herrn Abts Specht Hochwürden in Wolfenbüttel leibliche Tochter sind den 14. in Wolfenbüttel getraut."

Similarly the church register of Wolfenbüttel contains the record:

"den 14ten. November ist Herr Johann Georg Pfeffer Superintendens und Pastor Primarius zu Seesen mit Jfr. Anna Margaretha Specht, des hiesigen Herrn Ober-Superintendenten Abt Christian Spechts eheleibl. Tochter im Hause ehel. copulirt worden."

The date of her marriage, thus indubitably established, renders the date of the birth of our authoress given by Goedeke as 1689 impossible, as she would have been married when but ten years old. A further search in the baptismal register of the Kreuzkirche of Hanover, of which the *Abt* Specht was at one time pastor, revealed the following entry: "Anno 1679. 5. Majus Anna Margaretha M. Christian Specht's Tochter." This would make her twenty years old at the time of her marriage, and therefore agrees perfectly with the date of this in 1699. Goedeke's date must therefore be corrected to read 1679 instead of 1689.

The dates are thus clear. A curious contradiction, however, in the testimony concerning her marriage exists, which I have not succeeded in reconciling. In both of the records given above it will be noticed that she is mentioned as *Jungfer*. On the other hand, in the sketch of his father's life written by the oldest surviving son Georg Josua Pfeffer, certainly with the knowledge and probably under the supervision of the mother, for it is printed with the funeral sermon and several poems written by her and friends upon the death of her husband, it is expressly stated that she was the wife of Pfeffer's predecessor in office Christoph Sebastian, and that a year after the death of her first husband she married his successor. The account reads as follows:

"Hierauf ist er [Pfeffer] von Höchstgedachter Fürstlicher Durchlaucht zum Superintendente Adjuncto des damahligen noch am Leben gewesenen Herrn Superintendentis Christophori Sebastiani nacher Seesen ernennt und von dem damahligen Gandersheimischen Herrn General Superintendenten Wernern introduciret, von dem Abt Specht aber nomine Serenissimi in Seesen vor dem altar confirmiret worden, und als der Senior drey viertel Jahr darauf verstorben, hat der seelige die Bedienung allein übernommen, worauf denn ferner die Macht und Weissheit Gottes die Hertzen so dirigiret, *dass er sich mit der nunmehr betrübten Witwen, damahligen Jungfer Anna Maragretha Spechten* des seel. Herrn Abt Spechts ältesten Tochter im Jahre 1699 *ehelich verknüpft.*"

Certainly this evidence is too strong to be lightly set aside, for it would seem but natural that the son should be well acquainted with the circumstances of his mother's life, especially as the account must have been printed, as we have seen, with the mother's sanction and probably under her supervision. Evidently she was married but a short time to Christoph Sebastian, for his first wife died in 1691 according to the church register of Seesen, and his own death occurred seven years later as we have seen.

An additional bit of evidence indirectly corroborating Anna Margaretha's marriage to Sebastian is the record of the birth of a daughter Henriette Christina to the *Feldprediger* Sebastian under the date of Dec. 9, 1698. The name of the mother, according to the general custom, is not mentioned. The present *Generalsuperintendent* at Seesen, the Rev. Karl Lutterloh, to whose kindness I am indebted for many of these facts, and who is well versed in the history of his parish, assured me, that he considered the Sebastian of this entry to be identical with *Superintendent* Sebastian. Should this be the case it would definitely prove the marriage of our authoress to Sebastian. Furthermore, that the child had been born posthumously, since the date of the superintendent's death is given in the records

as July 12, 1698. This would indicate probably, although not necessarily, that the couple had been married but a short time before the husband's death, since no previous entries of the birth of children are to be found. An entry of marriage between Anna Margaretha Specht and Sebastian would of course definitely settle the question, but a careful search of the church register of Wolfenbüttel refused to reveal any such entry. According to Beste, *Geschichte der Braunschweigischen Landeskirche*, p. 317, her father had been stationed at Wolfenbüttel since June 17, 1692, and her marriage would in all probability have been celebrated in that town. Before being called to Wolfenbüttel her father was court chaplain at Eutin, but the early date of his removal, 1692, precludes the possibility of her having been married before this. Moreover, as we have seen, the evidence points rather to her marriage having occurred but a short time before Sebastian's death.

Over against these statements and entries we have, as already mentioned, the double record of her marriage as *Jungfer*. It is just possible that the church clerks who made the entries, not knowing the details of the case and accustomed to use the word *Jungfer* in most of the records of marriage, thoughtlessly made use of it here. That this mistake should have been made in Seesen, where she must have been known as the wife of the deceased superintendent is incomprehensible. In case the record of the birth of a daughter, mentioned above, had reference to a totally different Sebastian, for which the difference of titles might argue, could it be possible, that having been married but a short time and having given birth to no children she was described by courtesy as *Jungfer?* I know of no similar instance. Let us, however, turn from this puzzling contradiction as to her marriage to a consideration of her poems.

The manuscript in the possession of the Göttingen library consists of one hundred and two leaves of folio size, thirty-four and a half centimeters long by twenty-one and a half centimeters wide. The poems are in various handwritings. Many of them show a confusion of the dative and accusative endings of the masc. and neut. sing. and were evidently copied or written down from dictation by a person to whom Low German was more familiar than High German, or at all events, who could not distinguish accurately between *dem* and *den*, etc. That this is the case I judge from the fact that some poems show no traces of this confusion and in no instance are the forms *mir* and *mich* wrongly employed, which would be the case if the confusion were due to the authoress.

In the letter addressed to Prof. Heumann, to whom it will be remembered she sent her poems, the authoress speaks very deprecatingly of their worth, but cannot refrain from mentioning that the *Hofprediger* Mertens in Wolfenbüttel had once desired to see her poems, at which time she had compiled the volume accompanying the letter, and that she could bring forward a hundred more such poems, had she not long since destroyed them as being unworthy of preservation. It will be seen, that in spite of her apparent humility, she possessed a goodly portion of female vanity.

By far the larger number of the poems are religious in character. A few are upon secular topics of a general nature such as 'fickle fortune' (*das wechselnde Glück*), upon the proverb 'ich traue nicht' and upon her two birds. The others, and they are not a few, are occasional poems. Most of them are panegyrics of various royal and princely personages, the favorite ones being Duke August Wilhelm of Brunswick and his third wife Elisabeth Sophie Marie. The praises likewise of Ludwig Rudolph of Braunschweig-Blankenburg and his consort Christine Louise and of Prince Christian of Anhalt-Zerbst and his consort Johanna Elisabeth are sung. King George II is also made the subject of one poem. The other poems were dedicated to friends of the authoress and commemorate various occasions.

Of greater interest than these personal poems are the spiritual ones. They are, moreover, of greater intrinsic worth since they spring directly from the heart and are the spontaneous expressions of the varying emotions of the writer. They are written in the fervid exaggerated style of the religious lyric of the seventeenth and early eighteenth century, and under the influence of hymn writers such as

Gerhardt, Spener and Rist. Especially close is the imitation in a hymn entitled *Dank-Lied*, beginning:

Nun danket alle Gott
dem theuresten Erhalter
dem grossen Zebaoht
dem menschlichen Verwalter.

It is at once apparent that this hymn owed its origin to Martin Rinckart's famous choral *Nun danket alle Gott.*

As a rule the poems are written in iambic verse. One, however, entitled *Baldiger Wunsch wegen Verstreuung der unglücklichen Zeiten*, and which the authoress calls an aria, is composed in dactylic measures. The first stanza runs:

Eilt ihr Minuten
Hemmet die Fluten
Stopfet die Quellen des Elends einmal.
Eilt ohn Verweilen
Glück zu erteilen
Jaget von dannen Schmerzen und Qual.

The light tripping dactyls are but little suited to the thought which the poem seeks to express. The use of this metre for hymns is, however, quite common during the seventeenth century, frequent examples being found among the hymns of Johann Rist and Philip Zesen.

Most of the poems are cheerful in tone and give testimony of an unfaltering belief in the goodness and mercy of God. Some are decidedly jubilant and reflect the joyfulness of the writer in the spirited movement of the verse. This is, for example, true of the Easter song beginning:

Victoria, Triumph, erschallt ihr Freuden-psalmen,
Der Löw' aus Juda Stamm hebt nun das Haupt empor
Der Lebensherzog krönt uns jetzt mit Siegespalmen,
Der starke Simson raubt dem Feinde Schloss und Thor.

The hymn beginning with the words:

Die Güte des Herrn erfreuet den Geist

if perhaps a little less jubilant, breathes nevertheless a spirit of joyful confidence in the goodness of the Lord, which strengthens the mind, sustains us in all trials and rescues us from every danger.

Every life has its shadow and that of our authoress was no exception. On the contrary, to judge by certain passages of the abovementioned letter to Prof. Heumann, she seems to have had more than her share of sorrow and suffering. She writes that if ever any one had lived beneath the sun who had been considered worthy to partake of the cup of Christ's sufferings, that she had cause to write her name in such a register. A few of her poems are products of such hours of pain and sorrow. For example, the one entitled *Trauriges Nachtlied* seeks to express the feelings of the soul in the long dreary watches of the night, when sleep is impossible and the heart, crushed beneath its burden of sorrow, feels a sense of utter loneliness, The first stanza reads:

Ihr Stunden voller Finsternissen,
Ihr Wüsten voller Dunkelheit,
Ihr Nächte voll Bekümmernissen,
Ihr Bilder schwarzer Ewigkeit,
Wie lange soll in euren Mauren
Ich hier mein Schicksal noch betrauren.

Even here the mood is not entirely one of sadness, for with the coming of day the heart takes new courage and is sustained by the hope of the time when there shall be no more night:

Wohlan ich hör' den Wächter schreyen,
Der Tag vertreibt die finstere Nacht.
Aurora komm' mich zu erfreuen,
Dieweil dein Purpur wieder lacht,
Bis endlich alle Nächte weichen,
Wenn wir den grossen Tag erreichen.

Not a poet of any great power, our authoress commits frequently errors of good taste. Thus, for example, in this same poem she sings:

Indessen strömt der Thränen Fluten
Gleich wie ein kleines Mittelmeer.

In another poem in which the vicissitudes of life are compared to the inconstant winds of April we are told that capricious fortune offers her in one and the selfsame hour both champagne and bitter gall:

Canari, Sect und bittre Gallen
Verwechseln sich in einer Stund.

The detailed enumeration of the aches and pains with which she is afflicted and which she gives in the same poem destroys the intended pathos by rendering the whole ludicrous.

A goodly number of the poems belong to the category of the so-called *Jesuslieder.* These are very characteristic of the religious lyric of the second half of the seventeenth century. As is well known they were not hymns so much as spiritual love songs addressed to Jesus the heavenly bridegroom. They took as their model the Song of Solomon and closely imitated the erotic character of this Hebrew

love song. One of the first to introduce the new movement was Philip Nicolai,[1] pastor at Waldeck, who as early as the close of the sixteenth century greets Jesus as the bridegroom and showers impassioned epithets upon him. Under the influence of the "Schäferpoesie" cultivated by the Pegnitzschäfer of Nürnberg the religious lyric of the seventeenth century took on more and more a pastoral and amorous nature. Frequently the poems appear in the form of echo songs, such as those made famous by Friedrich von Spee in his *Trutznachtigall*. Even the hymns of men like Johann Heermann and Paul Gerhard are not free from conceits of this kind. Further developed by Johann Frank, Rinckart and Rist, the erotic *Jesuslieder* reach their climax in the hysterical poems of Johann Scheffler (Angelus Silesius), which he collected under the title *Heilige Seelenlust oder Geistliche Hirten-Lieder der in ihren Jesum verliebten Psyche*, published in 1657. So passionate are the utterances of the love-sick soul, so vivid the descriptions of the joys afforded by the embraces of the heavenly bridegroom, that the poems appear to modern ears nothing less than blasphemous. Decidedly erotic in character are also the hymns of the Pietists and Herrenhuter, which were widely known and extensively used. This being the character of many of the poems written by men, it is but natural that the hymns written by women should express in fervid manner the longing of the soul to be united with its bridegroom. Sex played, as we know, an important role during the Middle Ages in the worship of the Virgin, the so-called *Mariencult*, and in the religious ecstasies of overwrought, hysterical nuns. A large number of poems written by women during the seventeenth century and which belong largely to the category of *Jesuslieder* have been preserved for us.[2] Especially prominent among these are the names of Aemilia Juliana Countess of Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt (born 1677), Countess Ludamilla of Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt (1641), Anna Sophia of Hessen-Darmstadt and Catharina Regina of Greiffenberg. It need not, therefore, surprise us that among the poems of our authoress Anna Margaretha Pfeffer hymns addressed to Jesus form a large percentage. That she was writing under the direct influence of the Pietists and of the above-named women is evident from the fact that in the *Braunschweiger Gesangbuch* (1698), which was used in Seesen and with which she must have been familiar, there are a number of *Jesuslieder* by Spener and by Aemilia Juliana and Anna Sophia.

Among the poems of our authoress the best example of a *Jesuslied* and the one most fervent in its yearning is that entitled *Herzliches Vergnügen an dem süssen Seelenfreund Jesu*. The first and last stanzas are as follows:

O Jesu meine Lust, mein liebstes Leben,
Du meiner Seelen süsser Bräutigam,
Der Du Dich selbst für mich gegeben
Und durch Dein Blut erkauft ans Kreuzes Stamm.
O Jesu süsses Licht
Hör' was die Seele spricht,
Schau das verlangende Herze doch an
Wie es vor Liebe thränt
Und sich nach Jesu sehnt,
O holder Bräutigam,
O Jesu Gotteslamm
Hörstu nicht?

Und wollte mich der Tod schon von hier reissen,
Will ich im Himmel doch die Deine seyn,
Da will ich holder Schatz Dein Eigen heissen,
Wenn ich verachten kann den falschen Schein.
Jesu mein Lebenslicht,
O meine Zuversicht,
Hol' Deine treue und verlobte Braut!
Wenn ich nun sterben muss,
Bleibt dies mein fester Schluss.
Dir Jesu Gotteslamm,
Mein Seelenbräutigam
Gehör' ich zu.

The poem entitled *Herzinnigliche Vergnügung der Seelen an ihrem Bräutigam Jesu* is quite extravagant in its phraseology. In it Jesus is variously called *schönster Schatz verliebter Seelen, das Paradies seeliger Freuden*, and *im Ungemach vergnügte Wonne*, and the poetess sings:

Ich muss Dich theuren Himmelsbissen
In angenehmer Wollust[3] küssen,
Mein Herze Dich mit Schmerzen sucht.

One stanza of this poem dealing with the wounds of Christ deserves quoting, because

1 Cf. on this subject, F. A. Cunz, *Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes*, Leipzig, 1855; E. E. Koch, *Geschichte des Kirchenliedes*, 3d ed., 1866–76; Carl von Winterfeld, *Der evangelische Kirchengesang im 17. Jr.*, Leipzig, 1845.

2 Cf. the list in Goedeke's *Grundriss*, vol. iii, pp. 327–30, and the literature mentioned there.

3 It must not, of course, be forgotten in this connection that the word *Wollust* had not as yet acquired its present strong meaning.

such allusions are so typical of the religious lyric of the time. It runs:

O grosser König komm', komm' Trost der Heyden,
Lass mich in Deinen Wunden weiden,
Die schöner als Rubinen sind;
Die Purpurrothen Felsenklüfte,
Die Rosinfarben Lebensgrüfte
Darinnen alle Angst zerrinnt.

Such allusions appear to us as in very poor taste, but the hymn-writers of the seventeenth century delighted in speaking of the wounds of Christ as a place of refuge for the persecuted soul. Catharina Regina von Greiffenberg wrote a hymn entitled *Auf meines Heilands allerliebste Wunden*, in which she sings:

Zerfliesse Dich mein Herz und fliess' in seine Wunden
Bey heisser Liebesglut füll diese Höhlen zu
In seinen Schmerzen such dein süsse Seelenruh.

Hymn one hundred and forty-nine of the widely used *Nürnberger Gesangbuch* published in 1702 contains the stanza:

Jesu liebste Seele
Deiner Wunden Höhle
Ist mein Aufenthalt,
Wenn die Höllengluten
Und die Sündenfluten
Toben mit Gewalt,
Lauf ich zu und finde Ruh
In der offnen Seitenritze
Da ich sicher sitze.

In one of his poems the noted hymn-writer, Johann Rist, compares Christ's wounds successively to five cellars full of wine, to five tables laden with choice viands, to five springs from which water gushes, to five doors leading into heaven, to five caverns, where the soul can take refuge, to five apothecary shops full of precious spices and lastly to five pearls of great lustre. Hymns addressed to the various members of Christ's body are not infrequent. Thus Paul Gerhardt has seven different hymns addressed respectively to the feet, the knees, the hands, the side, the breast, the heart and the face of the Saviour. It is quite probable that our authoress had these poems in mind when she wrote a *Jesuslied* in which she apostrophizes the hands, eyes, ears, feet, side, and mouth of Christ. The first stanza reads:

Ihr angenehmen Jesus-Hände
Tragt meine Seufzer himmelwärts,
Bis dass ich selbst einmal anlände.
Wo meines Herzens Schatz und Herz.
Da will ich eueren Nagelmahlen
Viel tausend Liebesküsse zahlen.

Exceedingly numerous, and generally in very poor taste, are the comparisons of Jesus with various objects, which are found in the religious lyric of the seventeenth century. Thus David Schirmer[4] composed a poem consisting mainly of such comparisons, among which may be found such epithets as *die rechte Brunst Flammenamme*, *Nachtverlangen*, *der reine Kuss*, and *der Zimmetfluss*. Joh. Heermann has a hymn entitled: *Jesus das purpurrothe Blutwürmlein*.[4] Joh. Klajus composed one entitled *Jesus der Himmlische Pelican* and Sigmund von Bircken one beginning:

Ich singe tranter Jesu Dir,
Du himmlische Gluckhenne.

In keeping with such comparison, and probably in imitation of them, is the title of one of the poems of our authoress, namely *Jesus das beste Wischtuch der Thränen*. It is only fair to say, however, in justice to the author, that the poem although long and tedious, is not as bad as the title would lead us to suppose.

Within the limits of this article it has been possible to give only a general survey of the poems of Anna Margaretha Pfeffer, and to touch briefly upon their chief characteristics. From what has been said, however, it will be evident, that she was writing under the influence of the poets of the seventeenth century, of men like Gerhardt Rinckart and Spener, and the later Pietists and Herrenhuter. Some of her poems are not without a certain merit, being the outpouring of a heart imbued with a desire to seek help from God and sustained by its confidence in His goodness and mercy. She was, however, devoid of a sense of humor, so that she frequently oversteps the boundaries of propriety and good taste. On the whole, her poems cannot be considered equal to those of better known female poets, such as Ludamilla and Aemilia Juliana of Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt, and Anna Sophia of Hessen-Darmstadt, but she is at least deserving of mention in any historical survey of the religious writers of the early eighteenth century.

DANIEL B. SHUMWAY.

*University of Pennsylvania.*

4 Published in *Herrn Johann Heermanns . . . . Geistliche Buhlschafft und Liebessenfzer . . . . in unsere Mutter-Sprache versetzet von* M. Tobia Petermann, Dresden, 1651.

## *CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE HISTORY OF ENGLISH OPINION OF GERMAN LITERATURE.* I.*

### *GILLIES AND THE FOREIGN QUARTERLY REVIEW.*

It is generally held that Thomas Carlyle reawakened interest in German Literature after it had declined for more than a decade.[1] It has been overlooked, however,[2] that contemporary with him and even antedating him by a few years Robert Pearse Gillies (1788–1858) was active in translating and reviewing a considerable number of works that had appeared in Germany only a short time before. Gillies, "a sort of Scottish Crabb Robinson,"[3] was known to Carlyle, who considered him "a great German scholar,"[4] to Wordsworth, who corresponded with and addressed a sonnet to him,[5] and to Walter Scott, who, in a letter dated June, 1826, suggested to him the founding of a journal for reviewing foreign literature.[6] To carry out this plan Gillies left Edinburgh for London (February, 1827), where he founded the *Foreign Quarterly Review* (pub. 1827–46, when it was incorporated with the *Westminster Review*). He was to assume the editorship, but, for reasons to be stated presently, was prevented from doing so.

A word of correction in regard to this editorship may be inserted here. In his *Memoirs* (iii, 150 *et pas.*) Gillies speaks of himself as editor, and many writers since have repeated his statement without questioning it. Karl Elze (*Sir Walter Scott*, 1864, ii, 196), J. G. Lockhart, (*Life of Scott*, 1869, ix, 73), F. Eberty (*Walter Scott*, 1871, ii, 187), R. H. Stoddard (*Personal Reminiscences by Constable and Gillies*, 1876, p. xxvii), *Lippincott's Pronouncing Biog. Dict.* (1886), Francis Watt (*Dict. Nat. Biog.* xxi, 369), Allibone's *Dict. of Authors* (1897), R. E. Prothero (*Byron's Letters and Journals*, ii, 338, foot-note), these and others state that Gillies was the first editor of the *Foreign Quarterly Review*. On the other hand, the *Catalogue of the Brit. Mus.* (Period. Publ., pt. iii, 543), and H. R. Tedder (*Dict. Nat. Biog.* xi, 163), name J. G. Cochrane as the first editor. How can this discrepancy be explained? Had the above named writers looked into *Notes and Queries*, 1859 (2d. Ser., viii, 127), they would not have reiterated an untruth for so many decades. They would have seen the following plain statement by John Macray, a regular contributor to the *Foreign Quarterly Review*, and a lifelong associate of Cochrane. The note runs thus:

"It was originally intended that Mr. R. P. Gillies should be the editor of the F. Q. R.; but other occupations having prevented that gentleman from devoting adequate time and attention to the arduous duties connected with a new periodical from which so much was expected, Mr. Cochrane . . . stepped forward, and saved the infant periodical from threatened delay and difficulty."

The question of editorship having been disposed of, we may turn our attention to Gillies' opinion of German literature as expressed in his contributions to the *Foreign Quarterly Review* during the years 1827–28. According to John Macray (*loc. cit.*) the following articles are from his pen: "Ahasver, a Tragedy by August Klingemann" (i, 565–95); "Taschenbücher für 1828" (i, 641–46); "Heine's Reisebilder" (ii, 370–71); "Heinrich [von] Kleist's Gesammelte Schriften," "Tieck's Dramaturgische Blätter" (ii, 671–96); "Van der Veldt's Lebenslauf und Briefe" (iii, 318); and "Grabbe's Dramatische Dichtungen" (iii, 319).[7] A glance at the list of titles reveals the interesting fact that Heine,[8] Kleist[9] and

* I shall publish, as soon as feasible, a series of studies on "English and American Opinion of German Literature," suggested to me by my esteemed teacher, Prof. von Klenze, to whom I am besides indebted for much valuable advice.

1 W. Streuli, *Thomas Carlyle als Vermittler deutscher Litteratur und deutschen Geistes*, 1895, p. 23 ff.

2 Weddigen, *Herrigs Archiv*, lix, 159; Perry, *Atlantic Monthly*, xl, 129; Leslie Stephen, *Studies of a Biographer*, 1899 ("The Importation of German."), p. 38 ff.

3 H. A. Page, *Thomas de Quincey*, i, 186.

4 Letter to Alex. Carlyle, March 2, 1824 (*Early Letters*, ed. Norton).

5 Gillies, *Memoirs of a Literary Veteran*, 1851, ii, 145 ff., and Wordsworth, Poet, Works, ed. Morley, 539.

6 "It has often struck me that a quarterly account of foreign literature, mixed with good translations, and spirited views of the progress of knowledge on the Continent might make a regular and reasonable, though not a large income. . . . You are eminently qualified, in many respects, for such a task." *Memoirs of a Lit. Vet.*, iii, 143.

7 "Ernst Schultze's Werke" (i, 333) is by C. Moir, not by Gillies, as Poole's *Index* indicates.

8 L. P. Betz. *Heine in Frankreich*, 1895, p. 44 ff.

9 F. Lloyd and W. Newton, *Prussia's Representative Man*, 1875, p. 14, claim that Kleist remained unknown because he was not metaphysical.

Grabbe, all of whom Carlyle knew scarcely by name, were read and understood in England even before the French had become acquainted with them.[10]

Before discussing Klingemann's *Ahasver*, Gillies gives a short résumé of the modern German drama. He states that the great change in German literature, which may be dated from the appearance of Goethe's *Götz* (1773),[11] had been in preparation from about the year 1760, when Lessing commenced in good earnest his dramatic labors. The next individual, says Gillies, who made any remarkable advance in the same pursuit was not Goethe, as is commonly supposed, but Gerstenberg, whose *Ugolino* is a unique, however faulty, performance. Goethe as a dramatist, he adds, remains even at the present hour little better understood and appreciated in England than Klinger . . . and Lessing, whose names are seldom mentioned. Gillies is under the impression that the ardent and impetuous genius of Klinger had a great influence on the author of *Faust*. The next genius of importance in dramatic literature was Schiller, the *facile princeps* of German dramatists. Gillies considers *Don Carlos* his most finished composition. Kotzebue's dramas, he continues, which were at one time valued greatly beyond their desert, have of late years been proportionably underrated. Among the pre-eminently deserving dramatists since 1810, Gillies mentions in one breath such men as Müllner, Grillparzer, Klingemann, Werner, Heinrich Collin, Körner, Tieck, Kind, Fouqué, Houwald, H. Kleist, Raupach, Immermann, Heine, Carol. Pichler, Uhland, Zschokke, Kruse, etc. Turning to Klingemann, Gillies says of his *Faust:* In its own style it is admirable, and yet bears no other resemblance to Goethe's work but that of bearing the same title. Then he sketches the plot of *Ahasver*,[12] interspersing it with translations, but omits one-third of the Wandering Jew's narrative, because the language, by the introduction of sacred allusions, is rendered exceedingly unsuitable even for the German stage. Klingemann's production, continues the reviewer, is not a fair specimen of modern German tragedy. It was its singularity which first attracted our attention, and we were induced to review it as a "psychological curiosity" . . . which naturally awakened a thousand interesting associations of spectral agency, mouldering old castles, dark interminable forests, etc. For our next article on the German theatre, Gillies says in closing, we need only turn to the names of Müllner, Grillparzer,[13] Houwald and Raupach, in order to be reminded of dramatists who unite with impassioned eloquence a propriety of incident and character such as may satisfy the most fastidious critic. We may observe in concluding that one of the most extraordinary characters of this class in Germany, the late H. [von] Kleist, remains yet unknown even by name in England, while his *Prince of Homburg*, *Catherine of Heilbronn*, *Family of Schroffenstein*, etc., are extolled by Ludwig Tieck as models of dramatic composition.

The following year, as already indicated, Gillies introduced Kleist to the English public. He believed that Tieck overrated Kleist's posthumous works and that he went too far when he treated with severe censure or contempt almost every author who had risen to distinction within the last ten or fifteen years. Gillies wished to protest against Tieck's wholesale condemnation of the works of Houwald and others, for these modern compositions, says he, are often very beautiful and far from being inconsistent with nature. According to him, Kleist had the feelings of a poet, but in many respects wanted the due "accomplishments of art." He gives a short sketch of Kleist's life and character, because he believes it the best explanatory introduction to the *Prince of Homburg*. Then he adds: Having already noticed his [Kleist's] impatience and irritability, the reader will not expect that his language should be highly wrought, or his poetic adornments elaborate. Nor, having observed how capricious, dreamy and versa-

10 Süpfle, *Gesch. d. d. Kultureinflusses auf Frankreich*, 1886–90, II, ii, 14 ff, 38 and note 47.

11 In the course of this introduction Gillies makes one of his careless statements when he declares that in the year 1773, Goethe, who had already acquired high reputation by his *Werter*, came before the public with his *Goetz of Berlichingen*.

12 Cf. Carlyle's scathing criticism of this play and the *Faust* in his essay on "German Playwrights."

13 Even Carlyle (*ibid.*) does not hesitate to put Grillparzer in the same category with Müllner and Klingemann.

tile was his own mind, can we be surprised that he should have designed for the stage a character such as, in real earnest, never was exhibited there before. Gillies then sketches the plot of the *Prince of Homburg*, interspersing it, as was his custom, with translations of monologues and striking scenes, and comments thus on the fourth act: The conception is good, but the dialogue throughout is faulty; more especially in scenes which ought to be impassioned, it is lamentably tame. Yet this is the style of writing which Mr. Tieck would exalt in opposition to that of Müllner, Grillparzer, Raupach, Houwald and others. In summing up his opinion of the whole play, he says curiously enough: Whatever are its merits, Mr. Tieck may rest assured that compositions of this kind never will pass muster along with those of Müllner, Houwald, Raupach and other living authors whom he is disposed to condemn. The reviewer finds fault also with *Familie Schroffenstein*, of which he says: It is a dark picture from the Middle Ages, in which is displayed much vigor with a deplorable want of tact and judgment. He recognizes the beauties of *Catherine of Heilbronn*, calls it exalting and affecting, but concludes that though it keeps its place on the stage, it is extremely unequal and defective. *Michael Kohlhaas* he considers Kleist's greatest success and wonders why this narrative and the *Beggar of Locarno* [14] have not found their way into some of those collections of German romances that have been published in this country [England].

In two short articles of the same year (1828), Gillies characterizes in a fair way the works of Grabbe and Heine. Of the former he says: Whatever the faults of Mr. Grabbe's productions may be, in other respects, that they are novel and original must be allowed in all conscience. He is of the opinion that Grabbe possesses talents such as, with proper cultivation, may enable him to correct and avoid the extravagancies into which over-impetuosity and the determination to be original have betrayed him. Heine's prose and verse he finds lively and entertaining, and ventures to predict of the author that he may one day make a considerable figure in the world.

Gillies discovers passages here and there which prove that Mr. Heine is perfectly able to adopt a higher tone when he thinks proper to use the requisite exertion. This is particularly indicated by his poetry. As the matter now stands, Gillies continues, Mr. Heine has (very unintentionally perhaps [!]) given much offence to many people by his facetious levity of style, and satirical illustrations of character, so that his book has been actually proscribed in the Austrian and Prussian states! Even the hasty notice of Göttingen [in *Die Harzreise*] has, we believe, been severely censured. . . . . Heine has afforded us excellent descriptions, varied by humorous sketches of character from the society which he happened to encounter on his route.

Gillies, as can be readily seen, is not always trustworthy in his literary judgments. While he shows good discriminative power in recognizing earlier than almost any other man in England the genius of Heine and Grabbe, he errs woefully when he asserts the superiority of Klingemann's or Müllner's dramas over those of Heinrich von Kleist. His opinions of other German authors and works will be discussed in a study at some future time.

MAX BATT.

*University of Chicago.*

14 By classing this story with *Michael Kohlhaas* Gillies betrays, here as elsewhere, lack of sound literary judgment.

## *NOTES ON SIR GAWAYNE AND THE GREEN KNIGHT.*[1]

*a.* Lines 143–4.

For of bak & of brest al were his bodi sturne,
Bot his wombe & his wast were worthily smale.

For the *Bot* in the second line read *Both:*

1 In the *Modern Language Quarterly* for November, 1897, page 52, I published notes on four passages of *Sir Gawayne*, and as the edition of that periodical was a very limited one and copies of it are no longer obtainable, I may perhaps be allowed to mention them here.—(*a*) In line 427, *þe fayre hede fro þe halce hit* [*felle*] *to þe erþe*, I proposed to omit the *felle*, which is not in the MS., and to take *hit* as the verb = 'came' (cp. now *Englische Studien* xxvi, 403).—(*b*) Line 1281, *& ay þe lady let lyk, a hym loued mych*, I translated 'And ever the lady acted (feigned) as though she loved him much.'—(*c*) In line 1399 *Wyth lotez þat were to lowe*, I explained *lowe*, which the rhymes show cannot be N.E. *low*, as an aphetized form of the verb *alowen* 'to praise:' 'With words (behaviour) that were (was) to be praised.'—(*d*) In line 1451 I pointed out that *Inn-melle* does not mean 'in the conflict,' but is equivalent to the ordinary M.E. *imelle*, from O. Norse *í milli*, used here adverbially with a temporal meaning: 'and maims the pack at the same time.' With regard to the puzzling word *capados* (lines 186 and 572) it may be worth while recording that in *Notes and Queries*, 9th series, iv, 308 (Oct. 14, 1899), Mr. F. Amours quotes from the Old French *Frerabras* 612, where, in the description of a gambison, mention is made of *Cuir de Capadoce*, and he suggests that "Sir Gawayne's gambison was doubtless of Cappadocian leather, hence its name." He also points out that Froissart speaks of *cuir bouilli de Cappadoce*. In Godefroy's small Old French Dictionary ed. Bonnard and Salmon *capadouce* is explained as "étoffe de Cappadoce."

'For although in respect of back and chest his body was large, both his belly and his waist were becomingly small.'

*b*. Lines 228–9.

To knyȝte*ȝ* he kest his yȝe,
& reled hym up & doun.

The glossary assigns to *reled* in this passage the meaning 'swaggered,' but the Green Knight strode straight up to the 'high dais,' and did not 'swagger' up and down the hall. The difficulty disappears if for *hym* we substitute *hem*, and take it to refer to the Green Knight's eyes. 'On the knights he cast his eye (the singular *yȝe* used on account of the rhyme) and rolled them (his eyes) up and down.' Cf. l. 304 *runischly his rede yȝen he reled aboute*. It is not impossible that the poet wrote *yȝen*, and in l. 230 *studien*, rhyming with it, as the infinitive in *-en*, though not common, does occur in *Sir Gawayne* and the *Alliterative Poems*.

*c*. Lines 680–1.

And so had better haf ben þen britned to noȝt,
Hadet wyth an aluisch mon, for angardeȝ pryde.

For *hadet*, which makes no sense, Morris, in the Notes, suggests '=*halet*=*haled*=exiled (?);' but this also seems unsatisfactory. We should expect something synonymous with *britned*, and this condition is fulfilled if we read *hacket* or *haket*[2] = *hacked*, *hakked* 'hacked to pieces.'

*d*. Line 777.

þenne gedereȝ he to Gryngolet with þe gilt heleȝ.

*Gedereȝ* in this passage is rendered in the Glossary by 'gathers,' whilst Mätzner s. v. *gaderen* assumes the meaning 'Zusammenkommen, sich gesellen;' but neither of these explanations is satisfactory. In the *New English Dictionary* s. v. *gather*, section 18, this line is quoted as an instance of the use of the verb in the queried sense of 'to apply oneself to something.' But if we compare l. 2062 *Gordeȝ to Gryngolet with his gilt heleȝ*, and l. 2160, *Thenne gyrdeȝ to Gryngolet*, it seems evident that we have the same expression here, and that *gedereȝ* stands for *gerdeȝ* 'strikes.' The form *gerden* (with *e*) occurs elsewhere as well as the *gir*—, *gor*—forms, for example, *William of Palerne*, 1240.

*e*. Line 893.

And ay sawes so sleȝeȝ.

From the context it seems that *sawes* denotes something to eat or drink and not 'sayings,' as is suggested by Dr. T. G. Foster, in the *Modern Language Quarterly*, Nov. 1897, p. 54. Morris's emendation to *sewes* 'dishes' is however unlikely, as this word occurs in the line before and also in l. 889, and it seems improbable that the poet intended to repeat it here. I should suggest reading *sawses* 'sauces.' The following *sleȝeȝ* should be altered to *sleȝe;* in spite of the *syȝteȝ so quykeȝ* in *Pearl*, l. 1178, where Gollancz rightly emends to *quyke*, we are not justified in assuming here an instance of the French adjectival plural ending.

*f*. Lines 1008–9.

þat for to telle perof hit me tene were,
And to poynte hit ȝet I pyned me parauenture.

For the *ȝet* in the second line read *ȝef:* 'it would be a labour for me to tell thereof and to describe it,even if I were, peradventure,to take the trouble [to do so].

*g*. Lines 1283–4.

þaȝ I were burde bryȝtest, þe burde in mynde hade,
þe lasse luf in his lode, for lur þat he soȝt.

If we accept the alterations suggested in the notes to Morris's edition, the first line runs:

þaȝ ho were burde bryȝtest þe burne in mynde hade.

But the next line presents difficulties. Apart from the fact that *lode*, which is rendered in the Glossary by 'conduct, behaviour,' is not elsewhere recorded in this sense, we also need a verb. May not the original MS. have had *ī hī slode* = *in him slod* 'came to him, entered into him?' 'Even though she was the fairest lady the knight had in mind, the less love entered into him on account of the loss (danger) he was seeking, that is, the return blow which he had to receive.' In line 1182 the verb *slide* is used of falling asleep, and in line 1209 of softly entering a room.

*h*. Line 1331.

Shaued wyth a scharp knyf, and þe scyre knitten.

Instead of the verb *knitten* 'joined,' the context rather requires some word meaning

2 Instances of a medial double consonant being written single, as well of final *t* for *d* are not unfrequent in *Sir G.*, for example, *biges*, l. 9, *stale*, l. 107, *legeȝ*, l. 575, etc.—*naylet*, l. 599, *halet*, 1049, etc.

'severed.' The original had, no doubt, *kitten* 'cut,' which, owing to the *kn* of the preceding *knyf*, was altered by the copyist to *knitten*.

*i*. Lines 1443–4.

> For þre at þe fyrst þrast he þryȝt to þe erþe,
> And sped hym forth good sped, boute spyt more.

The fierce old boar felled three to the ground at the first thrust, and sped him forth 'bout spyt more.' Miss Weston renders the second line, 'and fled forth at his best speed, without more mischief,' and Morris, in the Glossary, gives 'injury' as the meaning of *spyt* in this passage, as also does Skeat in his *Etym. Dict.* s. v. *spite;* they all evidently regard it as identical with the Modern English *spite*, which is shortened from *despite*. It seems to me however more probable that it is shortened from *respit* (cf. line 176 *strayne* for *restrayne*), and that the phrase simply means 'without further delay.'

*j*. Lines 1998–9.

> Now neȝe3 þe nwȝere, and þe nyȝt passeȝ,
> þe day dryueȝ to þe derk, as dryȝtyn biddeȝ.

The first line tells us that the night is passing, and the morning of the New Year approaching, and a few lines further on Sir Gawayne gets up. But the words *þe day dryueȝ to þe derk* 'the day moves on towards the darkness, that is, hastens towards evening,' are not consistent with this, and are evidently incorrect as they stand. By simply transposing the *dryueȝ* and the *to*, however, we get perfectly good sense. *þe day to-dryues þe dark* = 'the day disperses the darkness.'

ARTHUR S. NAPIER.

*Oxford, England.*

## *FRENCH POETRY.*

*Ueber den Ursprung und die Geschichte der Französischen Ballade*, von FREDERIC J. A. DAVIDSON, aus Toronto. Halle: Erhardt Karras, 1900, 89 pp. (*Inaugural Dissertation zur Erlangung der Akademischen Doktorwürde, in Leipzig.*)

ROMANCE versification is the result of evolution from primitive to more elaborate and perfect forms. This is true not only of the verse itself and of the strophe, but also of the poems "à forme fixe," such as the *rondeau*, *triolet*, *villanelle*, *ballade*. No single man invented any of these; they developed until they nearly reached the point of perfection and then remained a standard of excellence.

In a few introductory pages, the author reminds us of the original union of poetry and music. It did not take long for epic poetry to free itself from this connection, but the lyric kept on for a while developing parallel with music. When the latter separation took place, the strophe and the refrain were already firmly established and thus continued to be used by poets when their productions were no longer intended for dance or song.

All this occurred very early as scholars have long since shown. A somewhat more delicate question is to determine the parts played by the north and the south of France in the later evolution of poetry. It is generally admitted that lyrism developed more fully and more rapidly in Provence. Lyric poetry was, so to speak, the only *genre* in the south, while in France, drama and epos were soliciting the attention of writers simultaneously with lyric poetry. From this fact it has been inferred, though we are not able to prove it positively, that the poems "à forme fixe" are of Provençal origin. Dr. Davidson contests this; the arguments given by his opponents seem to him far from sufficient. He maintains in the first pages of his monograph that the poems "à forme fixe" were the product of a slow evolution. In the second part he shows that all the elements of these poems are found in the early lyric poetry of the north. Thus it is not necessary to believe in the southern origin of the *rondeau*, *triolet*, *ballade*, etc.

To illustrate his point the writer chooses the *ballade*. His arguments are convincing enough as long as he contents himself with asserting that the elements of the *ballade* exist in early French poetry and that it is not necessary to believe in the Provençal origin of the *ballade*. But he seems to go further and to think that it is necessary to believe positively in the northern origin of the *ballade*—in this respect his arguments are insufficient.

Before its complete development he finds the following elements of the *ballade* in French literature:

1. Tripartition, or subdivision of the whole poem into three parts, and in general the recurrence to a greater or less extent, of the number three. We find this characteristic in *La Vie de St. Léger*, in the *pastourelles* of the twelfth century (three strophes of three verses, and three assonances), and almost without exception in the songs of the Trouvères and Troubadours. Similarly in the *ballade* we find three strophes, three refrains, three rhymes.

2. The definitive form of the *ballade* requires the verse of eight or ten (4+6) syllables (though one finds frequently 6+4, or 5+5). Now, these two forms of verse are the most common and most liked in Old-French poetry. The octosyllable, which is frequent in Church hymns as early as the fourth and fifth centuries in the form of iambic dimeter ∪—∪—‖∪—∪—, is the verse of the *Roman de Renart*, *Roman de la Rose*, *mystères*, *moralités*, etc. The decasyllable (4+6) is the verse of the *Chanson de Roland*, *Ogier le Danois*, etc., and received later the name, "vers commun."

3. The combination of assonances or rhymes, characteristic of the *ballade*, had previously been a favorite meter: ababbcbc for the *huitain*, and ababbccdcd for the *dizain*. On page 25 the author quotes a Latin strophe of Monk Ernfrid, where there are assonances according to ababbaba, the original form of the *huitain*. Dr. Davidson tries to reintroduce the principle of tripartition here. For the *dizain* it might be accepted: abab—bc—cdcd, although such an authority as Lubarsch takes the view that tripartition of the strophe would be more natural, ababb—ccdcd. For the *huitain*, at any rate, the arrangement seems rather odd: ab—ab—bcbc, that is, 2+2+4, when 4+4 is so much more natural.

4. The refrain has its origin in music; there is nothing new here. We find it already in the Psalms; sometimes, also, in the Greek and Roman poets, though it only acquired great importance in early French literature. The *ballade* made it a very important factor in poetical effect.

5. The *envoi*. True to the north, Dr. Davidson attacks Biadene's idea that the *envoi* came from the South. There are, he shows at the end of the *romances* and *pastourelles* of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, parts that exactly correspond to the *envois* of the later *ballades*. The same must be said of the *pastourelles* of Froissart in the fourteenth century: "Nun aber sind diese Gedichte echt nördlichen Ursprungs. Daher [! ?] wurde der Envoi unabhängig im Norden entwickelt."

Put together these different elements in such a fashion as to form a strong poetical unit, and you obtain the *ballade*, of which the rules are now explained from page 35 to 41.

The author, resuming his argument on page 41, now proceeds to show that there are numerous examples in Old-French poetry of the actual combination of these elements, at a time preceding the appearance of the *ballade*. And frequently the combination is made in a way that proves strikingly the close connection with the latter. Out of the two hundred and forty-seven *romances* and *pastourelles* given by Bartsch, ninety-two offer traces of *ballade* forms, not taking into consideration the *envoi* and the refrain; thirty have three strophes; thirty-eight repeat the same sequence of rhymes in each strophe; and forty-seven present an order of rhymes which, though not exactly the same as that of the *ballade*, yet comes very near to it.

Everybody will have to decide for himself whether he will accept Dr. Davidson's idea, or not. Absolute proof is as impossible to him as to the adherents of the Provençal origin of the *ballade*—in both cases there is a missing link. Discovery of further documents alone will allow a definite settlement of the question.

In the third chapter (pp. 53–89) the author reviews briefly the variations of the *ballade*: *ballade de vers coupés*, *ballade équivoque ou rétrograde*, *fratrisée*, *à double*, *à triple couronne*, *à onze vers*; *chanson balladée*, *double ballade*, *chant-royal* and the charming though rare *ballade à double refrain* (abaB bcbC, with *envoi:* bBcC).

Then follows a short history of the *ballade*. Dr. Davidson distinguishes three periods:

1. The fourteenth, fifteenth and first half of the sixteenth century, which in its turn may be subdivided into: *a*, that of the oldest *ballade* writers Machaut, Lescurel, Deschamps, Froissart, Christine de Pisan, Chartier, Ch. d'Orléans, and Villon; *b*, that of the "grands

rhétoriqueurs," Crétin, Meschinot, Melinot, etc.; *c*, that of the school of Jean le Maire de Belges; *d*, that of Clément Marot and his followers.

2. The second period covers the first half of the seventeenth century—Voiture, Sarrasin and La Fontaine being the chief representatives.

3. The third period extends from the middle of the nineteenth to our time and is represented by Théodore de Banville, Alphonse Daudet, Albert Glatigny, etc.

The monograph which I have just analyzed is a conscientious and interesting contribution to an important chapter of French literature. We may regret, however, that so much work and erudition has been spent over the solution of a problem which, as I have pointed out, cannot be solved with the material now at our disposal. There are, besides, a few points—minor ones perhaps—which might have received more consideration. The fact, for instance, that the name *ballade* undoubtedly comes from the south shows the danger of excluding the influence of Provence. I should like also to call the attention of the author to what seems to me a contradiction. On page 46 Dr. Davidson accepts the generally prevailing idea that the *chant-royal* (five strophes and an *envoi*) is an outcome of the regular *ballade*. He repeats the assertion on page 59, adding the somewhat dubious argument that, since the *chant-royal* is longer than the *ballade*, the former must have arisen from the latter. On the other hand, on page 45, he claims to have discovered that Froissart's "Pastourelles" are truly "chants-royaux," and takes great pains to show that the *Pastourelle-chant-royal* is indisputably the ancestor of the *ballade*. Would it not be worth while to look into this matter? Perhaps, after all, the generally accredited opinion as to the relation of the *chant-royal* to the *ballade* is wrong; a closer relation may exist between the *chant-royal* and the *pastourelle* than has been suspected hitherto; or, again, the *chant-royal* may have developed parallel with, but independent of, any other poem "à forme fixe."

A. SCHINZ.

*Bryn Mawr College.*

## *SPANISH LITERATURE.*

*Historia de la literatura española desde los origenes hasta el año 1900*, por JAIME FITZMAURICE-KELLY, C. de la Real Academia Española. Traducida del inglés y anotada por ADOLFO BONILLA Y SAN MARTIN, con un estudio preliminar por MARCELINO MENÉNDEZ Y PELAYO, Director de la Biblioteca Nacional. Madrid: La España Moderna, 1901. 8vo, xlii, 608 pp.

*The Complete Works of Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra.* Edited by JAS. FITZMAURICE-KELLY. Translated by JOHN ORMSBY. Glasgow: Gowans & Gray, 1901. 4 vols.

THE first of the above works is a Spanish translation of the *History of Spanish Literature*, by James Fitzmaurice-Kelly, which appeared in 1898 (New York, Appleton: *Literatures of the World*). The author of this work revealed a breadth of reading and a critical insight,—a power of hitting upon the distinguishing peculiarity of the writer discussed, and of giving a concrete picture of him and his work, such as no other historian who has treated the whole subject, had yet done. Take, for example, the author's account of Juan Ruiz, Archpriest of Hita. I venture to say that the reader of the four pages here devoted to this "cleric of irregular life," will have a better conception of him than can be gained from any twenty pages he may find elsewhere.

Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelly's style is strikingly rich and picturesque; he invariably finds the right word, and presents his facts in such a clear-cut, distinctive way that they are readily retained by the memory. The *History of Spanish Literature* was successful, as it richly deserved to be. In fact it was so much better than anything the Spaniards had, that they very wisely resolved to translate it into Spanish. In this the author was fortunate in having his work fall into such competent hands as those of Sr. Adolfo Bonilla, a well-known scholar. And now the *History* appears in over six hundred pages, as compared with four hundred and twenty-three pages of the English edition. This alone is sufficient to show that the book has been almost entirely re-written. Errors that had crept in have been corrected, and the

text much augmented, while the bibliography has been largely increased and brought down to the present time.

Here every work of any importance that has appeared within the last twenty years, is carefully recorded; it shows at a glance how necessary a re-working of all the material was, and how antiquated, in many respects, were the histories upon which we have been depending. Prefaced to the whole work is the *Prólogo* of the distinguished Spanish critic, Sr. Menéndez y Pelayo—of exceeding interest, like everything that flows from the tireless pen of this scholar, and showing the widest and most minute knowledge of the subject.

The American reader will be especially interested in what Sr. Menéndez y Pelayo says of Ticknor's great work, and if it be not all pleasant reading, yet, on the other hand, it must be confessed that a part, at least, of what is here said about our distinguished countryman is true. He praises the accuracy of Ticknor's bibliographical knowledge, and justly points out that the weakest part of the whole work is that portion which treats of the Middle Ages,—and even here, Sr. Menéndez y Pelayo says that it must be taken into account that this portion of Spanish literary history *ha sido renovada por entero* since Ticknor's time. Of the latter he says:

"He rarely penetrated beneath the surface of the books; his judgments are often extremely trivial, and are sometimes even contradictory in terms."

With this, of course, we do not wholly agree. Sr. Menéndez finds most fault,—as the reader may see who will consult the very searching Introductions which this scholar has written to the Academy's edition of Lope de Vega—with Ticknor's treatment of sacred and scriptural subjects in the literature of Spain.

Ticknor naturally considers these matters from the Protestant view-point—we need refer here only, for example, to his criticism of some of the religious verse of Lope de Vega, and to many of his plays, especially his *Autos* and *Comedias de Santos*,—and this is just as naturally resented by an orthodox Catholic. Sr. Menéndez y Pelayo also points out that the ascetics and mystics have been wholly omitted by Ticknor, or treated in a manner entirely inadequate. This whole prologue, as we have said, is worthy of careful study, coming from the pen of so ripe a scholar; it is of exceeding interest, even though we may not always agree with the writer's statements. His conception of literature—of what is literature,—is one of the points where we differ with him. It seems to me that he gives an uncommonly wide significance to that word. Still, this is a point upon which there is likely to be much difference of opinion.

As to the omissions of the book, which Sr. Menéndez y Pelayo discusses, it is perhaps not the least task of the writer of a short history to decide what to insert and what to omit. In some cases there has apparently been an oversight,—for instance, the names Acevedo, and especially Valbuena, whose *Bernardo* is one of the very best epics in the Spanish language, and whose eclogues are unsurpassed for grace and naturalness;—these can easily be added in another edition. And so the entire omission of the *Romance* is a matter of regret, but that a whole chapter should be devoted to it, as the distinguished critic thinks, seems to me out of all proportion in a work of this character, and would quite upset the balance of the book.

But it is an ungracious task to point out the few omissions in a work like this, when we are unable, for want of space, to mention its many and singular merits,—all the excellent qualities of this truly scholarly book. In its earlier portions it wholly supersedes Ticknor, and everywhere will be found the author's personal views, based upon long study and intimate acquaintance with the writers discussed. Naturally, the vivid, picturesque style of the original has suffered somewhat in the translation. This was unavoidable, but enough of it shines through the Spanish to make the work most delightful reading. It is easily the best work on Spanish Literature, within the space to which it is limited, that has yet been written, and it is safe to say that it will be the standard short history of the subject for many years to come.

It is above all, however, as a student of Cervantes that Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelly is best known. In addition to his excellent *Life of Cervantes*, published in 1892, he is the co-editor with the late Mr. John Ormsby, of the

magnificent edition of *Don Quixote* in Spanish, published in two quarto volumes, in 1898 (London, David Nutt).

This work, which bears every evidence of being the *édition définitive* of the great masterpiece,—the standard text for all future commentators,—is due chiefly to the labors of Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelly. It is the English translation of his co-editor, Mr. Ormsby, that he has here edited anew. An edition of this English version, also in four volumes, was issued in 1887 (New York: Dodd, Mead & Co.), and we now have before us a revised edition, in which Mr. Ormsby's own copy, containing his latest corrections and additions, has been followed. Here, for instance, is given the Dedication to the Duke of Bejar, omitted in the original edition. A comparison of the revised version with this original shows many changes; and though they are principally merely verbal, and do not affect the meaning, they show the minute and painstaking care with which the lamented scholar revised his work, and with what solicitude he had filed and corrected his translation, which is not at all likely ever to be surpassed by any other. It is beyond all peradventure the best and most faithful English translation that has ever been made, while it at the same time retains much of the indescribable charm of the original.

The Introduction consists of thirty-six closely printed pages, in which every doubtful point is duly discussed,—not omitting the alleged authority of the edition of 1608,—and the history of the work carefully written in great detail, giving the results of the latest investigations; and certainly not least of all, the bibliography is here cleared up finally—for which task perhaps no scholar living was as well fitted as Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelly.

HUGO ALBERT RENNERT.
*University of Pennsylvania.*

## *HENRIK IBSEN.*

*Henrik Ibsen, a Critical Biography*, by HENRIK JÆGER, from the Norwegian by WILLIAM MORTON PAYNE, second edition, with a supplementary chapter by the translator. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co., 1901. 320 pp.

CONSIDERED selfishly from the point of view of the lover of literature, it was a fortunate fire that consumed the remaining copies of the first issue of this work, and thus hastened the appearance of the second edition. For we have here not simply a reissue of the original edition, but a rounding out of the work to include the last six of the dozen problem plays, which appeared after Jæger had prepared his study. It is no slight praise of this supplementary chapter to say that it makes no unpleasing contrast to the sympathetic treatment of Jæger himself. Indeed, in one respect it is superior to the rest of our book, since it is free from the faults of style almost unavoidable in a translation.

It is unfortunate that the "few trifling corrections" referred to in the preface were not made to include the Danicisms, from which the pages are not wholly free. Among these were noted the following: "Everyone knows his neighbors inside and out" (p. 33), "As good as no one cared to purchase" (p. 45), "the noble families of the country continued to go down hill" (p. 90), "the commodious metre of the song" (p. 108), "Others are made bitter and discontented, and thus express themselves" (p. 150), "even in Norway public opinion sang to a new tune" (p. 208). On page 182 the word *Chaplain* is evidently literally translated from *Kapellan*, which means assistant minister. Except for slight blemishes like these, however, the translation is spirited. In the rendering of the verse extracts Mr. Payne has aimed primarily at a faithful rendering of the content and the verse-form of the original, and in this he has been successful. For the prose extracts he is indebted to earlier translations.

Of Jæger's study of his great countryman little need be said, as it has long been recognized as the standard treatment from the Norwegian point of view. In his interpretation he avoids the German fault of seeking a hidden meaning in the simplest expression, evidently trying in all honesty to give the author's real intention. Whether or not the reader endorse these views he is, in the majority of cases, forced to recognize them as Ibsen's very own. In nothing is this more clearly shown than in the treatment of Ibsen's attitude at different periods towards his native country, and especially towards Christiania.

Were it not for the keen insight into the national character displayed elsewhere we might suspect that the author was not a real Norwegian, so severe are his strictures upon the Norwegian capital of twenty years ago.

In the supplementary chapter, called "The End of the History," a few traces of patching were noted, showing the journalistic material from which it was made up. Thus, on page 288, The Master Builder is referred to as "his latest work." The description of Evolf of the later play is a good example of Mr. Payne's delicate appreciation:

"These plans are all broken off by the accidental drowning in the fjord of the child, whose winsome figure, like that of Mamillius in 'The Winter's Tale,' makes but the briefest appearance upon the stage, then passes from our sight, although never from our memory." (P. 297).

Only one misstatement of fact was noted. It occurs in the chronological list of Ibsen's works, in which the date of publication of "The Feast at Solhaug" is given as 1857, whereas, according to the almost unimpeachable authority of Halvorsen (*Bibliografiske Oplysninger til Henrik Ibsen's Samlede Værker*, 1901), it should be 1856. The fixing of this date is of special importance, as on it depends the question whether or not Ibsen published anything between *Catalina* (1850) and *Fru Inger*. The question is, however, wholly a bibliographical one, as it is known that *Fru Inger* was written in 1854, about six months before *The Feast*.

A protest should be entered against Mr. Payne's misleading use of the term Norwegian, as applied to the language of the original. Jæger, like most Norwegians of his time, wrote Danish, or, if you will, Dano-Norwegian. If the literary language of Norway were Norwegian the ultra patriotic Norwegians would clearly not feel the necessity for a new national tongue to express the national aspirations.

DANIEL KILHAM DODGE.
*University of Illinois.*

## *ITALIAN LITERATURE.*

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—I assume that those readers of MOD. LANG. NOTES who are interested in Italian Literature, particularly that of the *Cinquecento*, will also be interested in learning of a collection of works by writers of the Renaissance that is being gathered together in first and early editions for Wellesley College, by Mr. Geo. A. Plimpton of New York, in memory of his wife, an alumna of the College.

As this is not the place, either for a catalogue or a list of the books in the collection, I will confine myself simply to noting down certain titles in the various departments of literature that your readers may see the general character of the *convito* that is one day to be spread before book-lovers.

It is not Mr. Plimpton's purpose to emulate the special collections, like those of Dante and Petrarch, that are also growing through private generosity, but rather to bring together such works as will be of literary as well as bibliographical interest to the student of the *Cinquecento*.

Of the brilliant Florentine spirits who rendered illustrious the last half of the fifteenth century, Leon Battista Alberti is represented by his *Hecatomphilea* (Ven., Sessa, 1534), Girolamo Benivieni by his *Amori* (Ven., Rovano, 1535), Angelo Poliziano by his *Stanze* (Bologna, Benedetti, 1520), Matteo Palmieri by his *Vita civile* (Florence, Giunti, 1529 e. p.). The *Opere Volgari* of the Magnificent Lorenzo are in the first edition (Figli di Aldo, 1554). Although neither a Florentine nor a writer of Italian, Pico della Mirandola is too closely connected with Lorenzo's circle not to have these Latin works mentioned here: the *De Morte Christi* (Bologna, 1496 e. p.) and *De Imaginatione*.

Macchiavelli would naturally head the list of Florentine historians but for mentioning the *Cronaca Fiorentina* by Ricordiano Malespina (Florence, Giunti, 1568), and that by the Villani, edited by Baccio Valori (Florence, Giunti, 1587 e. p.). Macchiavelli's *Opere* are in the so-called "edizione della testolina" (s. l. s. imp., 1550), and also in the ten-volume edition, Milan, Mussi, 1811. Varchi's *Storia di Firenze* is in the Florence-Cologne edition (Kulizio, 1721 e. p.), his other works are also in first editions: *Sonetti* (Florence, Torrentino, 1555), and *L'Ercolano* (Florence, Giunti, 1570). Nardi's *Storia di Firenze* is in the Lyons edition (Aucelin, 1582).

Of historians outside of Florence, besides Cardinal Bembo, there is Paruta, his successor as Venetian historiographer, and the *Storia Vinitiana* (Ven., Nicolini 1605), Giovio's *Storia dei suoi Tempi* (Florence, Torrentino, 1551–3), and his biographies, *Vita di Leone X.* (Venice, Rossi, 1557), and *Vita di Alfonso d'Este* (Fl., Torrentino, 1553).

Of the poets of the *Cinquecento* the following are among the authors and titles represented.

The poems as well as the prose works of that typical *Cinquecentista*, Cardinal Bembo, are in first editions: *Le Rime* (Ven., Sabio, 1530), *Le Prose* (Florence, Torrentino, 1548), *Lettere* (Rome, Dorico, 1548), while his *Asolani* (Venice, Aldo, 1505) is enriched by autograph notes in preparation for the second edition of 1515. Benedetto Menzoni's *Opere Complete* are in the second, but first complete edition (Fl., Tartini, 1731). Angelo Firenzuola's *Rime* (Venice, Aldo, 1572), Alamanni's *Opere* (Lyons, Griffio, 1532, third edition, first complete), Monsignor della Casa's *Terze Rime* in the edition of 1538 (Venice, Curzio Navo), which unites in the same volume *Tutte le Opere del Bernia;* Anibal Caro, *Rime* (Venice, Aldo, 1572, and Giunti, 1584). Angelo Costanzo, *Rime* (Padova, Comino, 1738); *Vittoria* Colonna, *Rime* are in the second edition (s. l., 1539); Gaspara Stampa's *Rime* (Venice, 1738); Chiabrera's *Poesie* (Genova, Pavoni, 1605); Sanazzaro's *Sonetti e Canzone* (Naples, Sulzbach, 1530), as well as his *Arcadia* (Fl., Giunti, 1514).

The dramatic works both of Macchiavelli and Ariosto are found in their *Opere Complete*, while *La Lena*, *I Suppositi*, *Cassaria*, and *Il Negromante* of the latter are published together under the title of *Commedie* (Florence, 1724). Angelo Firenzuola's *I Lucidi* (Florence, Giunti 1582), G. B. Gelli's *Circe* (Florence, Torrentino, 1549), Cardinal Divizi da Bibbiena's *Calandra* (Venice, Giolato, 1562), Trissino's *Sofonisba* (Vicenza, Janiculo, 1529) may suffice for dramatists.

In other branches of literature I might mention Belcari's *Vita del Beato Giovanni Colombini* (Siena, Bindi, 1541), Castiglione, *Il Cortigiano* (Aldo Romano, 1528 e. p.), Piccolomini, *La vita del Uomo Nobile* (Ven., Scotti, 1542); Sperone Speroni, *Dialoghi* (Ven., Aldo, 1550). In lighter vein are Lasca's *Novelle;* Cintio Giraldi, *Ecatomiti* (Fl., Torrentino, 1565 e. p.).

I might, on the one hand, add the names of Brunetto Latini, Marco Polo, Catherine of Siena, Ser Giovanni Fiorentino; on the other, Galileo, Fra Paolo Sarpi, Francesco Redi, Salvator Rosa *ed altri molti*, did not space forbid, since I wish to speak of a feature of the collection unique on this side of the ocean, and hardly equaled on the other—I mean Mr. Plimpton's collection of chivalric or romantic epics.

The majority of these centre around Charlemagne and his paladins—the sources, in fact, of Boiardo and Ariosto, as well as of their imitators. Besides the *Chanson de Roland* and the pseudo-Turpin, there is the old prose romance, ever new to the Italian populace, *I Reali di Francia*, rendered into verse by Cristoforo Altissimo (Venice, Sabio, 1534), and *La Spagna*, by Zanobi di Sostegno (Venice, Donati, 1530), *La Rotta di Roncevalle* (Padova, s. a.), and Pulci's *Morgante Maggiore* (Ven., Comin da Trino da Monferrato, 1546).

Of Boiardo's *Orlando Innamorato* there are three editions with Agostini's continuation: that of 1539 (Venice, Sabio), of 1543 (Venice, Torti), a third s. i., but before 1545. Domenici's "*rifaciamento*" is in the first edition (Venice, Scotto, 1545, another of 1580), while Berni's better known rendering is found in the first and second editions (Venice, eredi di Giunta, 1541 and 1545, respectively).

Of Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso* there are five editions: Venice, Sisto, 1526; Venice, 1584; Pira, 1809; Florence, Molini, 1821; Florence, Ciardetti, 1824.

Brunet gives a list of one hundred and twenty-nine long-winded romances in verse which take their title from some character in Pulci, Boiardo, Ariosto, or develop into an epic (?) some episode or incident. Of these Mr. Plimpton has, thus far, succeeded in obtaining fifty-six, besides some which are not mentioned in Brunet's list. Among these are *Angelica*, by Brusantino (Ven., Marcolini, 1553), another by Pietro Aretino (Ven., Giannini, 1530). This is the first edition to contain also the *Sirena* and *Marfiza*, by the same authors; a *Marfiza bizzarra* by Dragoncino da Fano (Padova, Sardi, s. a.), another by Carlo Gozzi (Fl.-Ven.,

Colombini, 1773). *Bradamante, Sorella di Renaldo* is in its first edition. (Brescia Farsengo, s. a., circa 1490); the same lady "gelosa" is treated of by Secondo Tarentino (Ven., Printer's mark, a Swan, 1623), *Rinaldo appassionato* (Ven., Zoppino, 1528 e. p.); a *Ruggero vavassore* by Orivolo (Ven., 1543), *La morte di Ruggiero* by Pescatore (Ven., Gherardo, 1548); Chiabrera in his *Poemi eroici postumi* (Genova, 1653) also has a *Ruggiero*. Burlesques on this style are *Orlandino* by Teofilo Folengo (Ven., Sabio, 1526), and Forteguerri's *Ricciardetto* (Paris, Pitlin, 1732).

Dealing with other heroes are more worthy poems, as Bernardo Tasso's *Amadigi* (Fl., 1560 e. p.), Luigi Alamanni's *Girone il Cortese*, (Paris, Calderio 1548 e. p.), and *Avarchide* (Fl., Giunti, 1570 e. p.), Tullia d'Aragona's *Guerin Meschino* (Ven., Sessa, 1560), with the prose romance from which she took her material, *Il Meschino* (Padova, Valdesecchi, 1473 e. p.).

Some of Mr. Plimpton's most recent acquisitions will show that his interest is not confined to the *Cinquecentisti* and the chivalric epics: Dante Alighieri: *La divina commedia* (Ven., Vendelin, 1476–7); *Il Convito* (Fl., Buonaccorsi, 1490 e. p.).

Giovanni Petrarca: *Opera latina* (Squarzaficum, xvi c.); *De remediis* (Strasburg, Eggestyne, 1475 circ. also Paris, Mart. Juvinem, 1557); *Il Canzoniere* (Ven., Tridino da Monferrato, 1522).

Boccaccio: *L'Ameto*, (Venice, Bonfadini, 1592); *L'Amorosa visione*, (Venice, Zoppino, 1531); *Fiammetla*, (Venice, Giolito, 1542); *Laberinto d'amore*, (Venice, Zoppino, 1520); *Philocolo*, (Venice, Bindoni e Pisani, 1530); *Vita di Dante*, (Rome, Priscianese, 1544); *De casibus virorum* (Strassburg, Hussner, 1470?).

Tasso: *La Gerusalemme liberata*, (Ven., Franchi, 1583); *La Gerusalemme conquistata* (Roma, Faciotti, 1593 e. p.); *Le Rime*, (Venice, Aldo, 1581 e. p.); *Rinaldo*, (Ven., Senese, 1562 e. p.); *Torrismondo* (Bergamo, Ventura, 1587 e. p.); *Lettere familiari* (Bergamo, Ventura, 1588 e. p.); *Discorso sulla virtù femminile*, (Ven., Giunti, 1582 e. p.).

Mr. Plimpton has obtained some thirty manuscripts ranging in date from the early fifteenth century to the eighteenth. Of artistic as well as literary interest is a folio manuscript on vellum of Petrarch's *Canzoniere* and *Trionfi*, coming from the Hamilton library. The writing is beautifully clear. The first page of the *Canzoniere* is enriched by an illuminated border of fruit, flowers and birds, two angels hold the arms of the Bon family of Venice. The first page of the *Trionfi* has a semi-border, less elaborate than the first, but still graceful. A quaint sonnet at the end shows that about 1500 the book was the property of one Tito Meratta, "decan di San Giorgio Maggiore . . . . d'onori scarso e in borsa cappuccino," who presents this book "degno d' ogni gran signore," to the Convent library.

Another manuscript, that of Boccaccio's *De Montibus et Sylvis*, is interesting, not only for its intrinsic value, but from the fact that the collection contains also a copy of the first printed edition, that of Vendelin, 1473 (?), and the translation into Italian by Niccolò Liburnio, s. i.

It is expected that the books will be on view in New York in the coming spring, when an adequate catalogue will be prepared of the collection as it then stands. After passing into the possession of the College, it will be the desire of the donor, in which he will be earnestly seconded by the College authorities, that the books be made available to the student and book-lover.

MARGARET H. JACKSON.
*Wellesley College.*

## *FRENCH LITERATURE.*

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—Would you allow me to try to complete the review on *Mon Oncle et Mon Curé* which appeared in your last number?

P. 8, l. 16, *par* should be *pas;* p. 9, l. 6, *histoire, histoire;* p. 12, l. 26, *patrie, partie;* p. 17, l. 1, there should be a note or a reference to p. 16, note 1; p. 17, l. 4, *toute* should be *tout;* p. 18, l. 25, *que'elle, qu'elle;* p. 23, l. 31, *une, un;* p. 26, l. 18, *philosophies, philosophes;* p. 32, l. 16, *quel, quelle;* p. 35, l. 4, *Précisement, Précisément;* p. 38, l. 19, *Cathérine, Catherine;* p. 49, l. 11, *chair, chaire;* p. 50, l. 7, *et bien, eh bien;* p. 59, l. 14, *spécalité, spécialité;* p. 68, l. 28 and p. 69, l. 3, the saying is generally attributed to Joseph de Maistre, but I could not find the sentence in his Works although the idea is expressed several times in *Les Soirées de Saint-Pétersbourg.*

P. 74, ll. 31 and 32, *j'ai failli attendre* is attributed to Louis XIV.; p. 77, l. 5, *une* should be *un;* p. 77, l. 7, *répartie*, *repartie;* p. 90, l. 20, *vos*, *vous;* p. 112, l. 31, *foudre*, *fondre;* p. 120, l. 16, *débarrassées*, *débarrassée;* p. 140, l. 28, *diviné*, *deviné;* p. 144, l. 20, *blanc*, *banc;* p. 146, l. 19, *sonhaitiez*, *souhaitiez*; p. 148, l. 4, *coufusément*, *confusément.* Add a comma after *pas*, p. 43, l. 1; after *attendant*, p. 45, l. 18; after *cela*, p. 66, l. 11; an apostrophe after *grand*, p. 92, l. 19; *monsieur* is written now with a capital, now with a small *m* before *le curé:* its spelling should be made uniform. See also the various spellings of *Mont-Saint-Michel* p. 103, l. 26; p. 124, ll. 20 and 27; p. 158, note 3 of p. 103.

V. E. FRANÇOIS.

*University of Michigan.*

## A CORRECTION.

The title of my article in the January number of MOD. LANG. NOTES is misleading. In writing it, I had quite overlooked Prof. Holthausen's paper in *Archiv* 105. 367, which not only gives the preface in metrical form, with acknowledgment of a previous hint by Skeat, but has fuller emendations than mine in lines 1 and 21, and a better division at the end of line 5. I gladly acknowledge Holthausen's priority, and that of Krebs and Skeat as regards the original suggestion. My attention was called to the paper in the *Archiv* by Prof. Klaeber of the University of Minnesota.

ALBERT S. COOK.

*Yale University.*

## ERRATA.

By a blunder in the Post Office the proof of the article on "Shakespeare's Queen Mab," in the January number of the NOTES, could not be read. The following corrections may be noted:

Col. 20, l. 5, read $Q_1$ for A; l. 15, read *Amyntas* and Poole's; col. 21, l. 20, read Keightley; l. 22, read *Angels;* l. 25, read Douce's; l. 28, read Beaufort and *Antient;* reference 7, read 1881; col. 22, ten lines from bottom, read onomatopœia; col. 23, l. 6, read *Mhedhbh;* col. 25, l. 18, read Meadhbh; ll. 13 and 14 from bottom, read Mēve.

W. P. REEVES.

*Kenyon College.*

## BRIEF MENTION.

*Nova Legenda Anglie: As collected by John of Tynemouth, John Capgrave, and others, and first printed, with New Lives, by Wynkyn de Worde a. d. mdxvi.* Now re-edited with fresh material from MS. and printed sources by Carl Horstman, Ph. D. (2 vols. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1901). In 1893 Dr. Horstman edited for the Early English Text Society John Capgrave's *Life of St. Katharine;* Dr. Furnivall supplied the "Forewords" in which the *Nova Legenda Anglie* is described as a work of Capgrave's "compiled from the *Hist. Aurea* of John of Tinmouth." He also added, "Dr. Horstmann is now [1893] re-editing the book, with very large additions." After the long delay which remains unexplained and which has disappointed the hope of many a one during a decade and more, these two volumes of important Latin texts will be eagerly received. On the other hand, the incomplete Introduction will evoke a just protest against Dr. Horstman's breach of contract with the public. The Introduction, though incomplete, is valuable. The results of investigation announced in the opening paragraph are all-important:

"The Collection here given is the result of three processes. In substance it is John of Tynemouth's Sanctilogium Angliae, as extant in MS. Cotton Tiberius E. 1, a MS. of St. Albans, of the second quarter of the fourteenth century; but this collection, arranged in the order of the Calendar, was in the course of the fifteenth century rearranged in alphabetical order, and slightly modified by reducing the number of Narrationes appended to the lives—probably by Capgrave, under whose name the Collection is more generally known, though his name is not contained in the MSS. now extant; and, lastly, the Collection so rearranged was, with the addition of fifteen new lives, edited by Wynkyn de Worde in 1516, under the title Nova Legenda Angliae."

The printed edition of 1516 is now reproduced with special reference to the contents of the Tiberius MS., and the Introduction discusses very admirably those aspects of the history of St. Albans from which it is concluded that this MS. if not the original itself was at least one of the first copies of the Collection, "made in the Scriptorium of the abbey under the direction of John of Tynemouth, then chronographer of St. Albans." Other interesting paragraphs recite the evidence for the remaining initial statements quoted above.

There is much here to create a warm interest in the life and character of John of Tynemouth, and the showing (within limits) of Capgrave's true relation to the Collection is an important gain. Dr. Horstman directly and indirectly suggests new problems which will, doubtless, promptly receive attention. Capgrave has recently been made prominent in the history of the language (see W. Dibelius in *Anglia* 23 and 24) and he has always been famous for his zeal and learning; Dr. Horstman now leads the way in the rediscovering of John of Tynemouth.

*Chapters on English Metre.* By Joseph B. Mayor. Second edition, revised and enlarged (Cambridge, University Press, 1901). The first edition of this well known book is dated 1886. Its character has not been changed in revision; it remains a loosely connected series of 'chapters' of criticism and doctrine; this looseness of plan has finally been justified in the making possible an enlargement to the extent of three new chapters by the simple method of insertion. Of these new chapters that on "Shelley's Metre" (xiv) makes accessible an essay previously (1888) printed (in an edition of only twenty-five copies) for private distribution. A chapter on the "The English Hexameter" (xv) is altogether new, while the third inserted chapter (vii), "on the metrical Systems of Dr. Skeat and Mr. Robert Bridges, was originally addressed to the Philological Society." This chapter will attract notice. Mr. Bridges has, unfortunately for his theory of rhythmic stress (see his *Milton's Prosody*), written dramas in verse and with his eye upon his theory. He fears the critics may declare one piece to be prose. It contains such lines as, "Never do I go out, however early in the morning." Are the critics to be blamed? Prof. Mayor finds the hole in Mr. Bridges coat:—

"He puts forward tentatively, one after another, various rules, which can hardly be described as light-giving or convincing, and after telling us that 'such *at least seem to be some* of the rhythmic laws' which are essential to verse, he ends by saying that after all it does not matter: the rhythm will be found all right if it is properly read."

Mr. Bridges however should have added, 'provided, always, it has been properly written.' Turning to Dr. Skeat's paper (*Trans. of the Phil. Soc.*, 1895-98, p. 484 f.), Prof. Mayor has an easy task in showing that that which is offered as a method of scansion is nothing of the kind. Dr. Skeat first applied this method in his Chaucer (vol. vi, p. lxxxiv f.), a fact not noticed by Prof. Mayor; this should be the end of 'amphibrachic verse.' It is to be regretted that no notice has been taken of Bischoff's discussion of the epic cæsura (*Englische Studien*, xxv), but Prof. Mayor has apparently no marked aptitude in self-criticism. One may confidently trust the new edition of his book for the undisturbed transmission of his errors with respect to variation of rhythm as means to secure variety of movement.

*The Language and Metre of Chaucer set forth by Bernhard Ten Brink.* Second edition, revised by Friedrich Kluge. Translated by B. Bentinck Smith (Macmillan & Co., 1901). We hasten to welcome this Girton College translation, because it is only too true that, to quote the words of the translator,

"in its German form ten Brink's time-honoured work presented great difficulties, even to students tolerably conversant with the German language, and that, if it were to be used to advantage to any considerable extent these difficulties must be removed by an English translation."

The translator has rendered a real service in interpreting the text-references in terms of the Student's and Globe editions of Chaucer's works, and no one will object to the importation from the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch* of Professor Kluge's "Biographical Notice" of the author. Since 1884, the date of the first edition of this work, the study of Chaucer's Grammar has made great progress, but of this progress Professor Kluge's revision in 1899 gave no indication. The act of revising a work fifteen years old which treated a department of a 'growing science' was performed in the most perfunctory manner; it had not fallen into the proper hands. Now that we have the work in English dress it will surely become more intimately and more widely known, and a thorough revision may be looked for; such a revision would be an important service to the cause of Chaucerian study; nothing more important could be suggested. One may predict that it is in the bringing to pass of this result that the translator of the German work will come to find her most gratifying reward. The translation is well done, though an infelicity of literalness like that of *Nachlass*, "remains" (='papers'), p. ix, has slipped in.

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

**Baltimore, April, 1902.**

## *THE SEVENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE CENTRAL DIVISION OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA.*

THE seventh annual meeting of the Central Division of the Modern Language Association of America was held at Champaign, Ill., Dec. 26–28. In point of attendance and general quality of the papers read there seemed to be indications of an increased interest and elevation of standards in the Mississippi Valley, from which the membership of the Central Division is principally drawn. On Thursday evening the annual address of the president was given by Prof. James Taft Hatfield of Northwestern University. His discussion of *Scholarship and the Commonwealth* was most felicitous in theme and very rich in suggestions for the future of the Modern Language Association. Among others the point was made that academic education should stand in closer relation to civic life; that the university should be training more men for the state and that the state should look more to the university for men to fill its offices. He emphasized the importance of having the Modern Language Association act as a unit in elevating the work and the importance of its members to their proper position. It was also suggested in veiw of the number of excellent teachers who are unable to obtain positions, while incompetent and poorly prepared teachers with some influence are often appointed, that the Modern Language Association use its influence to endeavor through its officers to exercise some control over the appointments of instructors in modern language work in colleges and high schools, or at least that it should be regarded as a court of reference in regard to the qualification of candidates for such positions. With regard to the value of the Association and the annual meetings to the members, Prof. Hatfield said:

"It is, therefore, worth much to us, scattered, isolated, and almost swallowed up in the great ocean of American commercialism, that we should now and then come together and refresh our faith in the value of our mission; that of faithfully keeping alive the tender plant of pure humanism. It is profitable to meet now and then, were it only to encourage us as guardians of that fair and serene domain, whose interests are all those most sacred ideals which our better humanity loves and cherishes."

*The opening monologue of Goethe's Faust, with special reference to lines 418–429* was the title of the first paper of the session on Friday morning, read by Prof. A. R. Hohlfeld, of the University of Wisconsin. It consisted of: 1. A critical review of the literature on this topic from Scherer's article of 1886 to Minor's interpretation of 1901. 2. A list of mooted points on which opinion still differs more or less. 3. A detailed treatment of these points, especially of the crucial line, *Flieh! Auf! Hinaus ins weite Land*, and of Scherer's *Flickverse: Ihr schwebt, ihr Geister*, etc. In conclusion Prof. Hohlfeld expressed the opinion that logical and artistic consistency exists in the scene, but that Collin's and Minor's view must be modified in several important respects.

Prof. Albert E. Jack's paper consisted of a study of *English Elegiac Poetry, with a Bibliography*. The different forms of elegiac poetry were discussed and brief reference was made to the individual works of some of the more representative writers of elegiac poetry. The possibility of influence of the Italian poets in Tennyson's *In Memoriam*, particularly that of Petrarch's sonnets was also mentioned, and attention was called to coincidences in metre, as well as to the testimony of the English poet's diary.

*In What Order Shall Luther's Works Be Read* was discussed by Dr. W. W. Florer of the University of Michigan. Attention was called to the fact, that, although Luther's importance in the development of the NHG. written language is recognized by every scholar, his works do not receive due consideration in the college curriculum. Dr. Florer made an earnest plea for more general recognition of Luther's importance and believe that better results might be obtained if a beginning

were made with the Bible translation of 1545, which represents Luther's fullest development and offers but few linguistic difficulties. After having been thus introduced to Luther's vocabulary through a work the subject of which he is perfectly familiar with, the student may profitably take up the earlier writings of Luther. Dr. Florer also advocated the reading of the modern revisions and translations of the Bible by the beginner before entering upon the study of the German classics.

The paper of Prof. C. von Klenze, of the University of Chicago, was of more than usual interest and bore evidence of an immense amount of investigation. The subject was *Goethe's Predecessors in Italy*. The essayist stated that it was an attempt to ascertain whether the poet's attitude to Italy, its art and artists, its national life, etc., as expressed in the *Italienische Reise*, was original with Goethe, or simply a reflection of the traditional view expressed in a maturer and more powerful form. An examination of travelers' accounts of Italy published during the eighteenth century shows that up to about 1786 there existed no appreciation for anything but the antique; Medieval art was despised, the early Renaissance art was unknown and Michelangelo was regarded as a barbarian. The eighteenth century traveler missed the flavor and color of cities; he traveled without appreciation, merely from curiosity. Addison, for example, thoroughly familiar with his Latin, sees only antiquity; the places which he visits remind one of *passages* from Vergil which he knows by heart. Winckelmann was unable to see anything in Venice; for him it might as well have been a *Pfarrdorf* built out in the ocean. Florence bored him. Prof. von Klenze's conclusion was that Goethe did in Italy precisely all that his predecessors did, and but little more. He was very much interested in Classical antiquity and neglected more and more other forms of art. His is the most powerful and mature expression of that point of view, which we have now outgrown.

One of the few papers of a pedagogical nature was that of Prof. D. K. Dodge, of the University of Illinois, on *Intercollegiate Agreement in English Courses*. Particular emphasis was laid upon the possibility of increasing the efficiency of graduate work in English by the adoption of something like uniformity in the undergraduate work of the colleges. If a number of the leading universities would agree upon a definite requirement as to amount and kind of work as a pre-requisite for admission to advanced courses, much time and effort would be saved the student. Possibly the presence of courses in Shakespeare and Nineteenth Century poetry in the announcements of nearly all the colleges may be regarded as a sign of a tendency toward at least some uniformity. In the list of required studies Old English should be included.

The paper of Prof. K. Pietsch, of the University of Chicago, discussed an *Old Spanish Version of the Disticha Catonis belonging to the thirteenth century*. The popularity of the *Disticha Catonis* in Spain during the Middle Ages is attested by the number of MSS. and early prints of the Latin original, as well as by allusions to the supposed author and quotations from the *Disticha* in such early Spanish works as the *Libro de Alexandre*, the *Siete Partidas of King Alfonso el Sabio*, the *Castigos é Documentos* of King Sancho IV, the *Sobre el Credo* (MS. of the Escorial) of Pedro Pascual, bishop of Jaen, etc. Most noticeable among these quotations is that found in *Pedro Pascual*, inasmuch as a copla *en cuaderna via* quoted twice by him occurs also in a print of Leon, 1533 (Vienna, Hofbibliothek) entitled *Castigos y exemplos de Caton*, which fact puts it beyond doubt that the *Castigos*, a version of the *Disticha en cuaderna via*, dates as far back as the thirteenth century. Other editions of this version are *Medina del Campo*, 1542 (British Museum, mentioned by Pérez Pastor, *La Imprenta en M. del C.*, p. 17 from *Cat. Heber*); *Medina del Campo*, 1543 (Madrid, Bibl. Nac., found by the essayist); *Burgos*, 1563 (Library of Gayangos *cf. Gallardo. nr. 514*—the copy seems to have disappeared) and *Alcalá de Henares*, 1586 (Library of the Marqués de Jerez, *cf. Pérez Pastor*, *l. c.*). Prof. Pietsch is engaged upon a reconstruction of the much corrupted text.

A paper by Dr. May Thomas, of the University of Chicago, was entitled *A Comparison of the Tristran and Isolde Story*. The three versions compared were the twelfth century epic

represented by Chrétien de Troyes, the fifteenth century prose version as a typical representative of which Thomas Malory was taken, and Richard Wagner's interpretation in the nineteenth century. The subject was discussed from the standpoint of the different ideals in regard to the position of woman, morality, duty, etc.; reference was also made to the dramatic and technical purpose of the love potion in the different versions.

A very interesting paper on *Some Features of the Technique of Adam Bede* was read by Prof. Violet D. Jayne, of the University of Illinois. The limits of this report unfortunately permit no proper discussion of it, but its value as a study in method makes it desirable that its appearance in print may not be long deferred.

Prof. T. Atkinson Jenkins, of the University of Chicago, presented a paper on the *Sources of Marie de France's Espurgatoire Seint Patriz.* He has found that one of the Harley MSS. of the *Tractatus de Purgatorio Sancti Patricii* contains a text which stands very close to that used by Marie de France in her metrical translation. Use has also been made of the three Latin texts published by Mall in 1889; the Latin and Old French texts will be placed in parallel columns, and will appear in the Decennial Memorial volumes of the University of Chicago. In revising the Old French text the editor profits materially by the reviews of his first edition, especially by those of Messrs. H. A. Todd, K. Warnke, and G. Paris.

The paper of Prof. C. F. McClumpha, of the University of Minnesota, on the *Classification of the Short Story* was introduced by a comparative table of the contents of the November numbers of six popular magazines, showing the amount of space given to the short story in comparison with that devoted to the serial novel, the essay, and poetry. A brief historical sketch of the growth of story-telling was presented in which the essential differences among the various kinds of narrative were pointed out. These differences lead to the many distinctions that furnish possible definitions of the chief forms of fictive narrative known to us to-day as romance, novel, and short story. Special stress was laid on the many possible distinctions that indicate the exact nature of the short story, in order to separate the short story from that with which it is so often confused, namely, the novel or novelette. The general classification of the novel was then discussed, showing the advantages that could be derived from it in aiding the student to understand the various forms and tendencies of fiction. But the general classification of the novel will not suffice for the short story. Three modes of classification were then presented, each being fully illustrated by selected works: 1. a classification determined by the form of the short story; 2. a classification based on the treatment of the plot; 3. a classification determined by the subject matter. The first mode of classification considers only the formal or exterior part of the story. It is essentially superficial and affords very indefinite results. Every new form may give a new class, but the most frequent forms occurring furnish eight noteworthy classes: 1. the personal or *ego* narrative, 2. the impersonal, 3. the story recounted in a series of letters, 4. in the form of a diary, 5. a combination of all possible forms, namely, letters, telegrams, diary, narrative, etc., 6. it may be a conundrum, 7. it may be a so-called pastel in prose, or prose-poem, 8. it may be dramatic in form, such as a one-act play. The other modes of classification were given in detail and the paper was concluded by a plea for the above classification merely as a means for the study of the short story. While conceding that no table of classification could ever be complete, the writer contended that the study of this recent development in fiction will be facilitated greatly by some scientific mode of classification.

Prof. Starr W. Cutting, of the University of Chicago, had for the subject of his paper, *Das and Was in Relative Clauses Dependent on Substantivized Adjectives in Modern German.* The paper will be published in full in the near future.

*The Influence of Wilhelm Müller on Heine's Lyric Poetry*, by Prof. John Scholte Nollen, Iowa College, was based upon a metrical study of the works of the two German poets with especial reference to the relation of Heine's *Lyrisches Intermezzo* to Müller's *77 Gedichte.*

In a letter to Wilhelm Müller, dated June 7th, 1826, Heine testifies that he owes the metre as well as the musical effect of his *Intermezzo* to the influence of Müller's lyrics. Though Heine was not always sincere in such admissions of influence, it appears that in this case his statements are correct in every particular. The year 1821, in which Müller's *77 Gedichte* appeared, was actually pivotal for Heine's lyric poetry in the very things noted in Heine's letter. With this year the crudity, harshness, and roughness, the affectation of primitive effect, the abuse of diminutives and of the horrible, the monotony of rhythm and rime, which characterize many of the poems of the *Junge Leiden*, disappear once for all. Heine had evidently learned from Müller to avoid the superficial imitation of the *Volkslied* that marked his earlier verse. The metre to which Heine refers in his letter must be that of the *Hildebrandston* which is the characteristic form of Müller's collection, appearing far more frequently there than in any other representative collection of German lyrics aside from Heine's. And it appears that that of the *Hildebrandston* is the overwhelmingly prevailing form in Heine's verse exactly during the years 1821 to 1824, when, according to his own statement, he was strongly influenced by Müller. Aside from this one form, the metrical character of Heine's and Müller's verse is widely different. The presumption of Müller's influence upon Heine during the period named is confirmed by the very large number of echoes of motifs and turns of speech from Müller in Heine's poetry. A background was formed for the study of these parallels by an examination of the lyric poetry of Goethe, Tieck, A. W. Schlegel, Brentano, Uhland, Eichendorff, the *Wunderhorn*, and other collections of *Volkslieder*. The argument for the influence of Müller upon Heine in the parallel passages found rests upon the following facts: that there is no corresponding similarity with all the mass of other lyric poetry studied; that the parallel passages almost without exception appear in Müller's poetry earlier than in Heine's; that the coincident passages in Heine's verse belong almost exclusively to the years 1821 to 1824, or are later echoes from these years.

Dr. Philip Allen in his paper on *Wilh. Müller* presented some of the unpublished writings of the German romantic poet, which are to appear in book form during the present year at the University of Chicago Press. These consist of, 1. A Diary, 2. Twenty-four letters, 3. Nine Sonnets, 4. Miscellaneous small papers of interest. This material, much of it of considerable biographical importance, was sent to Dr. Allen and Prof. Hatfield by Mrs. Georgina Müller, wife of the lamented Oxford professor, F. Max Müller, and daughter-in-law of the poet.

The paper of Dr. Marcus Simpson, of Northwestern University, entitled *Notes on Wieland's Translation of Shakespere*, gave some idea of the comparatively little interest which Germany of the eighteenth century felt for the great English poet. Before Wieland's translation Shakespere's dramas were but little known in Germany, although a few translations of separate plays and inaccurate statements and criticisms had appeared. Wieland translated twenty-two dramas under great difficulty with few books and no friends to aid him. The translation (1762–6) was severely criticized by Gerstenberg and ably defended by Lessing. His treatment of Shakespere was mechanical and often unpoetical. Many examples were collected and in part cited showing his inability to render the English original in fitting German. Wieland himself mentions the work but little in his letters. His article in *Teutscher Merkur*, 1773, on *Der Geist Shakespeares*, is of interest as showing the change in Wieland's conception of Shakespeare in the years following his translation. The alterations of the original text made by Pope and Warburton, whose edition he used, were mainly adopted by him, though at times he reverted to the original text for his translation. His worst fault in the work was the ruthless omission of passages and at times of scenes. The translation affected his own work and attitude towards the drama, though he never quite appreciated Shakespere.

*The Sources of Cyrano's Histoire Comique des Estats et Empire de la Lune* was the title of the paper read by Asst. Prof. John R. Effinger, Jr., of the University of Michigan. The object of this paper was to show how Cyrano, in writing his *Histoire Comique des Estats et*

*Empire de la Lune* (published in 1656, a year after his death, though probably in manuscript as early as 1649) was influenced,—

1st. By the general notions current in his time regarding the existence of other inhabited worlds and the possibility of aerial navigation, and,

2nd. By a book entitled, *The Man in the Moone, Or a Discourse of a Voyage Thither, by Domingo Gonsales, The Speedy Messenger, London, Printed by John Norton and are to be sold by Joshua Kirton and Thomas Warren, 1638*, which is known to have been written by Francis Godwin, Bishop of Hereford. A French translation by Jean Baudoin, appeared in Paris in 1648. The writer did not claim to be the first to call attention to this English book, but he wished to show by actual comparison, as had not been done before, that beyond the general idea of a lunar voyage, Cyrano had merely copied a few details from Godwin's book, and had then gone on to a general satirical criticism of seventeenth century society in France, which was of far greater scope than anything to be found in the English tale of marvelous adventure, which was Utopian and uncritical. It was shown also, that Cyrano frankly acknowledged his acquaintance with Godwin's book.

Prof. W. E. Simonds, of Knox College, presented a *Record of the Shakespearean Plays Performed in Chicago in Five Seasons*. The dramatic seasons included in this report are those of 1895–96, '96–'97, '97–'98, '98–'99, '99–'00. The following plays have been produced: Mid. N.'s D., five times; Com. of Er., eight times; Two Gent. of Ver., four times; Much Ado, six times; Twelfth Night, four times; Tam. of the Shrew, twenty-one times; Hen. IV, four times; Mer. of Ven., twenty-six times; As You Like It, twenty times; King Lear, three times; Jul. Cæs., four times; Ant. and Cleo., eight times; Othello, twelve times; Macbeth, nineteen times; Rich. III, twenty-three times; Hamlet, thirty-six times; Rom. and Jul. fifty-nine times; Cymbeline, fifteen times; The Tempest, five times. This gives us a list of nineteen plays of which there were two hundred and eighty-two performances, an average of fifty-six plays for each season.

The paper of Prof. Julius Goebel, of Leland Stanford Jr. University, on the *Authenticity of Goethe's Sesenheim Songs*, was presented in his absence in a brief summary. An examination of the various arguments which have been advanced against the authenticity of the songs copied in 1835 by Heinrich Kruse, shows that there is not the slightest reason to doubt Kruse's veracity. The originals which Kruse copied were lost, however, when Stoeber in 1837 made his copies. The three poems which were found among the papers of Lenz may have been obtained by the latter from Friederike. The inner evidence derived from a careful study of the style and the diction of the poems goes to prove that all the poems found by Kruse must be ascribed to Goethe.

Prof. Malcolm W. Wallace, of Beloit College, presented the last chapter of a study of the *Influence of Plautus on English Dramatic Literature in the Sixteenth Century*, which is being published by Scott, Foresman and Co. as an introduction to *The Birthe of Herculus*, a sixteenth century play. *The Last Decade of the Century* was the title of the chapter read, and an endeavor was made to trace the Plautine influence in *Mother Bombie, The Comedy of Errors, The Silver Age, and Timon of Athens*.

*Literary Criticism in France* by Prof. E. P. Baillot, of Northwestern University, provoked an animated discussion. The essayist expressed the fear that at present the reading of criticism was tending to replace study of the authors themselves. While not depreciating criticism, he feared the excessive number of critics.

Mr. George A. Mulfinger, of the South Division High School, Chicago, discussed in his paper the *Sources of Kürnberger's 'Amerikamüde.'* The belief so long current, to the effect that Kürnberger more or less embodied Lenau's experiences in the United States, seems to be entirely fallacious. The following works were, however, very skillfully used by Kürnberger: *Reise Sr. Hoheit des Herzogs Bernhardt zu Sachsen-Weimar-Eisenach durch Nord-Amerika in den Jahren 1824–6 (herausgegeben von H. Luden, Weimar, F. von Raumer); Die Vereinigten Staaten von Nord-Amerika (Leipzig, 1845, Dr. M. Wagner und K. Scherzer); Reisen in Nord-Amerika in*

*den Jahren 1852–3* (*Leipzig, 1853, G. Duden*); *Bericht über eine Reise nach den westlichen Staaten Nordamerikas* (Bonn, 1829); *Sealsfield's Morton oder die grosse Tour; George Howard's Brautfahrt, Der Squatter Regulator* and *Das Cajütenbuch*.—The details of these investigations are soon to be published in *Americana Germanica*.

In his paper on *Taine*, Dr. H. P. Thieme offered an explanation of Taine's salient quality, based on psycho-physiology. Taine's system and salient quality are inseparable and lead to a high standard of morality; a morality whose province lies in the tearing down and building up of the physical organism, from which evolve the psychic or moral phenomena.

Of the paper on *The Development of the Middle High German Ablaut in Modern German* by Dr. Paul O. Kern, of the University of Chicago, only that portion dealing with the development of the MHG. preterite into its present form was presented, 1. the appearance and disappearance of subdivisions, 2. the leveling out of sing. and plur. 1. In series i, *ē* as well as *ei* seems to have been simultaneously supplanted by the vowel of the plural; in ii *ou* yielded to the *ō*- class. In iii we find *o* (Brenner, *Grundzüge* § *56*) and *schund* (*Z. f. d. Phil.* xxxii, 108 f.) by the side of the old sing. *a*. For the new *o*- classes in iv (*befohl*) and v (*wog*) see von Bahder, p. 109, 110. 2. The victory of the vowel of the plural in all classes but one is due to the following causes: its domination within the tense (i, ii, iv, v), reoccurrence in the past part. (i, ii, iv b (*befehlen*) v b (*wegen*)), furnishing a means of differentiating from the new present (i, ii) and vowel lengthening (iv a, v a). Von Bahder's suggested explanation of the retention of MHG. *a* in iii needs modification. The *ä*- subjunctives do not appear before or simultaneous with the *u*- plural (cf., for example, *Americana Germanica* i, 3, 46). The pronunciation *finde* for *fünde* removed the latter from its indicative by grouping it with the pres. This reduced the majority of the vowel of the plur. in the pret. ind. giving the sing. an even chance.

The following officers were elected to serve for the ensuing year: President, Starr W. Cutting, University of Chicago; Secretary and Treasurer, Raymond Weeks, University of Missouri; First Vice-President, Violet D. Jayne, University of Illinois; Second Vice-President, John R. Effinger, Jr.; Third Vice-President, Laurence Fossler, University of Nebraska; Members of the Council, C. Alphonso Smith, University of Louisiana; A. R. Hohlfeld, University of Wisconsin; W. E. Simonds, Knox College; C. von Klenze, University of Chicago; C. W. Eastman, University of Iowa. The next annual meeting of the Central Division of the Association will be held in Chicago.

CLARENCE WILLIS EASTMAN.
*University of Iowa.*

---

## *CHAUCER'S lavender.*

CHAUCER uses the word *lavender* only once. It occurs in the *Legend of Good Women* (l. 358), in the following brief description of Envy:

> Envye is lavender of the court alway;
> For she ne parteth, neither night ne day,
> Out of the hous of Cesar; thus seith Dante;
> Who so that goth, algate she wol nat wante.

'Dante' means *Inferno* xiii, 64, and the passage there (as quoted by Skeat) runs as follows:

> La meretrice, che mai dall' ospizio
> Di Cesare non torse gli occhi putti,
> Morte commune, e delle corti vizio,
> Infiammò contre me gli animi tutti.

Skeat glosses Chaucer's *lavender* as *laundress, washerwoman;* and in his note (Clar. Press ed. of *Leg. of Good Women*, p. 143) says that Chaucer "has neatly substituted *lavender* for the *meretrice* of the original," and he adds (*Works*, vol. iii, p. 304) that the "presentation to us of Envy as the person who washes all the dirty linen of the court, is particularly happy."

The figure does not seem to me such a happy one, and I cannot think that Chaucer means to say all this by his word *lavender*. It is not his habit to drag in such remote and hidden allusions, especially when there is no suggestion of them in his originals. The word here is evidently a fair equivalent of *meretrice;* and this meaning is, I think, safely established by the following quotations. Here as ever the *Oxford Dictionary* (though it does not de-

fine Chaucer's word correctly) gives generous assistance. Under the forms *lavender*, *launder*, *laundress*, two definitions of the word are given: 1. a person who washes linen; 2. a caretaker of Chambers in the Inns of Court. Chaucer's word is quoted under the first head. The use there and in other places will help us to arrive at a third definition.

One of the earliest occurrences of the word is in the legend of St. Brice (*Alleng. Leg. Neue Folge*, p. 156):

> Þan bifell on Þis manere:
> A woman Þat his lander was
> In Þat tyme had done trespas:
> Flesly scho had hir body filde,
> And was deliuer of a knaue-childe.

This *lander* was one who "come and ȝede, and wessche his clothes, when Þai had nede," and the innocent St. Brice is accused of complicity in her 'trespas.'

In a fourteenth-century ballad (Wright, *Specimens of Lyric Poetry*, p. 49), in which an old man describes the joys of his youth, we again find the word in evil surroundings:

> Whil mi lif wes luther ant lees,
> Glotonie mi glemon wes,
> With me he wonede a while;
> Prude was my plowe fere,
> Lecherie my lavendere,
> With hem is gabbe and gyle.

The dictionary reference to Barbour's *Bruce* again does not bring out the specific color of the word as there used. It occurs in the episode of the king and the laundress in labor (xvi, ll. 270–292), and the laundress is here taken as the type of a creature least worthy the king's notice.

To these three examples of the use of the word may be added another, taken from the story of Edmund Leversegge, an unpublished narrative preserved in a British Museum manuscript (Addit. ms. 34, 193), of which I possess a copy. The story tells of a vision which came to one Edmund Leversegge of Frome, in the county of Somerset, on the eve of the feast of Corpus Christi, 1465, during a time of pestilence. In this vision Edmund is directed to proceed to the University of Oxford and spend some years there in the study of theology. He receives specific directions as to his behavior there, and certain pleasant vices he is warned against, among them one in the following words:

*Also she seid I charg Þe Þat Þou go neuer to Þi lauender howse ne lett her com in Þi chamber as long as Þou art in Oxforthe. Moreover I charge Þe Þat wat tyme Þou felist Þi flesch rebelle azenst Þi saule, use Þou to fast bred and watur, and on day in Þe weeke I charg Þe to fast watur, etc.* (f. 130).

In two later occurrences of the word, the meaning *meretrix* is beyond question. In Greene's *Groatsworth of Wit* (ed. Brydges, p. 65), in the tale of the evil life of Roberto, we are told that

"he had shift of lodgings, where in every place his hostess writ up the remembrance of him, his laundress, and his boy; for they were ever his in [that is, inn] household; besides retainers in sundry other places."

The context here shows that *laundress* can mean only *mistress*. Again in Webster's *White Devil* (act iii, sc. ii, p. 65, Symond's edition), Francisco, in turning over the leaves of a book which contains the names of all offenders lurking in the city says, when he comes to the large section devoted to the harlots:

> Did I want
> Ten leash of courtezans, it would furnish me;
> Nay, laundress three armies. That in so little paper
> Should lie the undoing of so many men!

It is an interesting meeting of extremes when Spanish *cortesana* and French-English *lavender* come together in the same meaning.

GEORGE PHILIP KRAPP.

*Columbia University.*

---

## *HEINE AND WILHELM MÜLLER.*

### I.

IN the early years of his literary career, before he had gained such fame as to make him independent, Heine did not weary of casting about for patrons and friends among the prominent authors of his time. Even the incomplete correspondence in the last volumes of the Hamburg edition of Heine's works includes a considerable number of letters written

with the evident, though somewhat covert object of gaining the favor of men who could be useful to an ambitious young poet striving for public recognition. Unfortunately, not all these letters can be said to bear the stamp of ingenuous sincerity; Heine did not hesitate, on occasion, to use the luring bait of flattery, and his flattery is palpably calculating rather than frankly enthusiastic. It is not at all surprising, of course, to find Heine positively deifying Goethe, and attributing his poetic inspiration to Goethe's influence, in a letter dated December 29, 1821; it is somewhat of a shock, however, to find a letter to Adolf Müllner, written the very next day, in which Heine adroitly caresses the author of *Die Schuld* in order to coax a favorable review of his *Gedichte* from Müllner the influential editor; he even goes so far as to assure Hofrat Müllner, with an easy pun, that *Die Schuld* is to blame for his, Heine's, having become a poet. A year and a half later, May 4, 1823, Heine takes pains to write to the curious pedant and collector, Maximilian Schottky, that the latter's Austrian folk-songs had strongly affected the form of the poems in the *Lyrisches Intermezzo*, and June 10, 1823, to Fouqué, of the influence of the ballad of Doña Clara in the *Zauberring* upon *Almansor*. These two statements happen to be correct enough. Quite different with a letter written at the same time, May 4, 1823, to Uhland,[1] in which Heine pretends to "a harmony of sentiment and life" with the good Swabian that certainly never existed; nor does it appear that Uhland was at all deceived by this pretense, for there is no evidence that he ever returned Heine's advances.

Wilhelm Müller was one of the poets whose friendship Heine made a special effort to gain in the manner suggested; and it happens that we have a letter to Müller that contains a most interesting confession of literary indebtedness. This letter probably was not the first Heine addressed to Müller; it is more than likely that he wrote an earlier letter to accompany the copy of the *Tragödien nebst einem lyrischen Intermezzo* sent to Müller in 1823, with the inscription

"Als ein Zeichen seiner Achtung und mit dem besonderen Wunsche, dass der Waldhornist das lyrische Intermezzo seiner Aufmerksamkeit würdige, überreicht dieses Buch der Verfasser."[2]

Unfortunately, the whole of Wilhelm Müller's library and correspondence was destroyed by fire, and the letter of June, 1826, Max Müller tells us, "escaped only because my mother, a great admirer of Heine, had preserved it among her treasures."

How Müller received Heine's advances it is impossible to say. Heine speaks in the letter just mentioned of the "liebevolle Aufnahme, welche meine Tragödien und Lieder bei Ihnen gefunden," but if that refers to a direct answer, this answer is not now extant. Heine may refer here—a lapse of memory would explain the inexactness of the reference—to a very brief and not very enthusiastic notice by Müller of a cycle of seventeen lyrics contributed by Heine to the *Aurora* for 1823, almost all of which were soon after incorporated in the *Lyrisches Intermezzo*. The notice runs as follows:

"Siebzehn Lieder von H. Heine, der unlängst eine Gedichtsammlung zu Berlin herausgegeben hat, verdienen Aufmerksamkeit. Es herrscht in ihnen ein freier, eigenthümlicher Klang, und unter einigen unbedeutenden und verfehlten zeichnen sich mehrere durch Originalität der Empfindung aus."[3]

Müller then singles out the poems now numbered 14, 16, 29, and 35 in the *Intermezzo*. When this somewhat grudging and very meagre bit of criticism—the only mention of Heine's name in Müller's collected works—is compared with the enthusiastic praise Müller lavished upon other poets who were very inferior to Heine, the natural inference is that the latter did not appeal strongly to his sympathy. At the same time, it is not at all probable that Müller shared the hostile attitude of his friends, the Swabians, towards Heine; in that case, his wife would scarcely have been "a great admirer of Heine."

However that may be, Heine's expressed

1 *Deutsche Revue* xxii, 152.

2 The late Professor F. Max Müller still had this copy in his possession; see *Cosmopolis*, vol. lv, 635.

3 *Müller's vermischte Schriften*, ed. by Schwab, Leipzig, 1830, v, 430.

admiration for Müller was certainly sincere and lasting; for while his early praise of Schlegel and Uhland, for instance, gives way to sarcastic disparagement, he never mentions Müller without respect, and even affection. In the *Harzreise*, Müller is one of the poets whose "beautiful songs" are sung upon the Brocken (Elster iii, 162); and it seems significant that, whereas in the first redaction, 1825, Uhland is mentioned first, in the second, 1827, Müller's name leads. In *Italien*, 1828, (Elster iii, 265), a reference to "des allzufrüh verstorbenen W. Müllers *Rom, Römer und Römerinnen*" calls forth the lament "ach, er war ein deutscher Dichter!" Finally, the mention of Müller in the *Romantische Schule*, 1832–3 (Elster v, 350), is unusually sympathetic:

"Wilhelm Müller, den uns der Tod in seiner heitersten Jugendfülle entrissen, muss hier ebenfalls erwähnt werden. In der Nachbildung des deutschen Volkslieds klingt er ganz zusammen mit Herrn Uhland; mich will es sogar bedünken, als sei er in solchem Gebiete manchmal glücklicher und überträfe ihn an Natürlichkeit. Er erkannte tiefer den Geist der alten Liedesformen und brauchte sie daher nicht äusserlich nachzuahmen; wir finden daher bei ihm ein freieres Handhaben der Uebergänge und ein verständiges Vermeiden aller veralteten Wendungen und Ausdrücke."

By far the most important document for the relation of Heine to Müller, however, is the letter of June 7th, 1826,[4] sent with a copy of the *Reisebilder*. The following extracts will indicate the character of this letter, the most explicit testimony Heine ever gave of his indebtedness to another poet:

"Ich bin gross genug, Ihnen offen zu bekennen, dass mein kleines Intermezzo-Metrum nicht bloss zufällige Aehnlichkeit mit Ihrem gewöhnlichen Metrum hat, sondern dass es wahrscheinlich seinen geheimsten Tonfall Ihren Liedern verdankt, indem es die lieben Müllerschen Lieder waren, die ich zu eben der Zeit kennen lernte, als ich das Intermezzo schrieb. Ich habe sehr früh schon das deutsche Volkslied auf mich einwirken lassen; späterhin, als ich in Bonn studierte, hat mir August Schlegel viel metrische Geheimnisse aufgeschlossen, aber ich glaube erst in Ihren Liedern den reinen Klang und die wahre Einfachheit, wonach ich immer strebte, gefunden zu haben. Wie rein, wie klar sind Ihre Lieder und sämmtlich sind es Volkslieder. In meinen Gedichten hingegen, ist nur die Form einigermassen volksthümlich, der Inhalt gehört der konventionellen Gesellschaft. Ja, ich bin gross genug, es sogar bestimmt zu wiederholen, und Sie werden es mal öffentlich ausgesprochen finden, dass mir durch die Lektüre Ihrer 77 Gedichte zuerst klar geworden, wie man aus den alten vorhandenen Volksliederformen neue Formen bilden kann, die ebenfalls volksthümlich sind, ohne dass man nöthig hat, die alten Sprachholperigkeiten und Unbeholfenheiten nachzuahmen. Im zweiten Theile Ihrer Gedichte fand ich die Form noch reiner und durchsichtig klarer—doch, was spreche ich Viel von Formwesen, es drängt mich mehr, Ihnen zu sagen, dass ich keinen Liederdichter ausser Goethe so sehr liebe wie Sie. Uhlands Ton ist nicht eigenthümlich genug und gehört eigentlich den alten Gedichten an, woraus er seine Stoffe, Bilder und Wendungen nimmt. Unendlich reicher und origineller ist Rückert, aber ich habe an ihm zu tadeln Alles, was ich an mir selbst tadle: wir sind uns im Irrthum verwandt und er wird mir oft so unleidlich, wie ich es mir selbst werde. Nur Sie, Wilhelm Müller, bleiben mir also rein geniessbar übrig, mit Ihrer ewigen Frische und jugendlichen Ursprünglichkeit. . . . . Ich bin eitel genug zu glauben, dass mein Name einst, wenn wir Beide nicht mehr sind, mit dem Ihrigen zusammengenannt wird—darum lasst uns auch im Leben liebevoll verbunden sein."

Heine himself was not the first to call attention to the similarity in tone between his *Intermezzo* and Müller's lyrics. An anonymous reviewer of the *Intermezzo* in Brockhaus' *Litterarisches Conversationsblatt*, Sept. 23, 1824, wrote as follows:

"Keine Nachahmung oder Ähnlichkeit, aber eine innere, gleichsam musikalische Verwandtschaft im Anschlagen desselben Tones, in einem ähnlichen Tonfalle, in einer gleich leichten Behandlung der Sprache und im glücklichen Versbaue mit den Liedern Wilhelm Müllers ist mir darin aufgefallen. Doch wer weiss, ob dies nicht mehr ein individuelles dunkles Gefühl als etwas Wirkliches ist?"

As Heine mentions this particular review with high praise in a letter to Moses Moser (June 24, 1825), it may be inferred that its phraseology was not without influence upon the strikingly similar words of the letter to Müller.

Let us now see what evidence can be found to test the correctness of the statements Heine makes in his letter as to Müller's influence

4 *Werke*, Hamburg, 1861–3, xix, 273; also in *Heines Briefe* ed. by Steinmann, i, 47, and in part in Strodtmann's biography, second ed., i, 235, and in G. Karpeles, *H. Heines Autobiographie*, Berlin, 1888, pp. 149, 195.

upon his poetry. The tendency towards insincere flattery with an ulterior motive which appears in other of Heine's letters, makes a close examination of these statements necessary.

No one can read the first two collections of lyrics in Heine's works—the *Junge Leiden*, including poems written 1817 to 1821, and the *Lyrisches Intermezzo*, almost all of which was composed in 1822—without feeling the marked difference between them, such a difference as does not exist between the *Intermezzo* and *Die Heimkehr*, following immediately after it, 1823–4. The principal points of difference, apart from the subject-matter, appear to be these:—There is a great deal of crudity, harshness, and roughness in the poems of *Junge Leiden*, an affectation of primitiveness in the persistent use of archaic forms, an abuse of diminutives and of the horrible, a certain monotony of rhythm and of rhyme, due, for example, to the unbroken flow of trochaic or iambic movement, and the regular beat of exclusively masculine endings. The poems of the *Intermezzo*, on the contrary, are simple without archaic affectation, smooth and melodious without monotony, and characterized by a propriety of diction that is found but rarely in the earlier collection. It is evident enough that in the *Junge Leiden* Heine was misled into superficial imitation of the *Volkslied*, and that he finds himself, so to speak, in the *Intermezzo*. The time of transition can even be fixed with fair precision; the first poems in the characteristic tone of the *Intermezzo* are the tenth *Traumbild* (Da hab' ich viel blasse Leichen Beschworen mit Wortesmacht), and the third of the *Lieder* (Ich wandelte unter den Bäumen Mit meinem Gram allein), both dated 1821; and even in these there is a trace of the earlier harshness. Now this time of transition coincides closely with the appearance of Müller's *77 Gedichte eines reisenden Waldhornisten*, published 1821, the very collection whose influence upon his *Intermezzo* Heine admits in his letter to Müller. Furthermore, these poems of Müller have precisely the qualities of simplicity, clearness, unaffected popular style, and insinuating melody, that distinguished Heine's *Intermezzo* from his earlier verse. We even have clear evidence, if it were needed, that the change in Heine's manner was not a matter of unconscious development, but was the direct result of new artistic insight. Heine had announced his *Gedichte* in 1821, as "ganz im Geist und im schlichten Ton des deutschen Volksliedes geschrieben" (Elster i, 2). His new conception, at the same time a tacit condemnation of his own earlier practice, appears in a review of his friend Rousseau's poems, in *Der Gesellschafter*, Berlin, July 14, 1823:

"Es kommt darauf an, den Geist der Volksliedformen zu erfassen und mit der Kenntnis desselben nach unserem Bedürfnis gemodelte, neue Formen zu bilden. Abgeschmackt klingen daher die Titulaturvolkslieder jener Herren, die den heutigsten Stoff aus der gebildeten Gesellschaft mit einer Form umkleiden, die vielleicht ein ehrlicher Handwerksbursche vor zweihundert Jahren für den Erguss seiner Gefühle passend gefunden. Der Buchstabe tötet, doch der Geist macht lebendig (Elster vii, 220)."[5]

As everything tends to confirm Heine's general statement of his indebtedness to Müller, so with the specific statement: "Mein kleines Intermezzo-Metrum hat nicht bloss zufällige Ähnlichkeit mit Ihrem gewöhnlichen Metrum." The reference must be to the flowing iambic-anapestic rhythm of the "Hildebrandston," the measure of Goethe's *König in Thule* and Heine's *Lorelei*, which is the characteristic meter both of Müller's *77 Gedichte* and of Heine's *Intermezzo* and *Heimkehr*. A bit of comparative statistics on the lyric poetry most read by Heine at this time will be illuminative. In the first volume of Goethe's poems, of 150 *Lieder* and ballads only 4% are in the

5 A few years later, Müller formulates the theory that underlies his own practice in strikingly similar terms, in an essay published in *Hermes*, 1827 (Vermischte Scriften, iv, 105):

"Die eigenthümliche Natur des Volksliedes ist die Unmittelbarkeit seiner Wirkung auf das Leben. Das Leben kann aber nur durch das Leben lebendig ausgesprochen werden. Daher ist ein heilloser Irrthum einiger Modedichter der nächsten Vergangenheit, dass sie Volkslieder zu geben meinten, wenn sie alterthümliche Phrasen, unbeholfene Wendungen, auch wohl gemeine Derbheiten aus den alten Vorbildern nachäffend zu neuen Verbindungen zusammenfügten. Keiner Dichtungsart liegt es mehr ob als der lyrischen, zeitgemäss zu sein. . . . Die sogenannte altdeutsche Schule hat in solchen Verirrungen besonders ihr Mögliches gethan. Es hätte nicht viel gefehlt, so wären neue Volkslieder in der Sprache des alten Ludwigsliedes gesungen worden. Und warum nicht? Jene Sprache hat doch einmal gelebt, aber die Sprache der neumodigen Volkslieder hat niemals gelebt. Und welcher Mensch kann dem Todtgeborenen Leben einhauchen?"

Hildebrandston; in the three volumes of the *Wunderhorn* only 2% of about 850 numbers are in this form; among Brentano's secular poems 8%; in Uhland's *Gedichte* (1815), of 135 *Lieder* and ballads 11%; of the 61 lyrics in Eichendorff's *Ahnung und Gegenwart*, 18%, but scattered as they were through the length of the novel, they could hardly make such a mass impression as if they had been collected. Müller's first published poems, the ones appearing in the little circulated collection *Bundesblüthen* (1816), do not show a preference for the Hildebrandston, as only two of them are in this meter. In the *77 Gedichte eines reisenden Waldhornisten*, 1821, the Hildebrandston suddenly appears as the overwhelmingly predominant note; of 64 *Lieder* and ballads, just 25% are in this form. In the second collection of the *Gedichte eines reisenden Waldhornisten*, 1824, also mentioned by Heine, 18% of the ninety poems are still in this meter, and about the same proportion holds for the mass of the later poems in ordinary German stanzas.

For purposes of comparison, I have arranged Heine's poems according to the years of their production, not according to published collections; the question of course being, not whether a poem happens to appear in the *Intermezzo* or some other collection, but whether it was written before or after 1821. For the dates Elster's chronological list was used (vii, 646 ff.); though this list is not absolutely reliable, it is quite sufficiently so to serve our statistical purpose. The figures run as follows: Before 1821 Heine wrote 60 *Lieder* and ballads, and 8% of them are in the Hildebrandston; in 1821 of 45 poems 29% are in this form; in 1822 (year of the *Intermezzo*) of 71 poems 49%; in 1823-4 (years of the *Heimkehr* and the *Harzreise*) of 111 poems 39%; in 1825-6 (years of the *Nordsee* and its free rhythms) of 9 strophic poems none are in this meter; in the ten years 1827-36 of 157 poems 10%; in the last twenty years of Heine's life this meter disappeared almost completely—there are only two poems among some 230, or less than 1%, in the Hildebrandston.

It appears immediately that the Hildebrandston is even far more predominant in Heine's poetry from 1821 to 1824 than in Müller's collections of 1821 and 1824, and that this striking predominance again exactly coincides with the influence of Müller's poetry, to which Heine bears witness. One important difference must he noted, however: that Müller's poems in this form are almost all purely iambic, while with Heine there is just as decided a preference for largely anapestic rhythm. The difference is, indeed, generally characteristic; in all rising rhythms, Heine tends strongly toward anapestic movement, while with Müller anapests are always exceptional. But again, it appears that one of the two anapestic poems in the Hildebrandston in Müller's *77 Gedichte* made a particularly strong impression upon Heine, judging by evident reminiscences of it in his poems; it is *Thränenregen*, beginning "Wir sassen so traulich beisammen."

Besides the Hildebrandston, two others of Müller's stanzas might be mentioned, because of their relative frequency in the *77 Gedichte* and the reminiscences of them that seem to appear in Heine's poems; but an examination shows that neither of them could have exercised any important influence upon Heine's choice of meter. The first of these is the stanza of *Die Prager Musikantenbraut*, which appears 4 times each in Müller's collections of 1821 and 1824; Heine uses this stanza 4 times before 1821 (including the translation of Childe Harold's "Good Night"), but not at all during the whole period 1821 to 1826, and only 4 times from 1827 to 1836. Then the stanza of *Des Postillons Morgenlied*, which appears 8 times in the *77 Gedichte* and 7 times in the *Gedichte* of 1824; this is the most frequent stanza in Heine's poems before 1821, occurring 11 times (18%, evidently beginning with the translation of Byron's "Fare thee well"); it appears only once in 1821, twice in 1822, then 12 times in 1823-4 (10%), once 1825-6, and 25 times 1827-36 (76%). It is rather striking that the *Don Ramiro* stanza, so common in Heine's poetry (occurring 4 times before 1821, twice 1821-2, 20 times or 18% in 1823-4, 4 times 1825-6, 43 times or 27% in 1827-36—far more frequently than any form of this period), does not appear at all in Müller's two collections of 1821 and 1824, and is very rare in his later verse. So the meter of *Die Grenadiere*, frequent at almost all periods of Heine's verse, appears but once in Müller's. The

rhythm of the second *Traumbild* ("Ein Traum gar seltsam schauerlich") is the most frequent form in Heine's first period, and later almost disappears (13 times or 22% before 1821, once in 1821, 4 times in 1822, once in 1823–4, 3 times In 1827–36); Müller has this meter once only until 1824, then 13 times in his last period.

In general, Müller's poems show a far greater variety of metrical forms, Heine's, on the contrary, greater variation of rhyme-order. Wherever Müller uses the stanza of *Der ewige Jude*, he clings to the rhyme-scheme aabb; Heine has four different rhyme effects for this stanza, aaaa, aabb, abab, xaya. For the *Don Ramiro* stanza, Heine has eight different rhyme effects: aabb, abab, xaya, abba, axya, assa, asas,[6] absence of rhyme; Müller has only the first three.

Neglecting differences of rhyme-order, the following table summarizes the relative metrical variety of the two poets, Heine's poems being counted up to 1836; the figures refer to the number of different stanza forms, quite apart from the frequency of any one of them:

| | Müller. | | | Heine. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Iambic-anapestic. | Trochaic-dactylic. | Mixed. | Iambic-anapestic. | Trochaic-dactylic. |
| Couplets | 19 | 12 | — | 1 | 2 |
| Three-line stanzas | 3 | 2 | — | — | 1 |
| Four-line " | 37 | 30 | — | 31 | 13 |
| Five-line " | 5 | 2 | — | — | — |
| Six-line " | 16 | 11 | — | 9 | 5 |
| Seven-line " | 2 | — | — | 2 | 1 |
| Eight-line[7] " | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | — |
| Nine-line " | — | 2 | — | — | — |
| Ten-line " | — | — | 1 | 2 | — |
| Twelve-line " | — | — | 1 | — | — |
| Fourteen-line " | — | 1 | — | — | — |
| | — | — | — | — | — |
| Totals | 84 | 61 | 3 | 46 | 22 |

Of the fixed foreign forms, only the sonnet is common to both poets; Heine alone uses the *ottava rima*, Müller alone uses the distich, gloss, and *ritornello*. Both have free rhythms; in metrically regular, but unstrophic and rhymeless poems, Müller has four different forms, Heine one. Altogether, Müller has 154 different metrical forms, Heine only 78 in a larger bulk of poetry covering a much longer period of time. Both poets show a marked preference for iambic-anapestic rhythms, Heine even more decidedly than Müller; the latter has 88 iambic to 65 trochaic meters, Heine 49 iambic to 22 trochaic.

Heine seems to have been much less impressed by the content of Müller's poetry than by its form. Although in his letter of June 7, 1826, Heine greets Müller as "the poet of the *Griechenlieder*," there is not the least sign of the influence of these *Griechenlieder*, to which Müller largely owed his fame, upon Heine's verse; besides, the inscription in the copy of the *Tragödien* sent to Müller appeals expressly to the "Waldhornist," not to the Tyrtæus Müller. We can easily imagine that the somewhat strained rhetoric of the *Griechenlieder* would hardly appeal to such a skeptic as Heine, who, as a matter of fact, was never carried away by the almost universal sentimental enthusiasm of the time for Hellas struggling to be free. He could, indeed, find "much poetry" in C. L. Blum's collection *Klagelieder der Griechen* (letter from Berlin, March 1, 1822: Elster vii, 569 f.), but soon after he had his jest at "our Tyrtæuses" (*l. c.*, p. 579): and he never mentions Müller's *Griechenlieder*, even in *Die Romantische Schule*.

The popular romantic drinking-song and *Wanderlied*, very frequent in Müller's poetry, are scarcely found at all in Heine's; so too with the pious note of Müller's little cycle *Johannes und Esther*. Müller's poems swarm with stereotyped lyric figures, such as the miller and the miller's lass, hunter, gardener, musician, postillion, innkeeper's daughter, watchman, apprentice, and so on; of all these figures, only the knight, boatman, fisher-lass, and shepherdess play any part in Heine's poetry. Heine prefers original types, like the æsthetic tea-table of *Intermezzo* 50, or the lieutenants and ensigns of *Heimkehr* 66, to these conventional figures. In general, the *Rollenlied*, or stereotyped character lyric, which is the prevailing form with Müller, is not at all characteristic of Heine. So, too, Heine generally ex-

6 s indicates assonance instead of rhyme.

7 Including only such as are not merely reduplications of four-line stanzas.

presses direct personal experience, while Müller for the most part works up conventional sentiments and motifs. The similarity in the treatment of nature by the two poets is doubtless due largely to common influences, especially the influence of the *Volkslied;* but here, too, the coincidences to be noted later indicate that Heine's usage was affected to some extent by his reading of Müller's poems. As poets of the sea, Heine and Müller appear to have been practically independent of each other.[8]

In this connection, the fact may be noted that the "pathetic fallacy" seems to have dawned upon Heine as an effective poetic device just at the time when he became acquainted with Müller's lyrics, in which this romantic postulation of sympathy between man and nature is a characteristic note; and even the formal parallel between the life of nature and the life of the soul, to which Elster refers as a peculiarity of Heine's style that rarely appears elsewhere, is to be found in many of Müller's lyrics.[9]

The most impressive evidence of the influence Müller's lyrics had upon Heine is to be found in the many echoes of motifs and turns of speech from Müller in Heine's poetry. The following list of striking parallels, eliminating all mere lyric commonplaces, will indicate the character and extent of this influence. The danger and difficulty of operating with such parallels is obvious; I have tried to minimize the risk of false conclusions by forming a sufficient background for this comparison, a background consisting of the lyric poetry of Goethe, Tieck, A. W. Schlegel, Brentano, Uhland, Eichendorff, the *Wunderhorn*, Büsching and v. d. Hagen, *Sammlung deutscher Volkslieder*, Berlin, 1807, and Ziska and Schottky's *Österreichische Volkslieder*, Pesth, 1819. For Müller's lyrics, quoted from the two-volume edition by Max Müller, Brockhaus, 1868, the date of first publication is given; for Heine's, quoted from Elster's edition, the date of composition, and in case of doubt with an interrogation point.[10]

The argument for the influence of Müller upon Heine in the passages to be quoted rests upon the following facts: that there is no corresponding similarity with all the mass of other lyric poetry studied; that the parallel passages, almost without exception, appear in Müller's poetry earlier than in Heine's; that the coincident passages in Heine's verse belong almost exclusively to the years 1821–24, or are later echoes from these years, the very ones for which Heine testifies to Müller's influence upon him. In a few isolated cases the dates indicate either mere chance coincidence or the possible influence of Heine upon Müller. A few of the parallels here given were noted previously by Karl Hessel, *Zeitschrift für den deutschen Unterricht* iii, 47ff., and P. S. Allen, *Journal of Germanic Philology* iii, 35ff.

Before passing to Müller's poems, let us note a striking parallel with a passage from his book of travels *Rom, Römer und Römerinnen*, 1820. It is pretty certain that Heine read this book just before starting on his walk through the Harz; for he made a study of books of Italian travel after his return to Göttingen early in 1824 (Goedeke, Grundriss, 1st ed., iii, 449), and he shows his acquaintance with this particular book, as well as with Müller's letters to *Hermes* in 1821, by special reference to them in his *Italien* (Elster, iii, 266). The passage in question is a lyric outburst of Müller as he turns from a subject grown tedious to the freedom of nature:

". . . und so will ich Dich denn heute in freier, grüner Natur für das trockene Feld schadlos halten, das Du . . . mit mir durchwandelt hast. Auf die Berge wollen wir steigen und uns umschauen in der blühenden Gegend: wir wollen in die Hütte des Landmannes treten, nach seinen Geschäften ihn befragen und von seinen Früchten kosten. . . (p. 113).

Here Heine seems to have found the thrice repeated keynote of the Prologue to his

8 The Vineta question in its larger aspect—the sunken city in legend and in the works of Heine, Müller, and others—must be reserved for another study. It need only to be stated here that Müller's *Vineta*, which first appeared in the autumn of 1826, was of course unknown to Heine when he wrote his *Seegespenst* in 1825; and that, though Heine quotes Müller's *Vineta* in his *Nordsee* iii (Elster iii, 102), his own conception of the sunken city remained unaffected by it.

9 Elster, *Heinrich Heines Buch der Lieder*, Hellbronn 1887, p. xx, lxxvii; P. S. Allen in the *Journal of Germanic Philology*, iii, 71.

10 Gedd.=Gedichte; Hk.=Heimkehr; L. I.=Lyrisches Intermezzo; N. F.=Neuer Frühling; Rom.=Romanzen.

*Harzreise:* "Auf die Berge will ich steigen, Wo die frommen Hütten stehen, Wo die Brust sich frei erschliesset Und die freien Lüfte wehen." The same keynote is sounded again in the poem Elster ii, 69, originally in the *Harzreise:* Auf die Berge will ich steigen, Auf die schroffen Felsenhöhn.

JOHN SCHOLTE NOLLEN.

*Iowa College.*

---

## *ALFRED'S SOLILOQUIES AND CYNEWULF'S CHRIST.*

THERE is at least one passage in the *Soliloquies* which suggests acquaintance with the *Christ*. It is that near the beginning of Book III, where Alfred is discussing the future condition of the righteous and the wicked, and especially the increase of happiness and misery due in each case to the sight of the other band. This obviously resembles *Chr.* 1234 ff. It might be presupposed that we are prevented from assuming direct borrowing by Alfred, by the fact that Gregory the Great (*Patr. Lat.* 76. 1308), and perhaps other Fathers, had developed the thought, which in the last analysis no doubt goes back to the story of the rich man and Lazarus. What strengthens the probability, however, of borrowing from the *Christ*, is the occurrence of certain words in both passages. Thus, *wuldor* and *wīte:* (*Chr.*) *wuldor* 1243; *wīte*, 1249, 1269, 1292; (*Sol.*) *wuldor*, 65. 11, 22, 23; *wite* 65. 12, 15, 18, 19, 21, 23 (I quote from Mr. Henry L. Hargrove's forthcoming edition). So (*ge*)*sēoð: Chr.* 1244, 1253, 1256, 1270, 1285, 1291, 1300; *Sol.* 65. 14, 16, 19. With *þā hwīle þe hī on þisse weorulde wēron* (*Sol.* 65. 13) cf. the sentences beginning with *þenden* (*-an*): *Chr.* 590, 597, 772, 800, 814, 817, 1325, 1574, 1579, 1583. But perhaps the most striking parallel is suggested by *Sol.* 55. 23: *ǣlc hefð be hys gearnunge swā wīte, swā wuldor, swæðer hē on byð.* This recalls *Chr.* 595–6: *swā wīte, . . . swā wuldor, . . . swā him lēofre bið tō gefremmanne.* We have the combination again, it is true, in *Soul and Body* 7–8: *swā wīte, swā wuldor, swā him in worulde ǣr efne þæt eorðfæt ǣr geworhte.* On the question of Cynewulfian parallels compare those adduced in my article on the Wærferth preface in MOD. LANG. NOTES 17. 7 ff.

A peculiar combination of *ǣr* and *æfter* is found in our text and in the *Judith*. *Sol.* 55. 26 has: *ǣlc hæfð be þām andefnum þe hē ær æfter earnað;* and *Jud.* 65: *swylcne hē ǣr æfter worhte.*

ALBERT S. COOK.

*Yale University.*

---

## *CHAUCER'S 'bees.'*

"Next, o'er his books his eyes began to roll,
In pleasing memory of all he stole,
How here he sipp'd, how there he plunder'd snug,
And suck'd all o'er, like an industrious bug."
*The Dunciad* i, 127–130.

A contributor of *Notes and Queries* for May 17, 1851 (p. 387), because of "the incongruity of the terms 'sipp'd' and 'industrious' as applied to 'bug', argues that "Pope may have originally written this passage with the words 'free' and 'bee', as the rhymes of the last two lines." This is an uncalled for elutriation, not an elucidation, of the text. It serves, however, to call to mind the curious text-history of line 353 of Chaucer's *Parlement of Foules*, which is well told by Prof. Lounsbury (*Studies in Chaucer* i, 242 f.). "There can be scarcely any doubt that *flyes* was what Chaucer wrote," says Prof. Lounsbury (although he had previously received *bees* into the text of his edition of the poem). Chaucer 'withouten doute' wrote *flyes*, but why? The answer, though simple, may be worth a moment's attention.

The modern reader must be reminded of the obsolete generic use of *fly*, 'any winged insect; as the bee, gnat, locust, moth, etc.' [*N. E. D.*], with which is to be compared the use of French *mouche*. In Chaucer's day it was common to use not only the specific name, as *bee* (cf. French *abeille*, and Old French *e* pl. *es*), but also the particularized generic name, as 'the fly that maketh the honey' (cf. *He is ase þe smale ulȝe þet makeþ þet hony. Ayenb.* 136, quoted in *N. E. D.; these flyinge flyes that we clepen been.* Chaucer, *Boeth.* iii, metr. vii; also *The Parson's Tale* 469), which is also paralleled in

French by *mouche à miel* (cf. *Des eeps qui font le miel . . . Les mouches qui font le miel qu'on appelle eeps.* Bout., *Somme rur*, quoted by Godefroy *s. v. e.*). English and French are at present interestingly contrasted in the exclusive use of *bee* and the preferred (almost exclusive) use of *mouche à miel;* when the reference is clear, *mouche* without modification may signify *abeille:*

> "Un jour Charlot par hasard
> Se voit piqué d'une *abeille*
> . . . . . .
> Mais les *mouches*, dès l'instant."

The fifteenth century scribes who changed Chaucer's *flyes* into *foules* (and thence into *briddes*) committed merely a common blunder of the eye. In a catalogue of *foules* the unexpected word *flyes*, because of a general resemblance in written form to *foules*, was misread without a thought of the context. But one may also keep in mind that the way was now preparing for the acceptance of the new generic names, Latin *insecta* (pl.), *insect* and Welsh *bug* (cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, xvii, cols. 60, 61). On this point the *N. E. D.* gives the significant references, although it may be added that in 1530 Palsgrave defines the specific '*bee*' by the old generic '*fly*' (Ellis, *E. E. P.* p. 77), and that there is a lingering of this generic use in *Ecclesiasticus* xi, 3: "The bee is little among such as fly; but her fruit is the chief of sweet things." And finally our *Dunciad*-commentator reminds us of the specialized sense in England of *bug*, in consequence of which, it will be remembered, Mr. Bug successfully petitioned to have his name changed into Mr. "Norfolk-Howard."

JAMES W. BRIGHT.

---

## *FRENCH LITERATURE.*

*Pulcinella & C.*, par HENRY LYONNET. Avec une Préface de GUSTAVE LARROUMET, Membre de l'Institut. Ouvrage illustré de 50 photogravures. Paris: Société d'éditions littéraires et artistiques, Librairie Paul Ollendorff, 1901 (*Le Théâtre Napolitain: Le Théâtre hors de France*, quatrième série).

IN that passage of extraordinarily brilliant imagination, remarkable verbal power, and concentrated dramatic history which, under the name of *Venise la nuit: l'Enterrement de Watteau*, the Goncourts have incorporated in their *Pages retrouvées* and reproduced to close their *L'Italie d'hier*, they have incidentally given a descriptive and picturesque catalogue of the types long associated with the Italian stage and largely transferred to the drama of other countries. There are Pierrot descended from Pedrolino and Sganarelle (made by Molière out of the Zan(n)i into Zanarelle); there are Flautino and Lelio the lover and Sylvia the stock sweetheart; there are Fricasso and Fracasso, (Ja-) Coviello and Fracisquina and Cassandro; Brighella and Spezzafer, Colombine, Trastullo, and Lucia; Maramao, Cardoni, Zerbinnetta, Violetta and Narcissino; Cocodrillo, Cucurucu, and Cucurogna, Tartaglia, Fenocchio, Fiqueto, Scapin, and Zerbino; Gian-Fritello, Gian-Farina, Franca-Trippa, Beltrame, Gradelino, Tracagnino, Traffaldino, Arlequino, Razulto, Pantaleone, the Bolognese Doctor, Mezzetino, and Scaramuccia; Giangurgolo and Spavento; and there were the

> "triumphs of Pulcinello, straight as his beaver, having a great air in spite of his red nose and his little pointed paunch, proudly brandishing his wooden sabre, astride, more solemn than a Balbus, upon a Pulcinello crosswise carried by two Pulcinelli."

Nor is this all. For, as M. Lyonnet brings to notice in the course of his happily-wrought history rediscovering and showing the resurrected Pulcinella, whom he had been told had been relegated and was dead, many other types have been or still are prevalent, even if often reduced from their pristine prestige, popularity, or political power: Gianduja of Turin; Girolamo of Milan; Stenterello of Florence; the Guappo and the very modern Don Felice of Naples; the Rugantino, Felicetto, D. Anselmo (Tartaglia), Baldassare, Palummella (Colombine), not to speak of Sarchiapone and the less generalized Pascariello and Sciosciammocca; of temporary types like Don Fastidio; or of the classification by characters and not names as in the *amorosa*, *prima* and *seconda donna*, *servetta*, *sciocco*, *amoroso*, *buffo*, *caratterista*, *biscegliese*, and others.

Such an array gives force to the particular treatment of the Neapolitan Theatre with which M. Lyonnet has continued his series of studies upon the *Theatre in Spain*, the *Theatre in Portugal*, the *Theatre in Italy*, and volumes dealing with *Historical and Literary Excursions* (*Italy*, *Switzerland*, *Belgium*, and *Spain*), and *Across Unknown Spain*. The books upon these dramas are written with a reverse of usual methods. Professionally, M. Lyonnet is not a man of letters, but a man of affairs. His books deal not with dramatic theory but with practice. And his comparative criticisms have all the greater value as from one who has so fully studied the older and seen and stated the more modern manifestations of the stage in the Latin nations. He supplements these studies of dramatic data by historical, topographical, and anecdotical proofs, and so produces with the acumen of a trained business mind, the terseness of the experienced traveler, and the literary flavor of a lover of books and of a student of previous information where accessible in print or in tradition, a volume unconventional, delightful, and distinctly a permanent contribution to the knowledge of a theme of much interest in itself and of much importance to cosmopolitan dramatic literature. Upon these matters M. Lyonnet has shed much light. He has written the first complete history of the subject. He has brought together the conditions of the problem—as to the past and the perpetuation of Pulcinella—and its place in dramatic art. And he has beautifully proved the perfect compatibility of commercialism and culture, which he had already shown and still illustrates as *Directeur de la Revue Universelle Internationale Illustrée* in Geneva, and constant contributor to *l'Intermédiare des Chercheurs et Curieux*, the French *Notes and Queries* in which he is an authority, and to other historical publications.

The interest in Pulcinella, then, is due to many factors, not the least of which is his heredity. There is another contrast of the fat and the lean than the eternal one of Alain Chartier's *Débat du gras et du maigre*, or of pecuniary plethora and poverty so well represented in the typicism of Zola's *Ventre de Paris*. There is the antithesis under similarity of sentiment. And so existed Maccus and Bucco, the pivots of the antique Atellane art, the country clowns of classical Campania. Maccus, the meagre, and Bucco, the bloated, are brothers in physical desires and psychical qualities. Both are braggarts and cowards, conceited and cringing, simple and sly, inane and witty, liars and licentious, thieves and terrific trenchermen. Compounded now of the fat of the one, now with the famished form of the other, from these Pulcinella descends. But he is more the scion of Maccus than of Bucco. M. Lyonnet gives the proofs of this. From Maccus Pulcinella gets the humped back, the hooked nose, and the huge paunch. The *pivetta* of Maccus is perpetuated as the *pratique*, or whistle, of Pulcinella. Maccus was the *mimus albus*. Pulcinella wears the large white collarless blouse, wide white trousers, white shoes, pointed white hat, black skull-cap (Maccus was close shaven), and the half-mask of glazed leather[1] with hooked nose, a costume changed only when, representing another than himself, he adds a garment or wears a head-covering associated with his new character. The very simplicity of the garment is a proof of age, and of an origin near to the populace; the smock frock of the peasant, the laws which forbade variegated garments to the lower classes, the working blouse of to-day, all these are predicated by the persistent tenure of Pulcinella's theatrical costume. And, as the coarse clowns of Roman farce used Oscan or Italic dialects, so Pulcinella alone in the plays wherein he appears uses the Neapolitan dialect in contrast with the pure or perverted Tuscan of the other types. While, still further as collateral proofs of conservatism is the parallel drawn by M. Lyonnet between the Pompeii of the past and the Naples of the present, seen in the shops and homes of one room opening upon the street, as in the *bassi* of Naples; in the niche for protecting divinity transformed into the lighted Madonna or saint shrine of square, or corner, or building, or home; in the funerals of multiplied musics and mourners now become extraordinary processions of gaily-colored banners,

1 Cf. Molière's original use of the *masque*, subsequently relinquished, in playing Mascarille (*maschera*, *mascarilla*).

gildings, plumes, penitents, charity children, and hired weepers of both sexes in traditional costumes, a sad Saturnalia, a lurid accompaniment of garrulous and gesticulatory grief.

It is in this sense that Pulcinella has not merely hereditary dramatic interest, but a historical one as well. He is a type. He incarnates Naples. As says M. Lyonnet:

"Pulcinella, let it be known well once for all, is born between Santa Lucia and the Porta Capuana. He is Neapolitan from head to foot, and all the attempts made to drive him from home will fail."

He is localized in Naples and has not even strayed or stayed in other Italian spots. The French Polichinelle, his nearest relative, is very different.

"Let us leave Polichinelle to France, Punch to England, Hanswurst to Germany, Toneelgek to Holland, Don Christoval Pulichinella to Spain, Karagheus to Turkey."

For these are not inherently the same as Pulcinella, but only superficially imitative.

M. Lyonnet's work is thus a commentary upon a country (one recalls the Kingdom of Naples) represented in a dramatic character, and so has a value as reflecting with remarkable vividness the constitution of its civic life and the characteristic of its people called by the author "the most restless, the most noisy, the most exuberant of the earth." Violent and vivacious, gay and goodnatured, quick and quarrelsome, a mimic and a mocker, a born comedian and a perspicacious critic of human nature, the Neapolitan passes the larger part of his life upon the pavement, and it is this life which M. Lyonnet has made into a brilliant and vivid series of pictures showing the spectacles of the streets and having a sociological bearing. There are the vendors of petty wares and various foods who often lend animation to the plays showing Neapolitan life. There are the stated feasts of gigantic gluttony, prepared by daily payments for months to some prospective purveyor, and the incredible amounts disposed of then, or devoured upon the stage in realistic style. There are the festivals of the Madonna del Arco and of Piedigrotta, marvelous popular excursions of international reputation. There are the theatres varying in size from the largest—the *San Carlo*—to the smallest—*la Fenice*—in Europe, and upon their history and importance M. Lyonnet has touched. There are the same things existing described by Dumas two generations ago in the *Corricolo*, and which so clearly differentiate the Neapolitan from other natives of Italy. There is the Lottery which nets the Government more than thirty million lire annually, and the *Smorfia* which gives a number for twenty-two thousand words covering the catalogue of every concrete case or abstract idea in human possibility. And as illustration M. Lyonnet quotes from *Roma*, a Neapolitan newspaper:

"The drawing of yesterday, at Frattamaggiore has been providential for that town and the environs, because all the families, from the richest to the poorest, had played the numbers 26–37–71 with reference to a ridiculous accident befallen the priest while he was saying the mass. The winnings rose to an enormous height. 26 represents the mass; 37 the priest; 71 the colic. At Frattamaggiore and Afragola this triplet came out five hundred and thirty-seven times and brought more than a million to the players. Never was colic more fatal to Italian finances."

There are also the two hundred and eight Fraternities, associations for mutual benefits or burials, whose origin dates from the tenth century, and whose members in variegated garments, play such a part in the life of the people. There is the *Camorra* which has been such a terror in Naples, and which has reacted upon not merely the drama but the literature.

'La Camorra, mot dont les romanciers fantaisistes ont tant usé et abusé, de telle sorte que l'on se fait, hors de Naples, une idée très vague de ce que ce mot veut dire, n'est en somme, comme on l'a définie souvent, que l'exploitation du faible par le fort, du lâche par l'homme courageux, du travailleur par l'oisif: figurez-vous une vaste association avec chefs, sous-chefs, etc., organisée en vue d'opérations diverses de chantage, avec coups de couteau tout prêts à l'adresse des récalcitrants, et dont tous les membres ont juré l'obéissance passive. "La Camorra, a écrit M. Marcellin Pellet à qui j'ai recours toutes les fois que j'ai besoin de faits précis, a joué un rôle considérable dans l'histoire de Naples, même dans son histoire littéraire. Les romans de Francesco Mastriani nous la montrent à l'œuvre, surtout son livre *I Vermi, studii storici sulle classi pericolose in Napoli*, consacré à l'étude des camorristes,

des vagabonds, des forçats, des mendiants et des prostituées. Des romans de Mastriani ou la vie des bouges est si bien prise sur le vif, on a tiré des drames populaires comme la *Spigaiola di Pendino*, la *Pettinatrice di San Giovanni a Carbonara* ou la *Medea di Porta Medina*. M. G. Cognetti avec ses drames *A Basso Porto*, *A Santa Lucia*, *la Mala Vita*, mieux écrits, mais non moins bien observés, a mis également les camorristes sur les planches. Dans les théâtres napolitains on applaudit ces scènes de mœurs locales avec autant de passion que les farces de Pulcinella." '[2]

This will explain what M. Lyonnet has said elsewhere:

"Woman in the Neapolitan drama, as moreover in Neapolitan life, occupies so small a place that she does not count."

And everywhere are songs and shrill cries and shouts and shrieks of laughter, and baskets for filling by passing merchants sliding and shooting from the upper regions upon the head of the wayfarer, and everywhere a mixture of lazy people and *lazzi* and *lazzaroni*, of sacred and profane contrasts, and an atmosphere of music and masques and *maccheroni*. And the pivot of play, the pride of populace, with a power and a presence permeating the most densely peopled and perhaps most illiterate (40 per cent of conscripts; 56 in Campania, 67 in Salerno, and the women, worse) city in Europe, stands Pulcinella, type of the *popolano*, lover of the hot-spiced and highly-smelling *pizzaiuolo*, idol and incarnation of the sensual, superstitious, inconsequential, turbulent, goodnatured, dangerous, impulsive, patient, and perpetually fascinating Neapolitan.

*Pulliciniello*, *Policinella*, *Pulicinella*, *Polecenella*, *Pullecinella*, *Pulcinella*, or *Pulcinello* appears in the sixteenth century as a name, and even in the fifteenth as Joan Polcinella (and other forms are *Pulecenella*, *Puleceniello*). As a stage type he is assigned to Silvio Fiorillo—the famous *Capitan Matamoros*—by his contemporary Cecchini—the great *Frittellino*—and by others. But arguments against Fiorillo's being its "inventor" are that he is never represented as in the character; that his son Scaramouche never played it; that the type scarcely appears in the Italian troupes in France; that even in Molière, as in the intermezzo of the *Malade imaginaire*, he is merely substituted for the Pedant (cf. Moland: *Molière et la comédie italienne*); and that as Maurice Sand (*Masques et Bouffons*) says and M. Lyonnet thinks, Fiorillo restored the character

"and entrusted the role to Andrea Calcese, called *Ciuccio*, who imitated to perfection the accent and the manners of the peasants of Acerra, near Naples."

With the theory of Pulcinella's name one is even more at sea. M. Lyonnet quotes Maurice Sand:

"The specialty of Maccus was to imitate with the mouth the cry of birds and the puling of pullets, by means of a sort of call which became the *pratique*, the *sgherlo* or *pivetta*. . . . Maccus was thus surnamed, because of his cries of frightened fowl, perhaps also because of his nose like a beak and his odd walk (long-limbed, round-shouldered, bulging-stomached) *Pullus gallinaceus*, then, by contraction, *Pulcino*, and *Pulcinella*."

M. Lyonnet adds:

"However this may be, I infinitely prefer this version to that of the abbé Galiani, which makes this name come from a certain Puccio d'Aniello, villager with a comic face, with long nose, who in the seventeenth century made the fine days of a troupe of perambulating comedians in Campania."

Yet does this do full justice to the possibilities? Galiani was both *littérateur* and learned. More, he was a Neapolitan. And in that time, when things were thoughtlessly accepted and yet traditions persisted, when attempts at accuracy of investigation were swamped by the mass of details and prevented by the impossibility of consulting archives, the incomplete tabulation of materials, or the lurid light reflected from the coming Revolution and subverting society and study, it would be strange had the antiquarian *abbate* been vulgarly misled, or had he invented an inanity of superficial linguistic science. Besides, the bridge from actual peasant Puccio to historical actor of

2 *Naples contemporaine*, la Camorra, p. 80 et suiv.—Voir aussi: La *Camorra* par Marc Monnier, Florence, 1862.—La *Camorra, studio di sociologia criminale*, par G. Allongi, Turin, 1890.—*Usi e costumi dei Camorristi* par M. le Docteur A. De Blasio, fondateur du bureau anthropométrique de la préfecture de Naples avec préface de Cesare Lombroso, Naples, L. Pierro, 1897.—Catalogue Emilio Prass, Naples, 1898, p. 10 et suiv. (Note of M. Lyonnet).

peasants Ciuccio is not so wide either in sound, or in style of art. And there is no reason entirely to discard the tradition of the gay and witty villager beating at repartee the strolling band of passing players of whose *lazzi* he became leader.

Nor does M. Lyonnet mention other derivations which have been assigned. If *Pulcino* is a diminutive for *pullet*, and so an affectionate or other nickname, or an abbreviation to an inferior, one recalls that Pulcinella is the part of a servant, and with the trait of fidelity which cements affection. Thy servant may not be a dog; but he may be a cheerful chicken. The reference might be solely to the chicken-beak-nose. And if Pulcinella be accepted as "hen-chicken," the reference is to the squealing, nasal, shrill voice, and the timid character well expressed by the feminine termination seen in Pulcinella. But still further, *Policinello* may have sprung from the *pulex* of the past. Many reasons would seem to suggest this: 1. "Little Flea" as a term of semi-affection type is as plausible as the similar use of the names of other animals for diminutives of attachment, or as sportive sobriquets. Again, 2, the prominent proboscis of the flea or its puce-coloring may have been assimilated with the suggestive nose or the mask of the player. So, 3, affinity might have arisen between the biting character of the insect and the caustic remarks of the actor. Still further, 4, the characteristic of the type is his agility and activity, his suppleness and spring. Now Naples, like Italy, is famous for its fleas. What more simple than a mediæval creation based upon such facts, in a place where nickname and characteristic coalesce at every turn, as in the surname of a great patron of the Pulcinello of his time, Ferdinand IV, called Nasone. For completeness the mere statement of these theories would have been in place in a book within whose short compass has been crowded the discussion of such a very large number of facts. Some of these may be indicated: sketches of the long lives, the simplicity of living, and the playing and playwrighting of the pious and patriarchal men who have made themselves immortal *Punchinellos;* an idea of the prolific production of pieces connected with this particular stage—Altavilla printed a hundred plays—only a small portion of his work,—and M. Lyonnet quotes a man who told him that he had seen four hundred different Pulcinella plays; the large, if crude, work of Cerlone—the Goldoni of the Neapolitan theatre—and of Lorenzi, his more literary rival; the history not merely of the distinctly popular theatres, the *Nuovo* and *Fiorentini* and the little ones where Pulcinella reigns, but glimpses of those connected with high comedy and operetta; the non-technical character of this popular stage, direct inheritor of the *Commedia dell' arte* of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, practically devoid of stage scenery, without intrigue, without concatenation of circumstances, depending upon situations, and so, essentially popular (for the populace is not diplomatic but direct, and passion with it is not patience but promptness), and alone making possible the daily dual playing of perpetually changing pieces, where Pulcinella plays "a soggetto" and individually improvises; the hereditary office, the perpetuation of family fidelity to the stage, of dancing and dramatic dynasties such as the names of Cammarano, Petito, de Angelis,[3] and the present De Martino and Pantalena, with talent dominating the inconsistencies of their particular art; the connections with this stage for a musical moment, or the friendships for its players, of Lablache, Donizetti, Verdi and others; and in a delightful way is told in the first person, as is written the book, the bibliography of the theme, to which many foot-notes throughout add proofs of the author's scholarship.

So out of play, pantomine, or parody, contest of ephemeral incident and phase of permanent value, remains a large fund of interesting dramatic history, a gay yet caustic view of human nature, and a sequence of hereditary power of representation. M. Lyonnet, however, has discussed the other conditions obtaining in the modern dramatic status of Naples. He has devoted two chapters to the Popular Neapolitan Drama—the 'blood and

3 An interesting coincidence is suggested by the talent and reputation, so much appreciated in America, of Jefferson de Angelis. Mr. De Angelis kindly informs me that he knows of no positive connection with the Neapolitan family. The coincldence is all the more striking.

thunder' type, as seen in such plays as *The Foundation of the Camorra*, or *The Belle of the Porta Capuana*, melodramas and pictures of customs and codes.

Another chapter gives an admirable and witty description of the Christmas *Cantata of the Shepherds*, full of extraordinary puerilities and crudenesses, with costumes and setting as incongruous as those of mediæval representation (Adam and Eve in blue percaline upon which are sewed pink paper roses; Satan with worn black kid gloves; and a *pear*, showing traces of the bitings in a previous rehearsal, hanging from a *bamboo* tree to represent the holy and historic apple), and from which can be well gauged the old *Mysteries*. But particularly has M. Lyonnet set forth and, while praising the talent, scathed the methods of Eduardo Scarpetta, 'reformer' of the Neapolitan stage, inheritor of its traditions, bitter foe of Pulcinella, and who for more than twenty years has won fame and fortune by his adaptation of French plays, his translations called 'reductions,' his change of titles, his suppression of the authors' names, and his getting the credit and the cash for these Franco-Italianized comedies—of Scarpetta. The law of compensation holds here only partly. The French adaptations of Italian types or models in the earlier centuries were often different from persistent and bodily transfers. Judged independently of this rule, the success of Scarpetta, actor, manager, 'reducer,' is a tribute to French dramatic influence, duplicated in so many plays, and to French conception of human nature, applicable to universal conditions. It is also a new proof of generalizing power and of the creation of typical, even though specific individualities (most welcome to the type-trained Italian stage), which cannot but delight the lover of evidences of French intellectual power. Here M. Lyonnet becomes eloquent in his logical defense of Pulcinella banished by Scarpetta as antiquated, unnatural (so are all *masques* of old Italian comedy), and needing reformation (which Scarpetta makes by creating a new stock type, *Don Felice*, and by translating, translating, translating French plays, and changing old Neapolitan ones), while claiming that the suppression of the *masques*—who represent knaves, or bullies, or imbeciles—"is working for the good of the country," an argument which M. Lyonnet proves would rule out satire, reality, Molière, Goldoni, all the great dramatic authors as character-creators, or types like Tartuffe. As to *masques*, it is unnatural that a person may wear one, when all others speak open-facedly.

"In actual life, in history, we have never heard speak save of the Iron Mask which was led from citadel to fortress with a masque upon the face, and even then it is proved that this iron mask was of velvet."

But the masque is, first, a convention, and, second, a tradition. Suppress Pulcinella, and you suppress the entire Neapolitan stage

"of which he is the soul." He has "that flower of a special perfume which grows only at the foot of Vesuvius, the good, big gaiety of Pulcinella, child of the mole, whose originality charms me because above all it smacks of the soil." "Pulcinella is an institution."

He may be unreal. But if you reform him, be consistent.

"Is it natural, for example, that people who have a tongue in the mouth, should make great gestures, in the manner of deaf-mutes, to exchange their ideas?

No. Then we must suppress pantomime.

Is it natural that a person should smear his face in white, should dress in the same way, and should wear a black-skull cap?

No. Then we must suppress Pierrot (that is, the clown).

Is it natural that two lovers should adore each other in music and should repeat to each other for a quarter of an hour: *je t'aime, bonheur extrême*, etc., or that multitudes should vociferate without stirring: *let's run! let's leave!*

No. Then we must suppress the opera.

Is it natural that in the midst of a conversation some slightly clothed ladies should break in to dance a little cut?

No. Then we must suppress ballets.

Is it natural that an actor who has remained alone upon the stage should experience the need of expressing himself in a loud voice, should approach the footlights, wink and loll his tongue, seeming to confide in the public? Is it natural that, the play over, the principal personage, in spite of all verisimilitude, and following a custom superannuated and fortunately disappeared from our (France) midst, should address a word to the spectators to solicit their indulgence?

No. And yet things do not take place otherwise in your so-called reformed theatre, for love of truth.

Absurdity the masque of Pulcinella, absurdity the flour of Pierrot, the red cue of Gianduja, the wooden sword of Harlequin, the stuttering of Anselm, the thick utterance of Guignol, I grant it. But zounds! in all your reforms just leave me something original and amusing. It's with this system of unification pushed to excess that the inhabitants of the five parts of the world have arrived at all walking in dress coats and in silk hats and in being prodigiously bored in merely looking at each other."[4]

M. Lyonnet shows also other things: the influence of Mme. Matilde Serao of whose "Answers to Correspondents" in a newspaper, plying her *savoir-vivre* with childish questions as to conventionalities or proprieties, he gives an amusing account; the freedom from French formalism and functionaryism and the bane of the *bureau* in all things, which makes the theatre and life so much easier elsewhere than in France; the rapidity of representations without waits (partly due to the need of haste, since plays are given twice in succession in one evening, and greatly to the practical abolition of scene-shifting where such slight paraphernalia—principally a background—exist); the proofs (in the Pulcinella plays) of a 'popular' taste in that the piece is appreciated in proportion to the length of its title; in that the titles are extraordinarily picturesque; and in that these plays are amusing, non-psychological, episodic, naïve, and never descend to obscenity. M. Lyonnet also points out the interesting parallel between Pulcinella and Pierrot immortalized by the genius of Deburau and made literature by Champfleury, Gautier, and the book of Jules Janin; and the perpetuation of processes in playing which have three hundred years behind them, with other customs ranging from the call for unmasking before the play to the final "compliment" to the public followed by a little concert or vaudevilling. And in addition, he shows striking analogies and anticipations ranging from *Cyrano de Bergerac* to other lighter pieces of modern comedy; and the superficial character of this stage, rarely printed.

"One attaches—in Italy—so little importance to dramatic endeavors. The theatre is a place of rendez-vous, of conversations, of visits; very rarely a place of studies and of observations as with us (France)."

M. Lyonnet has produced a volume of extreme value and interest, and one which ranks him in scholarship and in sprightliness with the best and the most vivid histories due to authorities upon the subject. It is not a discussion of the dry details of dramatic construction and of theories of technique. But it is an acute and witty and 'living' treatment of a theme closely touching dramatic art at various times and in different countries. It is also a guide to specific modern conditions in a given time and place. As M. Larroumet so well states it in closing his introduction:

"Without apparatus of erudition or pretension of any sort, he gives us an exact and complete study upon one of the most popular and the most curious types of the universal theatre. Are there many books more majestic and of higher aims of which as much might be said?"

We have the hope that M. Lyonnet will do several things: give us books particularly upon the Russian and the other forms (Czech, Hungarian) of the Slav stage. And that he will come to America and give us his skilled and trained impressions of our own drama, which will be long—if it ever does so—before nationalizing. It is not imported British Ballets, nor falsified "French Folly." Our material is large and amply suggestive. There are tales from the times of the Argonauts to the lives of fisher folk, Cape Cod or other. There are types from the Creoles to Canadians. There is the drama of war (*Shenandoah*). There is the New England play (*The Old Homestead, Way Down East*). There are *Colorado* and the cow-boy. There are Texas Terrors. There is the middle ground of *In Mizzoura*. There is *Uncle Tom's Cabin* and the inevitable play of the future upon race questions. There are our own society and sociological problems presenting themselves. And there are the dramatizations which will yet come, of much in Cooper or upon the Indian. A study by M. Lyonnet of our purely American stage would

[4] Cf. in *Charles Demailly* of the Goncourts a somewhat similar phrase, speaking of the eighteenth century and its colored clothes:

"Et que diable veux-tu, Franchemont, que l'homme soit gai avec un habit noir? Dans ce temps-là, le vêtement riait avant l'homme; aujourd'hui, il pleure d'avance. . . Drôle d'idée, d'avoir mis la vie en deuil! . . ."

be exceedingly valuable, and the more as seen by practiced outside eyes. And because of the critical and historical power, with rare vivacity, which he has so well shown, we willingly place ourselves in his hands.

A. GUYOT CAMERON.

*Princeton University.*

---

## *DANTE.*

*Strenna Dantesca:* Compilata da ORAZIO BACCI e G. L. PASSERINI. Firenze, Anno Primo, 1902.

AMID the many discouraging things in respect to the social, political and industrial condition of Italy to-day, it is with sincere pleasure that we note the successful founding, in recent years, of two societies, both taking their name from the great Florentine poet. The one, *La Società Dante Alighieri* founded in 1890, is patriotic and practical in its objects, and especially aims at the preservation of the Italian language beyond the borders of Italy, and the protection of Italian emigrants and laborers abroad. The growth of this society has been very rapid, the number of members now amounting to nine millions. *La Società Dantesca Italiana*,—on the other hand, is of a more distinctly literary character, its object being to spread and increase the knowledge of Dante, and to prepare a critical edition of the *Divina Commedia*, and the minor works. As is well-known a beginning has been made in respect to the latter, by the definitive edition of the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* by Prof. Pio Rajna. All Dante scholars are looking forward with peculiar interest to the critical edition of the *Divina Commedia*, which in spite of the multitude of books on Dante, still remains a desideratum. Of more interest to the general public in Italy are the popular lectures on the *Divina Commedia* instituted by the *Società Dantesca*, in Florence, Rome, and elsewhere, distinguished professors and scholars, such as Del Lungo, Mazzoni, Rajna and others, being invited to interpret the various cantos.

One of the results of the success of these two societies is the publication of a small annual volume called *Strenna Dantesca*, under the editorial management of the well-known Dante scholars Orazio Bacci and G. L. Passerini. This little book contains a *Calendario Dantesco*,—with appropriate quotations from Dante or with historical notes, under each day of the year; the latter running as far back as the events of Dante's own life, and at the same time recording such recent events as the death of Scartazzini (February 12, 1901), and the inauguration of the Dante lectures in Rome (February 24, 1901).

Then follows a rather promiscuous collection of brief articles, notes on Dante's life, an extract from Gabriele D'Annunzio's *Francesca da Rimini*, a bibliography of Dante literature for 1901, an account of the founding of the *Società Dantesca*, a report of the twelfth Congress of the *Società Dante Alighieri*, and several brief essays by Del Lungo, D'Ovidio, and D'Ancona. There are also a number of poems on Dante by poets ancient and modern, including Boccaccio, Michel Angelo, Pucci, Alfieri, Carducci. The sonnet of the latter is of especial interest in its frank avowal of Atheism.

> Per me Lucia non prega e non la bella
> Matilda appresta il salutar lavacro,
> e Beatrice con l'amante sacro
> in vano sale a Dio di stella in stella.
> Odio il tuo santo impero; e la corona
> divelto con la spada avrei di testa
> a 'l tuo buon Federico in val d'Olona.
> Son chiesa e impero una ruina mesta
> Cui sorvola il tuo canto e a'l ciel risona:
> Muor Giove, e l'inno del poeta resta.

OSCAR KUHNS.

*Wesleyan University.*

---

## *SPANISH LITERATURE.*

*El Capitán Veneno*, por PEDRO DE ALARCÓN. Edited with notes and vocabulary by J. D. M. FORD, Instructor in Romance Languages in Harvard University. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1899.

*El Capitán Veneno*, por PEDRO DE ALARCÓN. Edited by G. G. BROWNELL, Professor of Romance Languages, University of Alabama. New York: American Book Company, 1901.

SINCE I agree entirely with the sentiment ex-

pressed by Prof. Heller in the January number of MOD. LANG. NOTES, that "if the critics would only do their worst, the editors might do their best," I have thought it worth while to go somewhat carefully through the two books above mentioned, and venture to point out some improvements that might be made in a future edition. Since Prof. Brownell's work appeared some two years later than Dr. Ford's, it is a matter of surprise that it contains errors that might have been avoided by a reference to the earlier edition. Every editor should adopt the *mot* of Molère, "Je prends mon bien où je le trouve," and so surpass the work of his predecessor instead of falling below it in quality.

*El Capitán Veneno* is an excellent story to put into the hands of students of the Spanish language, and the fact that both editors have supplied vocabularies indicate that the text is intended for early reading, and in this case it is not well to take anything for granted with pupils except the most elementary grammatical principles. This being the case, it seems to me that both editors have been guilty of some sins of omission. The references below are to Brownell's edition, because there is more to be said about it than about Ford's, which is genarally quite correct.

P. 23, l. 13: This use of *sea* should have been noted; also as used, p. 46, l. 11. P. 30, l. 26: *Cuidadito* is given in the vocabulary as the dim. of *cuidado*, but we are given no hint of its peculiar meaning. As a matter of fact, it is a stronger term than *cuidado*. P. 37, l. 20: Both editors give us a more or less exact equivalent for *echar su cuarto á espadas*, but neither one translates or explains it, which should have been done. P. 38, l. 14: *perito agrónomo* can not mean "surveyor," but 'skilled agriculturist.' P. 40, l. 7: *Dado que*, as a conjunction, needs mention in the vocabulary. It occurs several times in the text. P. 42, l. 3: Ford's definition of *cordón* is correct but Brownell's is not. P. 43, l. 13: Brownell defines *sumaria* as "verbal process," which is not English. At least it is not found in the ordinary English dictionary. Ford's definition is too prolix. It here means simply 'law suit,' or 'trial.' P. 43, l. 30: Such expressions as *pasar por las armas* should have been defined under the first word, not under the last; a fault of frequent occurrence. P. 48, l. 26: Both editors would have done well to say that *con que* means 'so then,' 'therefore.' Neither gives a satisfactory explanation of *acusar las cuarenta*, which should have a note. At the bottom of page 49 we are referred to the vocabulary for an explanation of *tomarse cariño*, but the explanation is wanting. P. 51, l. 16: *Volver loco* does not mean "go crazy," but 'drive crazy.' P. 52, l. 20: It looks as if both editors had mistaken the meaning of *lo trae como á un zarandillo*. Ford defines *zarandillo* as "winnowing fan," "frisky person." Brownell says "small flail," "lively person." It really means 'small sieve' (dim. of *zaranda*), and the phrase means 'to make one skip about as if shaken in a sieve.' P. 57, l. 16: *Alma de Dios* is given various renderings, all unsatisfactory. "In God's name" would answer for all occasions.

P. 57, l. 31, and p. 86, l. 14: *Doblemos esa hoja*, according to Brownell, can only mean "let us fold this leaf," whereas it really means 'let us turn over a new leaf;' that is, 'let us change the subject.' P. 59, l. 4: *Caramba* is defined merely as an "exclamation," just as if all exclamations had the same meaning. Similar criticism applies to various other words. P. 70, l. 3: Neither editor tells us that *el mes de las flores* is May, although, it is true, it might be inferred from Ford's note. In the same line Brownell defines *víspera* as "evening." It should have been "eve." *Antevíspera* is said to mean "the day before yesterday," which makes no sense in this passage. P. 72, l. 2: *la de Dios es Cristo* should have been more fully explained in both books. P. 72, l. 21: If Brownell had followed Ford in explaining *reo en capilla*, his explanation would have been more satisfactory. Near the bottom of page 76 the explanation referred to under *haber* is lacking. The force of the last note on page 79 is not apparent, since the imperfect could not have been used here. P. 80, l. 13: *De* after *mirada* should be omitted. Both editors would have done well by explaining more fully the meaning of *Rodrigo en la horca*, below. P. 81, l. 20: Neither book has a satisfactory explanation of *dale que dale*. P. 84, l. 26: The note supplies *angustias*, but we are no where

told what this word means. P. 85, l. 10: Neither book tell us that *por algo* means 'for good reasons.' P. 90: The pupil might well wonder how the editors expected him to find out the meaning of the words at the head of the last chapter.

O. B. SUPER.

*Dickinson College.*

---

## *ITALIAN LITERATURE.*

*La Locandiera*, by GOLDONI, with introduction, notes and vocabulary by Prof. J. GEDDES, JR., Ph. D., and Dr. F. M. JOSSELYN, JR., of Boston University: Boston, D. C. Heath and Co., 1901. 12mo, pp. vii, 114.

TEACHERS and students of Italian will welcome this convenient and attractive edition of a text admirably adapted for practical use. While, in the opinion of the present reviewer, modern language texts with special vocabularies are undesirable for college classes which have passed the elementary stage, they are serviceable in beginning a language, since they enable a class to take up reading early. For this purpose, *La Locandiera* is all that could be desired, and this edition gives enough assistance, but not too much, for students who have had a few preliminary lessons in Italian grammar. The editors should, however, have indicated in the vocabulary the gender at least of words like *affare*, *amore*, *arte*, *cenere*; and in this connection the query may be permitted whether such a vocabulary should not pay some attention to pronunciation. Either the student must continually refer to a dictionary—and in this case he could dispense with the vocabulary—or else he must depend entirely on the teacher for help in pronunciation. He cannot be expected always to guess correctly the pronunciation of such words as these, taken from *La Locandiera*: *albagia*, *bambagia*, *gelosia*, *asino*, *burbero*, *decoro*, *genere*, *fragile*. It hardly seems too much to ask that a special vocabulary should give at least the accentuation in doubtful or exceptional cases. It will be remembered that Prof. Grandgent, in his *Italian Grammar*, accents every word, and also indicates the quality of the vowels. Of course, this means a little extra labor. One of the best-known editors of French text-books in America wrote to me recently, in a private letter,

> "Omissions and inadequacies in a vocabulary are, I suspect, almost inevitable, for the time of a person who is competent to make one is worth more than one well made can possibly be expected to repay."

Possibly; but it seems to me that something more than royalties is at stake; and if the matter is left on this basis, I suspect that in the future even those college teachers who now believe in the use of vocabulary editions will make up their minds to worry along without them. These remarks are not intended particularly as criticism of Messrs. Geddes and Josselyn, who (except in omitting to give genders) have merely followed the general practice. Unfortunately the edition, admirable in many respects, contains a considerable number of errors. Of the misprints in the text, three are particularly regrettable, because they seem to mean something when really they reduce the sentence to nonsense; these are: *comando* for *comandano*, p. 10, l. 32; *crede* for *erede*, p. 17, l. 9; *Cavaliere* for *cavalieri*, p. 77, l. 18. Less serious are: *vogli* for *voglio*, p. 12, l. 14; *stà* for *sta*, p. 19, l. 10; *serà* for *sarà*, p. 33, l. 19 and p. 68, l. 19; *campatisco* for *com-*, p. 43, l. 11; CAV. for MIR., p. 44, l. 13; *sieto* for *siete*, p. 52, l. 11; *propio* for *proprio*, p. 72, l. 17; (*piano al conte*) should be inserted, p. 72, l. 20, and the following words spoken by the Conte, not the Marchese. A speech has been left out, p. 50, between lines 3 and 4, as follows: CAV. *Va' via, che tu sia maledetto*, and the omission has left the SERVITORE to answer himself. P. 25, l. 20, *potrebbero* seems a better reading than *potrebbe*.

In the notes and vocabulary, several interpretations are open to question, and others are positively wrong. P. 8, note 4, regarding the expression *tutte quante*, states that "*tante* is the antecedent understood of *quante*;" is not *tutte* here the antecedent of *quante*, though *tanti* may be understood in such an expression as *andate quanti siete* (p. 50, l. 20)? P. 21, l. 20: *ha una faccia burbera da non piacergli le donne*, is thus explained: "*Gli* is here redundant. *Le donne* is evidently put in as an

afterthought, in apposition with *gli*, for *alle donne*." This interpretation, even if possible, seems to me very far-fetched, and not in harmony with the context; surely the obvious interpretation is correct: "He has a surly face which shows that he does not like women." P. 25, note 2, the explanation of *da lei* belongs in p. 5, note 1. The doubling of the consonant, explained in *dille*, p. 31, note 3, occurs earlier, for example, *vattene*, p. 6; *fanne*, p. 18. "Ago" is not the best translation of "*sono . . . che* in speaking of time,"—at least, in the two passages where it is given; *sono sei mesi che è morto*, p. 4, l. 19, is rather "he has been dead for six months;" and in the other passage, *sono tre mesi che lo sai*, p. 5, l. 20, "ago" makes nonsense (cf. also p. 35, l. 21). Some notes give too free a translation, as p. 7, note 3. Some are unnecessary, as those which merely repeat meanings from the vocabulary; p. 4, portions of notes 1 and 2; p. 6, note 2; p. 21, note 1; p. 60, note 2. A few notes are needed on points nowhere explained, as *voi altri*, p. 7; *seco* used in the sense of "with him" (not *himself*), p. 72; and *beverò le sue bellezze*, p. 35, which is a phrase used commonly (as here) by one who drinks out of another's glass.

Coming now to the vocabulary, we find a number of "inadequacies." *Attacco*, p. 24, l. 19, may possibly mean "attachment," but its usual meaning, "attack," does equally well. The only meaning given for *cadere* and for *cascare* is "fall;" both are used in the sense "weaken, give in," pp. 22, 29, etc. "I am sorry" is better for *mi dispiace*, pp. 17, 18, etc., than "it displeases me." "Than" should be added to the renderings of *di*. *Ferro caldo*, p. 52, is translated "flat-iron;" but *ferro* alone has this meaning, p. 55, and surely the iron is not always hot. The only meaning given for *caldo* is "excited," which would thus have to be applied to the flat-iron in translating *è ben caldo*, p. 55, l. 7. *Quanto importa il conto*, p. 48, means "how much does the bill amount to?" but the only meaning given for *importare* is "to matter." *Mi sento mancare*, p. 60, means "I feel faint," of which no hint is given. *Ordinario*, p. 19, certainly does not mean "ordinary payment;" *mandare con l'ordinario* means "to send by post." *Manicotto* is out of its alphabetical position. Under *perchè* the meaning "in order that" should be added; it is given in notes on pp. 28 and 55, but not when it first occurs, p. 15, l. 22. "Complacently" is wrong for *con placidezza*, p. 34, which means rather "placidly, quietly." "Pique" for *puntiglio*, p. 78, does not make good English; nor does "at any rate" for *tant' è*, p. 27. *Venere*, p. 9, seems different enough from Venus to be granted a place in the vocabulary.

Now, some of these slips are pretty serious; and yet they are not such as will prevent the edition from being used successfully with a class, provided the instructor is capable of detecting mistakes, and alert in pointing them out. It is hoped that the list of corrections and suggestions here given will facilitate the use of the book, and that the most necessary changes will soon be made in a second edition. Since text-books for Italian are necessarily less numerous than for other modern languages, it is all the more imperative that they be accurate and trustworthy; and this is my excuse for a somewhat long review. There remains to be discussed one more matter, which is of interest to students of Goldoni and of the drama in general. Anyone familiar with *La Locandiera* notices at once that in this edition two of the *personaggi* have been left out,—the *comiche* or *commedianti* Ortensia and Dejanira. Whatever may have been the reasons for this omission, which involves the loss of several complete scenes and the rearrangement of others, I think most scholars will agree that the editors owed it to themselves, if not to their readers, to declare what they had done. The only allusion is in these mysterious words (p. vi of the Introduction):

"For criticism in regard to the original version of the *Locandiera*, the student is referred to *Scelta di alcune commedie di Goldoni*, Firenze, 1838. The version here offered is practically the same as the one given on the stage in Italy, and that presented by Eleonora Duse on two different visits to this country."

Not a word as to wherein the "original version" differs from the "version here offered;" merely a reference to a book that must be inaccessible to the great majority of readers. When the seeker for "criticism" does succeed in getting hold of the wretched little *Scelta*, he

finds himself as far away as ever, since the editors have inadvertently given the wrong reference! Prof. Geddes has very kindly favored me with the correct one, which is this: *Il Teatro moderno applaudito*, 61 tomi, Venezia, 1796–1801; tomo xv (1797), pp. 91–96. Here we find stated the interesting fact that already in the eighteenth century the parts of the two actresses were omitted when the comedy was performed on the stage. The reasons given for the omission were that these characters retarded the action, and that without them the play actually gained in interest and unity; furthermore, that Goldoni himself evidently saw their want of connection with the other characters, since in the second act he brings them on the stage less than in the first, and in the third act only one of them appears, and that in only one scene. With these arguments I do not entirely agree. To be sure, the amusing scene in which Fabrizio inquires *per la consegna* the names of the newly arrived guests, although of interest because so similar to a well-known scene in *Minna von Barnhelm*,[1] is not important; but the manner in which the actresses are treated by the Marchese, the Conte and the Cavaliere respectively, throws no little light on the characters of these gentlemen. While the actresses are on the stage very little in the second and third acts, we continually hear about them, and many details are left meaningless when deprived of the original connection. In act iii, scene ix (of our edition, for of course the numbering has to be changed when scenes are dropped out), the Marchese puts the gold flask in his pocket, and then becomes greatly agitated for fear Mirandolina will find out that he has it. Surely even such a fool as he is could put it back where he found it; but in the original version he gives it to Dejanira. Act ii, sc. i, a great point is made of the Cavaliere being served before the Conte, and later the Marchese sends to the Conte's room *three* glasses of wine,—meaningless unless we know that the Conte is giving a dinner to the two actresses. He has previously explained to Mirandolina that he really does this for her sake, and the explanation applies to nothing whatever in the shortened version. P. 28, a speech is omitted between lines 11 and 12, bringing together two speeches by Mirandolina; and below, the Marchese's remark, *Conte, voi me la pagherete*, is altogether changed in its application. I have noticed but one case, however, where words actually spoken have been altered to fit a new application. On the whole, it is remarkable that the play can be extensively mutilated in this way, and still, with comparatively trifling exceptions, retain unharmed its outline, its consistency, and its effectiveness on the stage. All this throws light on Goldoni's method of dramatic construction, and is surely a topic worthy of discussion. Since the editors say nothing about the subject, it is not plain whether they were governed entirely by the arguments mentioned. Presumably, however, they were also moved, in making their expurgation, by a feeling that the characters omitted were intrinsically unsuitable for class reading. It may be of interest, if of no special importance, to note that a new edition of *La Locandiera* for Italian schools, with notes by G. Tambara (Torino, Paravia, 1901), omits nothing. I confess that to me the play in its complete form seems entirely unobjectionable; yet I am not disposed to quarrel with anyone who sees offense in it, and wishes, in an elementary text-book, to make excisions. Certainly, even in its reduced form, the play is interesting and profitable reading. Only, when an expurgated text comes to me, I like to be told so, in general terms at least, and not left to find it out for myself. Aside from its reticence on this point, the introduction in our edition is adequate for its purpose. In speaking of *Le Bourru bienfaisant*, the editors might have mentioned that this comedy is also well-known in Italian as *Il Burbero benefico*. To their short bibliography they might have added the titles of Rabany's *Goldoni, le théâtre et la vie en Italie*, Paris, 1896; and of recent works by Masi, Concari and Landau.

KENNETH MCKENZIE.

*Yale University.*

1 I do not know whether this relationship has been pointed out before. Prof. Primer, in his edition of *Minna von Barnhelm* (Boston, 1896, p. 132), compares the scenes where Mirandolina and Just, respectively, present their accounts: but he makes no further mention of Goldoni. In 1755, Lessing wrote to Mendelssohn that he was studying Goldoni's works, using the 1753 editon. *Minna* was not written until several years later.

## *FRENCH-ENGLISH DICTIONARY.*

*A French and English Dictionary*, by HJALMAR EDGREN, Ph. D., Professor of Romance Languages in the University of Nebraska, and PERCY B. BURNET, A. M., of the High Schools of Chicago. New York: Holt & Co., 1901, pp. xvi-1252.

THE purpose and scope of this new dictionary of the French and English languages is concisely stated in the introduction (p. v) in the following words:

"We have endeavored to prepare a work embodying: I. A scholarly and yet thoroughly practical French-English dictionary, founded upon the highest modern authorities, and embodying a measurably complete list of modern and obsolescent French words with their pronunciation, derivation, and earliest occurrence in the language, as well as their meanings and less obvious uses; and II. An English-French dictionary serving the purposes of French composition and speaking, and containing a sufficient amount of modern and archaic words with their pronunciation, and etymologically arranged, to serve the French student of English."

These general features of the dictionary are explained at greater length in the succeeding pages of the introduction, which further includes a list of dictionaries used in the compilation, the elaborate scheme of indicating pronunciation followed out in the body of the text, a list of the abbreviations used, and a table of French money, weights, and measures, with American equivalents. The introduction is very clear and satisfactory, but two points seem to call for remark. In the first place it is rather surprising in such a complete scheme of pronunciation not to find some provision made for distinguishing between the French final consonants which are silent under all conditions, and those which may be pronounced in linking, as *aspect* and *tabac*. In the second place the word *chronique* should not be cited under examples of English words (p. xiii, l. 11).

Upon opening the dictionary proper, the reader's eye is at once struck by the unusual appearance of the words. This is due to the system of marking the pronunciation already referred to, which consists of countless signs and double signs beneath and through the letters and the use of italics for all silent letters. The compilers' purposes, to force the pronunciation upon the student's attention and to save space, are evidently accomplished. A further saving of space is secured by the grouping of related words under a single stem so far as is possible without sacrificing alphabetical order. That instant knowledge of the pronunciation and economy of space are great advantages to the student the reviewer will readily admit, but to one who uses his dictionary chiefly for translation the advantage is questionable, because of the greatly increased strain upon the eyes and attention in rapidly seeking for a particular word. Furthermore, though strictly logical, the scheme of indicating the pronunciation is so complicated that few students will take the trouble to master it. Besides the marks of pronunciation, each word is followed by a small figure to denote the time of its introduction into the language. This sign is a small ° for indigenous words, for others it is the first two figures of the actual date of introduction. The objection can be made to this system of dating that the number 17, for example, suggests to most students the seventeenth century rather than the year 17—, of the eighteenth century.

In a short review it is impossible to consider every word cited in the twelve hundred odd pages, the reviewer has, therefore, chosen for especial study certain arbitrary groups of words. In the French-English section of the dictionary these groups consist of the words beginning with *la*, prepared by Mr. Burnet, and those beginning with *ta*, as far as *tantôt*, by Professor Edgren. These sections have been minutely compared with the corresponding sections of the *Dictionnaire Général*,[1] the small *Dictionnaire Complet* of P. Larousse,[2] Gasc's *French and English Dictionary*, Student's Edition,[3] and Heath's (Cassell's) *French and English Dictionary*.[4] The results of this

1 *Dictionnaire Général de la Langue française*, par Hatzfeld, Darmesteter, Thomas, 2 vols., Paris, n. d.

2 P. Larousse, *Dictionnaire Complet Illustré*, 8o édition, Paris, 1896.

3 F. Gasc, *Dictionary of the French and English Languages*, New York, n. d.

4 Heath's (Cassell's) *French and English Dictionary*, by De Lolme, Wallace, and Bridgeman, revised and enlarged by E. Roubaud, Boston, New York, Chicago, n. d.

comparison are very favorable indeed to the new dictionary. In the list of words cited in the French-English division the *Edgren-Burnet* follows very closely the *Dictionnaire Général*, in the number of words it is quite superior to the *Larousse* and *Heath* dictionaries, but, in turn, the *Gasc* far exceeds the *Edgren-Burnet*. The following table will show the relative position of the new dictionary more precisely, the figures after each name represent the number of words there found which are lacking in the other dictionary, double spellings and proper names are included.

Dict. Gén.: *la* 3, *t-tan* 5; Edgren-Burnet: *la* 1, *t-tan* 21.

Larousse: *la* 16, *t-tan* 9; Edgren-Burnet: *la* 88, *t-tan* 32.

Heath: *la* 33; *t-tan* 14; Edgren-Burnet: *la* 83, *t-tan* 31.

Gasc: *la* 197, *t-tan* 68; Edgren-Burnet: *la* 20, *t-tan* 9.

In the matter of definition the same groups of words in the *Edgren-Burnet* have been compared with the corresponding sections of the *Dictionnaire Général*, and the following variations have been noted. *Labour*, ploughed land, is not found in the latter dictionary, while *labdacisme*, abuse of words beginning with *l*, is not in the *Edgren-Burnet*. The new dictionary fails to give the date of introduction of the following words: *2. la*, *labour*, *2. lai*, *laïcité*, *laideron*, *laite*, *lambel*, *lande*, *langoureux*, *langue*, *laryngotomie*, *laticifère*, *lauriot*, *2. ta*, *tabiser*, *tabourin*, *tabulaire*, *tâcheron*, *tacheture*, *tachygraphique*, *tactilité*, *tadorne*, *taille-douce*, *taissonnière*, *talcaire*, *talcique*, *talcite*, *taluer*, *tamisage*, *tamise*, *tamiseur*, *tamisier*, *tanaisie*, *tangon*, *tanné*, *tantième*. The following words are dated differently by the two dictionaries, the first date is that of the Dictionnaire Général, the second that of the Edgren-Burnet: *labourer*, tenth century, eleventh century; *lapidification*, 1690, eighteenth century; *laps*, thirteenth-fourteenth, fifteenth century; *tabletier*, thirteenth, twelfth century; *tâche*, twelfth, thirteenth century; *tactile*, 1541, fifteenth century; *taillade*, sixteenth, fifteenth century; *taillandier*, indigenous or 1564, fifteenth century; *taille-crayon*, nineteenth, fourteenth century; *taillerie*, 1304, thirteenth century. Again, the system of indicating pronunciation made use of in the *Edgren-Burnet* occasionally causes trouble in derived words where the accent or vowel quality changes. Thus the *Edgren-Burnet* has *tàbác* (to follow the *Dictionnaire Général's* system of indicating quality) and hence (*tàbá*)*gie* and (*tàbá*)*quière*, whereas the second *a* in these words has the same quality as the first *a*.

The reviewer has not found it possible to examine the whole of the dictionary for misprints, but in the sections studied the following errors may be noted. In the Introduction, p. xiii, l. 25, the pronunciation mark over the *u* of *emulate* should be beneath the letter; p. xiii, l. 38, *ay* should read *ây* (?); p. xiv, l. 8, the *o* of *overturn* should have the mark beneath it, the *u* above. In the text, p. 622, read *tænia* for *tœnia*; p. 623, read *tamandua* for *tamadua*.

With regard to the English-French section of the *Edgren-Burnet* dictionary the reviewer feels that there is no need of a detailed study, in view of the fact that from the word *abridge* onward there are only the most trivial differences in the word lists and definitions between the new dictionary and that published by Messrs. Heath & Co. The reviewer does not give voice to this report, which has been circulated during the last few months, without having first carefully compared a number of words under each letter of the alphabet in the two dictionaries.

On the whole the writer considers the *Edgren-Burnet* dictionary a most timely and excellent contribution to the means of studying French in the United States. There has been up to this time no small dictionary at a reasonable price which combines so many advantages as does this last one. With a sufficiently large vocabulary, we have with each word its meaning, pronunciation, etymology, and date of introduction into the language. No student could ask for more in an abridged dictionary.

MURRAY P. BRUSH.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

## *ENGLISH LITERATURE.*

*Shakespeare Studies. Macbeth.* By CHARLOTTE PORTER and HELEN A. CLARKE. New York: American Book Co., 1902.

THIS little book consists of two sections. The second includes the sources of the story (omit-

ting, however, the earliest of all, the account in Wyntoun's *Cronykil*) and other extracts from old books illustrating particular features of the play; the first, and more valuable, section is chiefly made up of questions accompanying each step of the action, and problems of interpretation and significance, which the student must solve for himself. Even old Skakespeareans will probably find here views and possibilities that had not occurred to them; while the younger student will be led to look below the surface and see that *Macbeth* is not merely a romantic tale, but a profound study of human souls, and an amazing piece of constructive art.

W. H. B.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### *ON THE PRONUNCIATION OF THE GERMAN ch.*

To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes,

Sirs:—I have noticed some discussion as to the pronunciation of the German *ch* in the last two numbers of the Mod. Lang. Notes. Is it not possible that the gentleman from New Haven and the gentleman from Baltimore could come to some agreement as to the English sounds that approximate the German frontal *ch* if each had an opportunity to hear the pronunciation of *hew* and *hear* from the mouth of the other? Vietor, *German Pronunciation*, second edition, p. 52, remarks, "It is not a regular English consonant, but sometimes occurs as the initial sound of *hue*, *hew*, etc." The statement is certainly correct according to the experience of the writer.

In teaching I have found that I can give the beginner the correct tongue position by having him pronounce first the English *sh* of *she*. Then if the tip of the tongue be lowered to the back of the lower teeth, the tongue is thrown forward into the position in which the German pronounces his frontal *ch*. A reference to the figures on pp. 28 and 29 of Grandgent's *German and English Sounds* will make this clear to any one who has had a little practical experience in phonetics. Of course the process is somewhat awkward, and a good ear is the greatest help. The great trouble on the part of the American is the tendency to open the mouth too wide and to pronounce the sound too far back on the hard palate. The sound thus produced generally degenerates into a *k*. The tendency to pronounce a *k* can be corrected to some extent by having the pupil exaggerate the length of the sound. It is impossible to pronounce a long *k*. Of course a correct tongue position in the first instance renders the pronunciation of a *k* impossible.

George M. Howe.

*Cornell University.*

### *THE UNIVERSITY OF GENEVA.*

To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes,

Sirs:—*À propos* of the remarks about the summer session of the University of Grenoble in Mod. Lang. Notes for February, permit me to call attention to another University which, if not French, is almost within the borders of France, and situated in a city whose mother-tongue is French and almost half of whose population are French citizens.

I believe I am right in saying that the University of Geneva was the *first* to establish a summer session for the benefit of foreign students. The plan was approved by neighboring institutions, such as Lausanne and Grenoble, and they were not slow to adopt the idea. At the summer session of the University of Geneva in 1900 seventeen nationalities were represented; there were five Americans.

Of far greater importance to foreigners than these vacation courses, however good they may be, is the *Séminaire du Français moderne* which forms part of the regular University work of Geneva, and which was founded for the purpose of giving a suitable training to foreigners who wish to teach French. It comprises the following courses: *littérature française moderne; étude des sources pour l'histoire de la littérature et de la langue françaises modernes; histoire des mœurs et des institu-*

*tions en pays de langue française dans les temps modernes; méthodes et exercices pratiques d'enseignement; lecture analytique d'auteurs français modernes; stylistique; phonologie; prononciation et diction; syntaxe du Français depuis le xvi siècle, gallicismes; composition et improvisation; exercices écrits de langues et de style; conversation.* This *séminaire* gives an excellent practical and theoretical training and has a large enrolment. I may be permitted to mention among the professors of Geneva the well-known, venerable *savant*, M. Eugène Ritter, who gives the course, *étude des sources*, and M. Bernard Bouvier who is the soul of the *séminaire* and whose inspiring courses *littérature française moderne* and *lecture analytique* are models of their kind. A *certificat d'aptitude à l'enseignement dn français moderne* is given to those who successsfully pass the difficult oral and written examinations.

In 1900–1901 there were fourteen Americans in attendance at the University.

It is hardly necessary to add that Geneva is one of the most charming and interesting of European cities, and that a sojourn there is very delightful.

WILLIAM KOREN.

*Princeton University.*

---

## *ROMANIC PHILOLOGY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF PARIS.*

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—Instruction in Romanic philology at the University of Paris has been greatly strengthened within the past two years. Instead of one chair with assistants, as was the case during the lifetime of the late Prof. Petit de Julleville, there are now two full professors, Thomas and Brunot. As a result the instruction has been more specialized. Prof. Thomas treats the formation of the Romanic languages, and Prof. Brunot the subject of French historical grammar. Both men by their publications have given ample evidence of their ability in their respective fields; Prof. Thomas by his collaboration on the *Dictionnaire général* and by his more recent work, *Mélanges d'Etymologies;* Prof. Brunot by his *Grammaire historique de la langue française*, and by the *Histoire de la langue*, which first appeared in the *Histoire de la langue et de la littérature française*, and, which has since been published separately.

In addition to the university proper the *École de chartes* and the *École des hautes études*, which are now under the same roof as the university and which are scientifically, if not officially, parts of it, offer unusual opportunities in the same lines of study. At the former, Paul Meyer continues his lectures on the Phonology and Morphology of Old French and Provençal, and, at the latter, Gaston Paris offers seminaries on special topics of Romanic philology and supplements this practical work by lectures on Old French Literature at the *College de France.* Both these men are so well-known that their names suffice to indicate the high character of their instruction.

A name less widely known but not unfamiliar to readers of the *Romania* is that of Maurice Roques, who has taken the place of Prof. Thomas at the *École des hautes études* and whose seminary in Vulgar Latin is a valuable adjunct to the work in Romanics.

If to this list of men, eminent for their scholarship, are added the phoneticians Rousselot and Passy, it is evident that the University of Paris and the institutions grouped about it, offer at present exceptional advantages for the study of Romanic philology.

EDGAR E. BRANDON.

*Paris.*

---

## *FRENCH LITERATURE.*

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—It seemed to me in reading Dr. Brush's review of Mr. Goodell's *L'Enfant Espion* in MOD. LANG. NOTES for February, 1902, pp. 106 and 107, that many mistakes and omissions evident in the edition were passed unnoticed. The following are some of the points which I noted and mentioned to the publishers when the edition appeared.

Among words not explained, or not satis-

factorily explained in either notes or vocabulary, should be mentioned, *mutuelle*, 8, 19= *école mutuelle*. If Mr. Goodell had consulted the *Dictionnaire Général* of Darmesteter-Hatzfeld he would have found the expression *enseignement mutuel*, with an explanation of the system in use in many European Catholic schools, of the instruction of younger pupils by older ones. *Un-tout-cas*, 28, 22 (="an umbrella used for a sun-shade as well") is not in the vocabulary at all, neither is there a note on it. The latter would, considering the formation of the word, be much more useful than such notes as, for instance, that on p. 11, f.

"Soissons: the old Latin town of Noviodunum, later Suessio. Clovis conquered the Roman general Syagrius here in 486. It has also been the scene of many sieges, the last in 1814."

Why should this cheap erudition be inflicted on the student who happens to meet, in a story of the Siege of Paris, casual mention of "le chemin de fer de Soissons?" Why the note on the Valois *à propos* of the innocent remark on p. 34, 24 sq.:

"Comme il l'avait troublée dès le premier regard, ce jeune homne si correct, à qui—ses yeux de diamant noir donnaient l'aspect royalment fatal d'un Valois!"

Certainly an allusion to the Massacre of Saint Bartholomew (*Bartholemew* in the text) is not necessary to explain this. The note is really confusing to an open mind. That regarding the rue de Grenelle, p. 56, might also be to one who did not already know that *all* the streets described were to be found in Paris—a thing taken for granted by the editor.

Why add to the definition of "*bradel* (voc.), articles made from cardboard", the further rather vague explanation: "perhaps so called from the maker or inventor, the place where made, etc.?"

*Coup de force*, 40, 7, might well have been translated under *coup*. (Coup de théâtre, 21, 1, is given under théâtre.) Mr. Goodell has, in general, a rather erratic method of entering idioms, *vous allez en voir de grises*, for instance (79, 20), is translated under *aller*. Fortunately a note directs the reader to the lurking-place of the explanation.

Mr. Brush very properly remarks that, "one would think that the editor had taken some school dictionary and simply gotten down the first meaning that he found after each of his French words."

He should, however, have noted especially and severely such words as *passer*, 45, 32 (='make'—the vocabulary giving only "pass, go by, go beyond"); *élèves* 51, 2 (="breeders"); *déjouée* 51, 13 (="baffled, foiled"), *tapisserie à personnages*, 71, 18 (="tapestry representing human figures"—the vocabulary gives "imagery"; *dégagement*, 69, 33 (="private exit"); *faisceaux* 78, 20 (="stacks," not "bundles"). There should be either in a note or in the vocabulary: *remettre les armes en faisceaux* ("to stack arms").

To the list of typographical errors given by Mr. Brush should be added, besides *Bartholemew*, mentioned above, *grédin*, 49, 17. Mr. Goodell has explained, in his preface, that he gives but few translations, 'the best results in his opinion being attained through personal explanation of the point under consideration.' Yet since he has explained a number of passages that required no explanation, he owes us a note in such cases as those cited.

The number of American reprints is increasing with great, in view of some facts one might almost say with alarming, rapidity. Nobody need now rush a text-book into print in order to get material sorely needed for his class-work. Let us seek, in our editing, quality rather than quanity.

MARY VANCE YOUNG.

*Mt. Holyoke College.*

## BRIEF MENTION.

*Parts of Speech: Essays on English.* By Brander Matthews (Charles Scribner's Sons, 1901). The normal mind will connotatively think of 'Parts of Speech' in a sense which could not be defined by anything as general and attractively indefinite as 'Essays on English.' The subjects of these essays are such as "The Stock that Speaks the Language," "The Future of the Language," "The Language in the United States," "Questions of Usage," "The Simplification of Spelling." These chapters are written in an engaging, chatty style, professedly literary rather than scholarly, and may be commended for "common sense in an

uncommon degree," and for sufficient accuracy to beget confidence in the author's judgment of many interesting questions. Many of the pages are aglow with a patriotism that will impress the young; the more mature reader will pronounce some of these passages, especially the closing definition of "Americanism" (pp. 343–350), flat and commonplace. In "Questions of Usage" the young might be misled to take the "argument for liberty" to be "a plea for license," although there is duly given a warning against this danger. The author is fond of applying Spencer's principle of Economy of Attention; this he does in a very suggestive manner, as in "An Inquiry as to Rime" (at p. 276 f.; cf. also pp. 229, 233). These essays should be widely read. They can do only good, for they will quicken the perception of the principles of language. "Excessive refinement goes only with muscular weakness," says the author (p. 236); the refinement of his style in the instance of this book must not be supposed to warrant the expectation of a weak grasp upon scholarship.

*Marie de France. Seven of her Lays done into English* by Edith Rickert: with designs by Caroline Watts (New Amsterdam Book Co., New York, 1901). It is "with the hope that these tales 'of old unhappy far off things' may find friends among English readers," that this and its companion volumes have been prepared, and that we hereby call attention to this series of most attractive little books. It is worth while to complete the enumeration of the list: 1. *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight.* A Middle-English Romance retold in Modern Prose, with Introduction and Notes by Jessie L. Weston. With designs by M. M. Crawford; 2. *Tristan and Iseult.* Rendered into English from the German of Gottfried of Strassburg by Jessie L. Weston. With designs by Caroline Watts; 3. *Guingamor, Lanval, Tyolet, Le Bisclaveret.* Four Lays rendered into English Prose from the French of Marie de France and others by Jessie L. Weston. With designs by Caroline Watts; 4. *Morien:* A metrical Romance rendered into English prose from the Mediæval Dutch by Jessie L. Weston, with designs by Catharine Watts. The volume selected for the present notice contains an 'Introduction' which deals in a careful manner with the facts of Marie's life and work, and the theories respecting her literary sources. The appended 'Notes' summarize for the reader results of literary scholarship, and thus constitute an attractive introduction to an important department of comparative literature. Profound research in language, folk-lore, fairy-tales, fables, history, tradition, etc., is here made attractive to the general reader without loss of accuracy, and even with some advantage to the technical reader himself.

*Much Ado About Nothing.* Edited by J. C. Smith (D. C. Heath & Co., 1902). This is another of the plays separately edited under the general supervison of Prof. C. H. Herford, which are known as 'The Arden Shakespeare.' The same editor contributed the *As You Like It* to the series and is, therefore, a tried hand in carrying out the avowed purpose to give special attention to the literary and artistic interpretation of the plays, though without neglecting the necessary points of grammar and language. In this plan of the general editor there is an implied rebuke of that 'purely verbal and textual' annotation which has too much hindered the appreciative study of the master-pieces. The plan of the series has been well followed by each editor, and this last number of the series meets all expectations. It has its share of points of special interest, such as a text adapted to "an easy introduction to the textual criticism of Shakespeare" (Appendix A), and the old stage-directions with the problem of the character 'Innogen' (pp. vii, xii, 73, 145). In the case of such a special point in the history of the play as the list of plays which were produced at Court in the spring of 1613, in celebrating the marriage of Princess Elizabeth and the Elector Palatine (p. viii), the student should have references for verification.

The grammatical note against line 17 shows excellent care of such matters, and equally discriminating are note 14, 15 (and others) on 'Euphuism' and note 81 on the Messenger's exclamation "I will hold friends wtth you, lady." But the editor has not had the courage to strike the comma out of line 63, and note i, 3.20 is too subjective in its reference to the rhythmic character of the 'remonstrance.' The "Criticism" of the play (p. xiii f.) will reward study. The whole constitutes a text-book of excellent quality.

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

**Baltimore, May, 1902.**

## *THE TENT SCENE IN Richard III.*

THE play of *Richard III*, written in Shakspere's youth and under the direct inspiration of Marlowe's example, bears the marks of the earlier poet's influence. We feel Marlowe in the too powerful centralization of the play on one dominant figure, in the high lyric key in which passion is pitched, in the lack of symmetrical development in any principal character, in the note of the superhuman which is heard so insistently throughout. Critics have commented on this often enough, and have frequently selected for especial condemnation the third scene of Act v, the tent scene on Bosworth Field, or rather that part of the tent scene in which the ghosts of Richard's victims rise out of the night to curse him and to predict his defeat.

This scene has, however, its artistic as well as its moral right in the drama. Without doubt, its key is high; but it comes late in the play, when we have become so accustomed to extreme tension of feeling and situation that its added pressure is hardly felt as overpressure. Torn from its connection with the events which have led up to it, it may appear overstrained, but in the play as a whole, and especially in the fateful suspense of Act v, it has not only its moral, but its artistic justification.

Through the earlier part of the drama, crime after crime has been planned and carried out by Richard; from the little princes to Buckingham no weakness and no strength has disarmed his purpose, and from Anne of Warwick to Hastings no one of his victims has fathomed his deceit until too late. The course and extent of his villainy have been of more than human proportions; we cannot speak of progress in crime, but rather of accumulation of crime.

In the third scene of the fourth act, however, that accumulation has reached its climax; Richard hears from Tyrrel the news of the boy-princes' death, and in a soliloquy of eight lines both sums up what he has accomplished and announces his next move. This he does, not in bald or half-formulated sentences of cool realization or hesitant acknowledgment, but with zest:

> "The sons of Edward sleep in Abraham's bosom:
> And Anne my wife hath bid the world good night."

He is poetical, metaphorical, Scriptural, as he himself said of himself. His deeds are not mere shifts for practical immediate ends; they are works of art, and as such deserve from him a mention which has literary quality.

The dramatist's recognition of this moment as the climax of Richard's villainy is indicated by the immediate entrance, upon this speech, of the first step in the return action; a messenger announces that Ely has fled, that Buckingham is up. Not at once, however, does the retrograde movement continue; two checks or retarding moments appear; Richard persuades the widowed queen to listen to his suit for his niece the princess Elizabeth;—and Buckingham is captured. Coincident with the latter news, however, come the tidings of Richmond's landing, and as we reach the third scene of Act v, we find the two armies, Richard's and Richmond's, encamped on opposite sides of Bosworth Field, around their leaders' tents.

In this scene, as the action lessens and the stage clears, the tension increases. At first we have anticipations of the coming day; Richard gives his abrupt and clear-headed orders; Richmond receives the anxious greetings of Stanley; the pitch of the scene lowers as we pass from the quick commands of the King to the hurried furtive promise of Stanley. Night settles upon the field; the tone of the play becomes lower and slower as Richmond commends his cause to God, and falls asleep in his tent. At that moment the slackening action ceases to move.

On the other side of the stage sits Richard, alone in his tent, with ink and paper before him. He has refused supper; he is not so cool as he was when earlier he bade Tyrrel reserve the account of the princes' death till he had supped. As silence falls upon the stage, and movement ceases, the suspense reaches the full.

Through the last few scenes the balance in which Richard's fortunes lie has been vibrating. The steady rise of its index was at one point, the news of Ely's flight, arrested, and since then has trembled from good omen to ill omen and back again; now events hang suspended. We ask ourselves as we look at the two men before us what we are to anticipate. Richmond we hardly know. We saw him for a moment, a lad of promise, in "Henry VI"; we have heard of him from time to time in this play, at first as a distant and then as a gradually-nearing threat to Richard. Richard we know. On his head there lies a matchless burden of crime; but the dauntless poise of that head, the daring ease with which the burden is carried, has all through the play commanded our unwilling and fascinated admiration. Such integrity of evil has seemed to justify its own existence.

If now the battle ensued at once, and Richard fell by the hand of Richmond, but half of poetic justice even would be done. The death of Richard, the mere cessation of his malign existence, would be no working out, either morally or æsthetically, of the problem which the drama has been presenting. A restoration of the disturbed balance is required, even if we speak solely from the æsthetic standpoint, in order to attain that harmony which is characteristic of the great art-product. The man before us has not only violated all human law, he has vaunted his independence of all earthly ties. In Part iii of "Henry VI" he declared of himself (Act v, Sc. 6):

> "I have no brother, I am like no brother;
> And this word 'love' which greybeards call divine,
> Be resident in men like one another,
> And not in me; I am myself alone."

And he has proved that alienation from our common humanity by his every act.

The pendulum must now swing back; the balance must be restored. The battle later is a mere epilogue; Richard can die fighting, and no one doubts his bravery; Richmond can succeed him, and no one doubts his claim; but what we crave to see is the detailed and convincing restoration of harmony, to see the sword of justice formally committed to Richmond's hand, and to hear the indomitable and loveless Richard cry out:

> "I shall despair, there is no creature loves me."

Through the silence of the tent scene now pass before Richard's eyes and ours the ghosts of his victims. Each one is there. No one greater sufferer speaks for all; but as they died, so they reappear, singly, recalling one by one the crimes that have been enacted one by one before us, and clinching each remembrance with the curse to Richard and charge to Richmond. Those who have in life been powerless against Richard give now irresistible strength to the hand of Richmond. Men, women, children, kings, princes, brothers, wife, kinsmen, friends, they lay on Richard their curse, and solemnly commit to the sleeping stranger, Richmond, their vengeance. No mere right of birth is on the morrow to back up Richmond's claim to the crown. He is the last Lancastrian as well as the first Tudor; but in his hands is now laid, by every murdered Yorkist, the sword that Richard of York had turned against his own house. The Wars of the Roses may end historically with the battle of Bosworth Field and the victor's marriage; but they end dramatically with this appeal of the dead Yorkists to their hereditary foe.

As we look the figure of Richmond grows in importance. Richard no longer dominates the stage. He is no longer the moving spirit of the action, but is passive in the grip of a fate as pitiless as himself. He is to die; but that is to him, and to us, and to the dramatist, nothing. What is here presented is everything:—that each of his victims is to strike him with Richmond's arm, and that he is to realize, in the few moments of horror as the vision passes away, his own bondage to the humanity he had scorned. We see the consecration and ennobling of Richmond as fit adversary to the hitherto redoubtable Richard, from whose grasp victory is withdrawn. We see the iron Richard forced to confess the human needs he had denied and despised; and his cry of despair, as he first feels his lack of all earthly ties, as he first shrinks from the solitude on which he had prided himself, makes us realize, like the knocking at the gate in *Macbeth*, the awful pause during which our ideas of life had been deranged as we watched with fascination a creature who set the world

at naught. Richard becomes human in that cry; our vision returns to us. The spell is broken; the balance is restored.

A comparison of this scene with such hints as exist in the chronicle and in the *True Tragedy* will show how clearly Shakespeare recognized these points and how deliberately he made them. Holinshed says:

"The fame went, that he had the same night a dreadfull and terrible dream; for it seemed to him, being asleepe, that he did see diverse images like terrible divels, which pulled and haled him, not suffering him to take anie quiet or rest. The which strange vision not so suddenlie strake his heart with a sudden feare, but it stuffed his head and troubled his mind with manie busie and dreadfull imaginations. For incontinent after, his heart being almost damped, he prognosticated before the doubtfull chance of the battell to come; not using the alacritie and mirth of mind and countenance as he was accustomed to doo before he came toward the battell. And least that it might be suspected that he was abashed for feare of his enimies, and for that cause looked so pitouslie; he recited and declared to his familiar friends in the morning his wonderfull vision and fearful dreame."

In the old play (Hazlitt: *Shakespeare's Library*, vol. 5) the King has a monologue of which the first part runs as follows:

"The hell of life that hangs upon the Crowne,
The daily cares, the nightly dreames,
The wretched crewes, the treason of the foe,
And horror of my bloodie practise past,
Strikes such a terror to my wounded consclence,
That sleep I, wake I, or whatsoever I do,
Meethinkes their ghoastes comes gaping for revenge,
Whom I have slaine in reaching for a Crowne.
Clarence complains, and crieth for revenge.
My nephues bloods Revenge, revenge, doth crie,
The headless peeres come preasing for revenge.
And every one cries, let the tyrant die."

From such fragmentary hints Shakspere built up the tent scene. His additions are, if we put it briefly, the presence of Richmond, with the detailed committal of Nemesis to his hand, and the cry of Richard on realizing his kinship with the humanity he had scorned. And these are the very things that make the scene the capstone of the tetralogy and the consummation of the play. The tent scene does not only dignify and dedicate the founder of the House of Tudor and close the long and bloody war of kinsmen for the crown; but it completes what would else have been incomplete; in humanizing Richard it restores to us and to the play that balance which had been so long disturbed.

ELEANOR P. HAMMOND.
*University of Chicago.*

---

## *HEINE AND WILHELM MÜLLER.*

II.

MÜLLER.

1817 (Frauentaschenbuch), 1821 (77 Gedd.), *Thränenregen*, i, 11:

Wir sassen so traulich beisammen
Im kühlen Erlendach.
Wir schauten so traulich zusammen
Hinab in den rieselnden Bach.
Der Mond war auch gekommen,
Die Sternlein hinterdrein,
Und schauten so traulich zusammen
In den silbernen Spiegel hinein.

Und sahe sie nicken und blicken
Herauf aus dem seligen Bach
Die Blümlein am Ufer, die blauen,
Sie nickten und blickten ihr nach.
Und in den Bach versunken
Der ganze Himmel schien.

HEINE.

1822 (L. I. 42), i, 81:

Mein Liebchen, wir sassen beisammen,
Traulich im leichten Kahn.
Die Nacht war still, und wir schwammen
Auf weiter Wasserbahn.
Die Geisterinsel, die schöne
Lag dämmrig im Mondenglanz. . .

1823 (Hk. 7), i, 98:

Wir sassen am Fischerhause
Und schauten nach der See.

1820? (Gedd. 1822, Rom. 20), i, 55:

Wenn der Mond beginnt seinen Strahlenlauf,
Dann schwimmen die Sternlein hinterdrein.

1820-21, *Almansor*, ii, 276:

Güldne Sternlein schauen nieder,
Mit der Liebe Sehnsuchtwehe;
Bunte Blümlein nicken wieder,
Schauen schmachtend in die Höhe.
Zärtlich blickt der Mond herunter,
Spiegelt sich in Bächleins Fluten,
Und vor Liebe taucht er unter,
Kühlt im Wasser seine Gluten.

1818 (Gesellschafter), 1821 (77 Gedd.), *Der Neugierige*, i, 7:
Ich frage keine Blume,
Ich frage keinen Stern;
Sie können mir nicht sagen,
Was ich erführ so gern.
O Bächlein meiner Liebe,
Wie bist du heut so stumm!

1818 (Gaben der Milde), 1821 (77 Gedd.), *Wohin?* i, 5:
Was sag' ich denn vom Rauschen?
Das kann kein Rauschen sein:
Es singen wohl die Nixen
Dort unten ihren Reihn.

1818 (Gesellschafter), 1821 (77 Gedd.), *Erster Schmerz, letzter Scherz*, i, 15:
Die Fensterscheiben glänzen
Im klaren Sonnenschein,
Und hinter den Fensterscheiben
Da sitzt die Liebste mein.
Ein Jäger, ein grüner Jäger,
Der liegt in ihrem Arm. . .

1818 (do.), 1821 (77 Gedd.), *Die böse Farbe*, i, 16:
Da klingt ihr Fensterlein.

1821 (77 Gedd.), *Der Prager Musikant*, i, 40:
Abends unter ihrem Fenster . . .
's Fenster klirrt, es rauscht der Laden.

1821 (77 Gedd.), *Vor ihrem Fenster*, i, 26:
Wie freut es mich, in dunkeln Abendstunden
Vor deinem hellen Fenster stillzustehn!
Die Blumen, die sich an den Rahmen schmiegen,
Umschlingen mir dein Bild mit ihrem Kranz.
Da sitzest du, so still und unbefangen,
Das schöne Haupt gestützt auf deinen Arm,
Und ich bin dir so nah' mit Lust und Bangen
Mit meiner Wünsche ungestümem Schwarm.
Du schauest her, es wissen deine Augen
Vom süssen Zauber ihrer Blicke nicht.

1821 (77 Gedd.), *Thränen und Rosen*, i, 138:
Vor eines Gärtners Haus.
Da lag ein Mägdlein schöne
Zum Fensterlein heraus.

1822 (Aurora f. 1823), *Des Jägers Weib*, i, 68:
Den Kopf gestützt auf meinen Arm
Steh' ich am Fensterlein.[11]

1818 (Gesellschafter), 1821 (77 Gedd.) *Trockne Blumen*, i, 18:

1821 (L. I. 22), i, 73 f.;
Blumen—Nachtigallen—Sternelein,—
Die alle können's nicht wissen,
Nur eine kennt meinen Schmerz.

1824? (Rheinblüthen f. 1825), ii, 12:
Du Lilie meiner Liebe,
Du stehst so träumend am Bach.

1823 (Hk. 9), i, 100:
Das ist kein Rauschen des Windes,
Das ist der Seejungfern Gesang.

1820? (Gedd. 1822, Rom. 14), *Wasserfahrt*, i, 49:
Ich kam schön Liebchens Haus vorbei,
Die Fensterscheiben blinken;
Ich guck' mir fast die Augen aus,
Doch will mir niemand winken.

1816 (Hamburgs Wächter 1817), *Die Romanze von Rodrigo*, i, 508:
Gute Nacht!—Das Fenster klirrte,
Seufzend stand Rodrigo unten.

1820 (Gedd. 1822), *Die Fensterschau*, i, 48:
Schön Hedwig lag am Fenster. . .
Hinschmachtend nach Hedewigs Fenster.

1822 (L. I. 57), i, 88:
Ich seh' sie am Fenster lehnen
Im einsamen Kämmerlein;
Das Auge gefüllt mit Thränen,
Starrt sie in die Nacht hinein.

1823 (Hk. 13), i, 102:
Wenn ich an deinem Hause
Des Morgens vorüber geh',
Wie freut's mich, du liebe Kleine,
Wenn ich dich am Fenster seh'.

1823 (Hk. 29), i, 109:
Ich sitze am Fenster und schaue
Hinaus in die Dunkelheit.

1823 (Hk. 60), i, 122:
Dort oben am hellen Fenster
Bewegt sich ein Schattenbild.
Du schaust mich nicht, im Dunkeln
Steh' ich hier unten allein;
Noch weniger kannst du schauen
In mein dunkles Herz hinein.

1825 (Nordsee i, 2), *Abenddämmerung*, i, 164:
Während die grossen Mädchen
Neben duftenden Blumentöpfen
Gegenüber am Fenster sassen.

1825 (Nordsee i, 10), *Seegespenst*, i, 176:
Nur dass am untern Fenster
Ein Mädchen sitzt,
Den Kopf auf den Arm gestützt.

1822 (L. I. 23), i, 74:
Warum sind denn die Rosen so blass,

[11] Cf. Eichendorff, ed. Dietze, i, 262, *In der Nacht*, Frauentaschenbuch f. 1818:
Schauend mein Herz am Fenster lauschet
Still in die Nacht hinaus.

Ihr Blümlein alle, Wie welk, wie blass?
Ihr Blümlein alle, Wovon so nass?

1818, 1821 (do.), *Die böse Farbe*, i, 16:
Ich möchte die grünen Gräser all'
Weinen ganz totenbleich.

1822 (Urania f. 1823, Gedd. 1824), *Erstarrung*, i, 48:
Die Blumen sind erstorben,
Der Rasen sieht so blass.

1818 (Gesellschafter), 1821 (77 Gedd.), *Der Müller und der Bach*, i, 19:
Da halten die Englein
Die Augen sich zu
Und schluchzen und singen
Die Seele zu Ruh.

1818 (Gesellschafter), 1821 (77 Gedd.), *Des Baches Wiegenlied*, i, 20:
Will betten dich kühl
Auf weichem Pfühl
In dem blauen krystallenen Kämmerlein,
Heran, heran Was wiegen kann,
Woget und wieget den Knaben mir ein!
Wenn ein Jagdhorn schallt
Aus dem grünen Wald,
Will ich sausen und brausen wohl um dich her.

1821 (77 Gedd.), *Doppelte Gefahr*, ii, 18:
Tief unten in den Fluten
Da ist ein goldnes Haus,
Da ruhen versunkene Schiffer
In weichen Armen aus.[12]

Am Ufer sitzt ein Mädchen,
Die hat ein Augenpaar,
Das droht mit Feuerflammen
Mir tödliche Gefahr.
Sie strickt an einem Netze. . .

O sprich, mein Lieb, warum?
Warum sind denn im grünen Gras
Die blauen Veilchen so stumm?[13]

1822 (L. I. 20), i, 73:
Dazwischen schluchzen und stöhnen
Die guten Engelein.[14]

1821 (Gedd. 1822, Fresko-Sonette ix), i, 62:
. . . sehn' ich mich hinüber
Nach jenem Nebelreich, wo stille Schatten
Mit weichen Armen liebend mich umschliessen.

1821 (L. I. Prolog), i, 66:
In einen kristallenen Wasserpalast
Ist plötzlich gezaubert der Ritter.
Doch hält ihn die Nixe umarmet gar traut.

1824 (Harzreise), *Die Ilse*, i, 159 f:
In meinen weissen Armen,
An meiner weissen Brust,
Da sollst du liegen und träumen
Von alter Märchenlust.
Komm in mein Schloss herunter,
In mein kristallnes Schloss, . . .
Dort soll dich mein Arm umschlingen,
Wie er Kaiser Heinrich umschlang;
Ich hielt ihm zu die Ohren,
Wenn die Trompet' erklang.

1826 (Nordsee ii), *Meergruss*, i, 180:
Dort unten im klaren Kristallhaus.

1841 *König Harald Harfagar*, i, 285 f:
Der König Harald Harfagar
Sitzt unten in Meeresgründen,
Bei seiner schönen Wasserfee;
Die Jahre kommen und schwinden.
Manchmal aus seinem Liebestraum
Wird er plötzlich aufgeschüttert.
Denn droben stürmt so wild die Flut
Und das gläserne Schloss erzittert.
Schnell beugt sich hinab die Wasserfee
Und küsst ihn mit lachendem Munde.

1830? (No. 35, ii, 20, variants ii, 498), MS.:
"Augen, sterblich schöne Sterne!" . . .
Und es sang ein kleines Mädchen,
Die am Meere Netze strickte (later: flickte).

12 Cf. Eichendorff, i, 319, *Der Gefangene* (Gedd. 1837):
Und um ihn thät sie schlagen
Die Arme weich und bloss,
Er konnte nichts mehr sagen,
Sie liess ihn nicht mehr los.
Und diese Au' zur Stunde
Ward ein kristallnes Schloss. . .
Es konnt' ihn keines bringen
Aus böser Zauberei.

13 Cf. Tieck, *Gedd.* 1821–3, ii, 175, *Lied der Sehnsucht*:
Warum die Blume das Köpfchen senkt,
Warum die Rosen so blass?
Ach! die Thräne am Blatt der Lilie hängt,
Vergangen das schön frische Gras.

14 Cf. *Wunderhorn* i, 276:
Um Annchen sungen die Engelein.

1821 (77 Gedd.), *Das Mühlenleben*, i, 8:
Seh' ich sie am Bache sitzen,
Wenn sie Fliegennetze strickt.
1821 (77 Gedd.), *Fastnachtslied von den goldenen Zöpfen*, i, 139:
Mägdlein mit den goldnen Zöpfen,
Mägdlein mit dem goldnen Haar!
1821 (77 Gedd.), *Der Dichter als Prolog*, i, 4:
Und auch der Mond bricht aus der Wolken Flor
Schwermütig, wie's die Mode will, hervor.

1821 (77 Gedd.), *Morgengruss*, i, 10:
Ihr blauen Morgensterne!
Ihr schlummertrunknen Äugelein.
1820 (Frauentaschenbuch), 1821 (77 Gedd.), *Ungeduld*, i, 9:
Den Morgenwinden möcht' ich's hauchen ein,
Ich möcht' es säuseln durch den regen Hain.
1821 (77 Gedd.), *Frühlingsgruss*, i 36:
Du heller linder Abendwind,
Flieg' hin zu meinem Schatz geschwind.
1821 (77 Gedd.), *Christnacht*, i, 23:
Herz, mein Herz, wie bist so selig?
Herz, mein Herz, und so allein?[15]

1821 (77 Gedd.), *Die Passionsblume*, i, 25:
Hast du nicht in stillen Stunden,
Heil' ge Blum, ihr zugehaucht
Das Geheimnis von den Wunden . . .
" *Morgen*, i, 34: Blumen—
Wie sie wanken, wie sie beben,
Scheu die trunknen Blicke heben!
War's dein Kuss, der sie erweckte?
" *Die Prager Musikantenbraut*, i, 42:
Blümlein weinten die ganze Nacht.[16]
1821 (77 Gedd.), *Der Perlenkranz*, i, 28:
Lass auf dein Haupt mich weinen:
Tauft denn die Thräne nicht?[17]

1821 (77 Gedd.), *Abendreihn*, i, 34:
Guten Abend, lieber Mondenschein,
Wie blickst mir so traulich ins Herz hinein?
" *Die Prager Musikantenbraut*, i, 42:
Und 's Denken ist ein luftig Ding,
Summt leis' ins Herz hinein.

15 Cf. Goethe, i, 70; *Neue Liebe, neues Leben:*
Herz, mein Herz, was soll das geben?
Was bedränget dich so sehr?
16 Cf. Herder, *Volkslieder*, Redlich 226: O Jüngling, wirst du auch so schwer wie diese Blume weinen?, and Eichendorff i, 341 (Frauentaschenbuch f. 1816): Sieh, die Blumen stehn voll Thränen.
17 Cf. Müller's *Debora*, 1827 (Vermischte Schriften iii, 181, 256): There is lack of holy water; suddenly tears stream from the eyes of the enraptured youth, the angel receives them in his hands, and Maria is baptized therewith.

1823 (Hk. 50), i, 118:
Mädchen mit dem roten Mündchen,
Mit den Äuglein süss und klar.

1822 (L. I. 38), i, 80:
Der Mond brach aus den Wolken
Und grüsste mit ernstem Blick.
1823 (Hk. 40), i, 114:
Wie der Mond sich leuchtend dränget
Durch den dunkeln Wolkenflor.
1824 (*Harzreise*), *Berg Idylle*, i, 152:
Äuglein wie zwei blaue Sterne.[18]

1823 (Hk. 61), i, 122:
Das gäb' ich den lustigen Winden,
Die trügen es lustig fort.
Sie tragen zu dir, Geliebte,
Das schmerzerfüllte Wort.[19]

1821 (L. I. 17), i, 72:
Herz, mein Herz, du vielgeduldiges . . .
1823 (Hk. 46), i, 117:
Herz, mein Herz, sei nicht beklommen.
1853, *Affrontenburg*, ii, 108:
Herz, mein Herz, ström aus die Fluten . . .
1822 (L. I. 7), i, 68:
Die Lilie soll klingend hauchen
Ein Lied von der Liebsten mein.
Das Lied soll schauern und beben
Wie der Kuss von ihrem Mund.
1821 (L. I. 22), i, 73:
Und wüssten's die Blumen, die kleinen . .
Sie würden mit mir weinen.

1823 (Hk.), *Almansor*, i, 146:
Thränenflut aus lichten Augen
Weint die Dame, sorgsam sinnend,
Auf Almansors braune Locken . . .
Und er träumt: er stehe wieder,
Tief das Haupt gebeugt und triefend,
In dem Dome zu Corduva.[20]
1821 (Gedd. 1822, Lieder 3), i, 31:
Da kam das alte Träumen
Und schlich mir ins Herz hinein.
1823 (Hk. 27), i, 108:
Gelächelt ins Herz hinein.
" (Hk. 47, 49), i, 118:

18 Cf. *Wunderhorn*, ii, 193: Sie hat zwey blaue Äugelein,
Sie glänzen wie zwey Stern.
19 Cf. *Wunderhorn* ii, 50, *Luftelement:*
O Luft, du edles Element,
Führ hin mein Liedlein behend . . .
Klopf leise an das Thor,
An meiner Fillis Ohr.
20 Cf. *Wunderhorn*, i, 72, *Die Nonne:*
Aus ihren schwarzbraunen Äugelein
Sie ihm das Weihwasser gab (im Grabe).

1821 (77 Gedd.), *Entschuldigung*, i, 37:
Schauen Augen, blau' und graue . . .

1821 (77 Gedd.), *Des Postillons Morgenlied vor der Bergschenke*, i, 39:
In dem Walde steht die Schenke
Einsam auf dem höchsten Berg,
Durch den Schornstein bläst die Hexe,
Und im Keller wühlt der Zwerg.
Aber sie, die flinke Dirne,
Weiss mit Geistern umzugehn.

1821 (77 Gedd.), *Seefahrers Abschied*, i, 43:
Und es fragen mich die Freunde,
Was ich doch so traurig bin.

1821 (Urania f. 1822), *Hirtenfeuer in der römischen Ebene*, i, 70:
Die Abendnebel sinken
Hernieder kalt und schwer,
Und Todesengel schweben
In ihrem Dampf umher.

Gehüllt in meinen Mantel . . .
Schau' ich empor zum Berge
Und träume mich beglückt.
(Hüttchen—Mädchen—Grab)

Er steigt so grün und helle
Hervor aus grauem Duft,
Wie eine Zauberinsel
In wogenblauer Luft.

Ich schau dich an, und Wehmut
Schleicht mir ins Herz hinein. . .
So schleicht das Bild sich leise
Hinein in meinen Traum.

1828 (N. F. 12), i, 208:
Schleicht sich wieder, himmlisch quälend,
In die kaum genesne Brust.

1831 (*Kitty* viii), ii, 33:
Das Abendrot und deine Augen,
Sie strahlen mir traurig ins Herz hinein.

1844? *Childe Harold*, i, 268:[21]
Seine blauen Augen schauen . . .

1824, *Berg-Idylle*, i, 152, 155:
Hier dagegen ist es einsam
Auf der kalten Bergeshöh', . . . .
Kleines Völkchen, Wichtelmännchen,
Stehlen unser Brot und Speck . . .
Und die Katz' ist eine Hexe,
Denn sie schleicht bei Nacht und Sturm
Drüben nach dem Geisterberge.

1823 (Hk. 2), i, 95:
Ich weiss nicht, was soll es bedeuten,
Dass ich so traurig bin.[22]

1823 (Hk. 7), i, 98:
Die Abendnebel kamen,
Und stiegen in die Höh'.

" (Hk. 12), i, 101:
Der Abend kommt gezogen,
Der Nebel bedeckt die See;
Geheimnisvoll rauschen die Wogen,
Da steigt es weiss in die Höh'.
Die Meerfrau steigt aus den Wellen . . .

1822 (L. I. 58), i, 88:
Gehüllt im grauen Mantel
Reite ich einsam im Wald.
Und wie ich reite, so reiten
Mir die Gedanken voraus;
Sie tragen mich licht und luftig
Nach meiner Liebsten Haus . . .
Was willst du, thörichter Reiter,
Mit deinem thörichten Traum?

1823 (Hk. 71), i, 128:
Wie dunkle Träume stehen
Die Häuser in langer Reih';
Tief eingehüllt im Mantel
Schreite ich einsam vorbei.
Mit ihren Reizen und Küssen
Erwartet mich Liebchen jetzund.

1825 (Nordsee i, 4), *Die Nacht am Strande*, i, 167:
Und er hüllt sich fest in den grauen Mantel
Und schreitet rasch durch die wehende Nacht.

1822 (L. I. 42), i, 81:
Die Geisterinsel, die schöne,
Lag dämmrig im Mondenglanz;
Dort klangen liebe Töne,
Und wogte der Nebeltanz.

21 First printed *Neue Gedd.* 1844, but almost certainly written 1824, when Heine was deeply moved by the report of Byron's death; see his letter to Moser, June 25, 1824.

22 Cf. Goethe, *Trost in Thränen*, i, 86: Wie kommt's, dass du so traurig bist, Da alles froh erscheint? *Wunderhorn*, i, 210: Wie kommt's, dass du so traurig bist Und gar nicht einmal lachst? Brentano, *Schriften*, ii, 174: Was mag dich nur betrüben, Dass du so traurig denkst?

1821 (77 Gedd.), *Thränen und Rosen*, i, 138:
Ein Knäblein ging spazieren
Wohl um die Abendstund'
In einem Rosengarten,
Da blühten Blümlein bunt.

Du hast ja auch geweinet,
Dein' Äuglein sind so nass;

Eine Thrän' fiel aus dem Fenster,
Da wuchs eine Ros' im Gras.[23]

1821 (77 Gedd.), *Schifferreigen*, ii, 16:
Es kommt ein Schwan gezogen
Des Abends auf der Flut.
Ich will am Strande liegen,
Es träumt sich da so gut.

1821 (Urania f. 1822), *Der Mondsüchtige*, i, 61:
Hinein in ihre Kammer
Mit aller Strahlen Flut!
Wo ist der Mond geblieben?
So later *Der Mond*, i, 161: Mond, du kannst ins offne Fenster in die kleine Kammer sehen.

1821 (do.), *Heimkehr*, i, 63:
Schwalben kommen hergezogen—
Setzt euch, Vöglein, auf mein Dach!..
Baut in meinen Fensterräumen
Eure Häuschen weich und warm.

1822 (Urania f. 1823), *Gute Nacht*, i, 46:
Es zieht ein Mondenschatten
Als mein Gefährte mit.

1822 (do.), *Frühlingstraum*, i, 56:
Ich träumte von bunten Blumen,
So wie sie wohl blühen im Mai:
Ich träumte von grünen Wiesen,
Von lustigem Vogelgeschrei...
Da ward mein Auge wach:
Da war es kalt und finster...
Ich träumte von Lieb' um Liebe,
Von einer schönen Maid,
Von Herzen und von Küssen...
Nun sitz' ich hier alleine
Und denke dem Traume nach.

" *Der Lindenbaum*, i, 48:

1822 (L. I. 43, first form), i, 519: Zauberland—
Wo bunte Blumen blühen
Im goldnen Abendlicht. (Later, i, 82:
Wo grosse Blumen schmachten).

1823 (Hk. 12), i, 101:
Dein Auge wird trüber und nasser,
Du schöne Wasserfee!

1822 (L. I. 2), i, 66:
Aus meinen Thränen spriessen
Viel blühende Blumen hervor.

1823 (Hk. 19), i, 105:
Wo einst ihre Thränen gefallen,
Sind Schlangen hervorgekrochen.

1822 (L. I. 59), i, 89:
Es singt der Schwan im Weiher
Und rudert auf und ab.

1823 (Hk. 9), i, 100:
Im Arm des holden Kindes
Ruh' ich allein am Strand.

1839? *Die Nixen*, i, 276:
Am einsamen Strande plätschert die Flut,
Der Mond ist aufgegangen,
Auf weisser Düne der Ritter ruht,
Von bunten Träumen befangen.

1823 (Hk. 22), i, 106:
Die Jungfrau schläft in der Kammer,
Der Mond schaut zitternd hinein.[24]

1822 (L. I. 53), i, 86:
Wenn ich ein Schwalbe wäre,
So flög ich zu dir, mein Kind,
Und baute mir mein Nestchen,
Wo deine Fenster sind.

1823 (Hk. 4), i, 97:
Die Schwalben, deine Schwestern, ...
Sie wohnten in klugen Nestern
Wo Liebchens Fenster sind.

1823 (Hk. 71), i, 128:
Der Mond ist mein Begleiter,
Er leuchtet mir freundlich vor.[25]

1822 (L. I. 41), i, 81:
Mir träumte von einem Königskind,
Mit nassen, blassen Wangen;
Wir sassen unter der grünen Lind',
Und hielten uns liebumfangen.

1822 (L. I. 52), i, 85:
Mir träumte wieder der alte Traum:
Es war eine Nacht im Maie,
Wir sassen unter dem Lindenbaum,
Und schwuren uns ewige Treue.
Das war ein Schwören und Schwören aufs neu',
Ein Kichern, ein Kosen, ein Küssen...

23 Cf. *Wunderhorn*, i, 257: Ihr Äuglein waren nass; and i, 285 f: Perlen aus den Augen schiessen, Schiessen hin ins grüne Gras... Nur der Boden wohl erquicket Dankend ihm entgegen schicket Rosen rot und Lilien blank. So Brentano, *Ich wollt' ein Sträusslein binden* (Ponce de Leon 1804): Da flossen von den Wangen Mir Thränen in den Klee, Ein Blümlein aufgegangen Ich nun im Garten seh'.

24 Cf. Uhland, *Volkslieder* 98, 1844-5: Der mond der scheint so helle zu liebes fensterlein ein; and Goethe, *An Luna*, i, 49.

25 Cf. Brentano, *Schriften* ii, 201 (1817):
Gibt der Stern, den ich gesehn,
Mir nicht weiter das Geleite.

Am Brunnen vor dem Thore
Da steht ein Lindenbaum;
Ich träumt' in seinem Schatten
So manchen süssen Traum.[26]

1822 (Taschenbuch z. gesell. Vergn.f. 1823), 1824 (Gedd. ii), *Der ewige Jude*, i, 60:
Der müde Wandrer dieser Welt,
Ein sicher Ziel ist ihm gestellt;
Was klagt er ob des Tages Not?
Vor Nacht noch holt ihn heim der Tod.
O Mensch, der du den Lauf vollbracht,
Und gehest ein zur kühlen Nacht. . .

1822 (Aurora f. 1823), *Der Apfelbaum*, i, 61:
"Wer schüttelt die Zweige? Es weht ja kein Wind,
Und es spielen ums Haupt mir die Lüfte lind."
Da gab es im See einen plätschernden Schall,
Als hätt' es gethan einen schweren Fall. . .
"Die schönen Äpfel, so rot, so rund,
Nun liegen sie unten im kalten Grund."

" *Die dürre Linde*, i, 134:
Dort von dem grünen Lindenbaum,
Da fielen die Blätter ab.

1824 (Gedd. ii), *Letzte Hoffnung*, i, 52:
Ach, und fällt das Blatt zu Boden,
Fällt mit ihm die Hoffnung ab.

1825 (Frauentaschenbuch f. 1826), *Nachtstück*, ii, 21;
Es fällt ein Stern vom Himmel.

1822 (Taschenbuch z. gesell. Vergn. f. 1823), *Die Schärpe*, i, 133:
Und wenn ihr ihn begrabet. . .
Lasst eine Stelle frei.[27]

1825 (Frauentaschenbuch f. 1826), *Tanzlied*, i, 67:
Und wenn eine Nadel dir
Abfällt aus dem Mieder,
Das giebt ins Herz zehn Stiche mir,
Die heilt kein Balsam wieder.

1821 (Urania f. 1822), 1824 (Gedd. ii), *Jägers Leid*, i, 75:
Es hat so grün gesäuselt
Am Fenster die ganze Nacht—
Mein Schatz im Tannenwalde,
Hast wohl an mich gedacht?

1825 (Urania f. 1826), *Morgenlied*, i, 88:
Wer schlägt so rasch an die Fenster mir
Mit schwanken grünen Zweigen?

1822 (Gesellschafter), i, 205:
Gekommen ist der Maie,
Die Blumen und Bäume blühn. . .
Die Nachtigallen singen. . .
Ich kann nicht singen und springen,
Ich liege krank im Gras;
Ich höre fernes Klingen,
Mir träumt, ich weiss nicht was.

1824 (Hk. 87), i, 134:
Der Tod, das ist die kühle Nacht,
Das Leben ist der schwüle Tag,
Es dunkelt schon, mich schläfert,
Der Tag hat mich müd' gemacht.

1822 (L. I. 59), i, 88:
Es fällt ein Stern herunter
Aus seiner funkelnden Höh'! . . .
Es fallen vom Apfelbaume
Der Blüten und Blätter viel.
Es kommen die neckenden Lüfte
Und treiben damit ihr Spiel.

1822 (L. I. 25). i, 75:
Die Blätter fielen, der Rabe schrie hohl.

1831 (*Kitty* iii), ii, 31:
Das gelbe Laub erzittert,
Es fallen die Blätter herab.[28]

1822 (L. I. 32, i,) 77:
Mein süsses Lieb, wenn du im Grab,
Im dunkeln Grab wirst liegen,
Dann will ich steigen zu dir hinab. . .

1822 (L. I. 34), i, 78:[29]
Und wenn ich nur das Kisschen wär',
Wo sie die Nadeln steckt hinein!
Und stäche sie mich noch so sehr,
Ich würde mich der Stiche freu'n.

1824 (Harzreise), *Berg-Idylle*, i, 153:
Tannenbaum mit grünen Fingern
Pocht ans niedre Fensterlein.

26 Cf. *Wunderhorn* i, 61 f.: Es sah eine Linde ins tiefe Thal. . . Worunter zwei Verliebte sassen, Vor Lieb' ihr Leid vergassen; i, 300: Als ich zu der Linden kam, Sass mein Schatz daneben; i, 321: Wohl unterm grünen Tannenbaum, Allda ich fröhlich lag, In mein feins Liebchens Armen Die lange liebe Nacht; Büsching u. v. d. Hagen, 283: Wohl unter einer Linde Schlief ich die Nacht, In mein feins Liebchens Armen, Die ganze Nacht; Uhland, *Die Zufriedenen* (1815), ed. Bibl. Inst. i, 28: Ich sass bei jener Linde Mit meinem trauten Kinde, Wir sassen Hand in Hand. . . Aus liebem Aug' ein Grüssen, Vom lieben Mund ein Küssen. . .

27 Cf. *Wunderhorn* i, 53: Macht uns, macht uns ein tiefes Grab. . . Da will ich bey meinem herzliebsten Schatz, In seinem Arm erstehen; Eichendorff i, 324 (1816); *Das kalte Liebchen:* "Lass mich ein, mein süsses Schätzchen!" "Finster ist mein Kämmerlein." . . "Weh, es bricht mein junges Leben!" "Mit ins Grab hinunter muss."

28 Cf. *Wunderhorn* i, 321: Die Blätter von den Blumen, Die fallen nun auf mich; iii, 153 (Claudius, *Der verschwundene Stern*): Es stand ein Sternlein am Himmel. . . Das Sternlein ist verschwunden; Büsching u. v. d. Hagen, 283: Die Blätter von der Linde, Die fielen auf mich; Dass mich mein Schatz verlassen hat, Das kränket mich.

29 This is one of the seventeen lyrics reviewed by Müller; see p. 104 of this Journal.

1827 (Lyrische Reisen), *Die Muscheln*, ii, 19:
Ein kleines Fischermädchen,
Zum Küssen gross genug. . .

1826 (Urania f. 1827), *Himmel und Meer*, i, 98:
So ist mein Herz dein Meer, sein Himmel du.
Wann gönnest du den Wogen endlich Ruh'?
" *Vineta*, i, 102:
Aus des Meeres tiefem, tiefem Grunde
Klingen Abendglocken dumpf und matt. . .
Aus des Herzens tiefem, tiefem Grunde. . .

A great poet, as Goethe saw and said, can afford to be, indeed can hardly help being, a great borrower, and it is no derogation to that notoriously great borrower Heine to have pointed out some of his indebtedness to one brother poet. For Heine is certainly not guilty of the sort of thing he lashes unmercifully in the *blöde Jüngerschaft* of Goethe: *das matte Nachpiepsen jener Weisen, die der Alte gepfiffen* (Elster vii, 256). In the matter of metrical effect, too, Heine's lyrics are a shining monument to the truth of his own saying: *Auch die Metrik hat ihre Ursprünglichkeiten, die nur aus wahrhaft poetischer Stimmung hervortreten, und die man nicht nachahmen kann* (letter to Immermann, April 25, 1830). There is verily no need of vindicating Heine's essential originality of both matter and manner as over against Müller, who was himself a chronic borrower[30] and far more conventional than Heine. It is a characteristic difference between the two poets, for example, that Heine, one of the greatest of German satirists and a brilliant epigrammatist, avoids the traditional form of the epigram, while the gentle and good-natured Müller manufactures stereotyped epigrams by the hundred. From the first, Heine recognized with unerring judgment just what Müller had to teach him, and we have seen that he was both a diligent and a grateful pupil, though one who had the power to outdo his master. And the sincerity of Heine's letter to Müller is fully vindicated.

JOHN SCHOLTE NOLLEN.

*Iowa College.*

30 P. S. Allen in MOD. LANG. NOTES xiv, No. 6, and in the *Journal of Germanic Philology* ii, 283, iii, 35, 431.

1823 (Hk. 8), i, 99:
Du schönes Fischermädchen,
Treibe den Kahn ans Land;
Komm zu mir und setze dich nieder,
Wir kosen Hand in Hand.

Mein Herz gleicht ganz dem Meere,
Hat Sturm und Ebb' und Flut. . .

1830, ii, 72:
Im Mondenglanze ruht das Meer. . .
Wo aus dem Meeresgrunde klingt
Glockengeläut und Beten.

---

## *THE OPENING OF BOCCACCIO'S LIFE OF DANTE.*

BOCCACCIO begins his Life of Dante with a reference to Solon. This, in the translation by Smith (*Yale Studies in English*, X), runs as follows:

'Solon, whose bosom was reputed a human temple of divine wisdom, and whose sacred laws are manifest proof to modern men of ancient justice, used frequently to say, as some relate, that all republics, like men, walk and stand on two feet. With sound judgment he declared the right foot to be the punishment of every crime, and the left the remuneration of every virtuous deed. He added that if either of these two things through carelessness or corruption be neglected, the republic that so acts must unquestionably walk lame; and that if she should be so unfortunate as to sin against both these canons, almost certainly she could not stand at all.'

This would appear to have been amplified, with the addition of the figure, from Cicero, *Epist. ad Brutum* i. 15. 3 (ed. Baiter and Kayser):

'Ut Solonis dictum usurpem, qui et sapientissimus fuit ex septem et legum scriptor solus ex septem; is rem publicam contineri duabus rebus dixit, præmio et pœna.'

With the statement in Stobæus (*Florilegium* 43. 76) Boccaccio can not, of course, have been acquainted:

*Σόλων ἐκείνην εἶπεν ἄριστα τὴν πόλιν οἰκεῖσθαι, ἐν ᾗ τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἄνδρας συμβαίνει τιμᾶσθαι, καὶ τὸ ἐναντίον ἐν ᾗ τοὺς κακοὺς ἀμύνεσθαι.*

A curious reflection of Solon's maxim may be found in *Gulliver's Travels*, to this effect:

'Although we usually call reward and punishment the two hinges upon which all government turns, yet I could never observe this maxim to be put in practice by any nation except that of Lilliput. Whoever can there bring sufficient proof that he hath strictly observed the laws of his country for seventy-three moons hath a claim to certain privileges, according to his quality and condition of life, with a proportionable sum of money out of a fund appropriated for that use; he likewise acquires the title of *snillpall*, or *legal*, which is added to his name, but doth not descend to his posterity. And these people thought it a prodigious defect of policy among us, when I told them that our laws were enforced only by penalties, without any mention of reward. It is upon this account that the image of Justice, in their courts of judicature, is formed with six eyes, two before, as many behind, and on each side one, to signify circumspection, with a bag of gold open in her right hand and a sword sheath in her left, to show that she was more disposed to reward than to punish.'

ALBERT S. COOK.

*Yale University.*

## *ARTHURIAN NOTES.*

1. *Chapalu.* In "Bataille Loquifer" figures a monster of this name, a cat-headed creature who, according to André de Coutances, played an important part in the Arthurian romance of his day (*Hist. litt. de la France*, xxii, 536, xxx, 219). According to the *Chanson de geste*, Renoart is carried by fairies to Avalon, where, at the command of Arthur, in order to test his valor, he is attacked by Chapalu, who is kept in a cistern (as a maritime demon maintained in his element); in the course of the encounter, the beast is able to attain the object of his craving, a draught of blood from the heel of his antagonist, and by this remedy is restored to human shape, of which he has been deprived by enchantment (Le Roux de Lincy, *Le livre des légendes*, p. 246, ff.). It has escaped the keen observation of Prof. Child, that the fiend, who in No. 30 of *English and Scottish ballads* is enclosed in a hogshead in the palace of king Cornwall, and does battle with a knight of Arthur, seems to be none other than Chapalu, or at any rate one of his kind.

2. *Gawain.* Scholars who have treated of this knight have failed to notice the most natural interpretation of the proper name. William of Malmesbury mentions Walwen as king of Walweitha or Galloway; he evidently understood the knight as an eponymous hero, and so the appellation may really have been; Walweia, Walweianus, Walwen, as in Geoffrey of Monmouth Locrin from Loegria. Walgainus, in Geoffrey, is son of Lot; the descent is accounted for by the usual association of Lothian and Galloway. If this be allowed, it follows that the genealogical system was neither traditional nor ancient, but literary and in the twelfth century modern; for Galloway was not one of the old Scottish provinces; on the contrary, the name of the region was formed from that of the invading occupants, *Gall Gaedel* or foreign Gael, as in Irish phrase was called the insular population of mixed blood, half Scot, half Norse, but in manners and conduct more closely affiliated with the latter. The odd result would be, that the typical hero of "British" fiction would not in truth represent a Briton, but be of Irish name and semi-Teutonic parentage.

WILLIAM WELLS NEWELL.

*Cambridge, Mass.*

## *MINOR NOTES ON CHAUCER.*

*House of Fame* 183–184:

> How Creusa was ylost, allas!
> That deed—ne wot I how—she was.

The Globe edition furnishes the reading *ne wot* for the *not* of the Mss., but it is to be noticed that the reading of F. and P., *that dede not*, is equally good rhythmically. On the other hand, the reading of B., *that ded not*, produces a line in exact rhythmic agreement with its companion in the couplet. The question of the rhythm may, therefore, be dismissed, and Skeat's inserted *but* confidently cancelled. But the substitution of *rede* for *ded* in the printed editions Cx. and Th. is in attestation of the somewhat unusual construction of the second line, and this is its chief point of interest.

It is surely not mere coincidence that the corresponding description of the loss of Creusa in the *Æneid* (ii, 734 f.) is also involved in syntactical vagarity. The doubtful construction of *misero* (l. 576), the rivalry between *fatone* and *fato mi*, the use of *seu*, and the mood of the verbs which appear to depend upon *incertum* (l. 740), these points have been much discussed

by the critics,[1] so that the commentary upon the passage in question might well have served to arrest the attention of the editors of Chaucer. It should not have escaped observation that Chaucer's curiously constructed line reproduces much of the effect of the construction of the original by the oddly placed and interrupting *not I how*, the equivalent of the oddly placed *incertum*.

*Compleint Damours* 12:

Ye han me cast in thilke spitous yle.

"The allusion is to the isle of Naxos" says Prof. Skeat, to which Chaucer alludes "at least thrice in a similar way." But these three instances relate directly to the story of Ariadne and, therefore, disprove the accuracy of the phrase "in a similar way." It is difficult to believe that this "synonym for a state of hopeless despair" (Skeat) involves a specific reference to Naxos rather than to Delos or any other isle. It would be equally consistent to require Florent to name the island to which he would banish his bride (Gower, *Confessio Amantis* i, 1578). This figurative use of island is, of course, grounded in the experience of life and of legend.

*Compleint Damours* 15–18:

Sooth is, that wel I woot, by lyklinesse,—
If that it were a thing possible to do
For to acompte your beautee and goodnesse,—
I have no wonder thogh ye do me wo;

The second and third lines are by way of an apologetic parenthesis, and at the same time epexegetic of the phrase *by lykliness*. However, *lykliness* is here equivalent in sense to *lyknesse*, 'likeness,' 'resemblance' (cf. the obsolete uses of *likeliness* and *likelihood*), and the phrase means 'in the matter of resemblance,' or 'by comparison.' The passage may, therefore be translated thus:

'The truth is (I can't deny it), when I compare myself with you,—if indeed it were possible to measure your beauty and goodness,—I am not surprised that you cause me distress.'

*Compleint Damours* 81:

Sonne of the *sterres* bright and clere of hewe.

From the line thus emended (*sterres* for *sterre*) it was an easy step to the careless report of Mss. F. and B., *sterre so bright*. The poet is employing, by metaphor, the figure of *micat inter omnes*, which, by simile, occurs in the *Book of the Duchesse* 817–829, and in the *Parl. of Foules* 298–301. The same figure is heightened into the extravagant contrast of *Anelida and Arcite* 71–73.

The suggested reading may to some minds furnish a presumption in favor of also restoring the "omnes" of the figure in the passage from the *Parlement* by reading *Passeth the sterres*. The matter is somewhat doubtful.

*Compleint unto Pite* 29–35:

But yet encreseth me this wonder newe,
That no wight woot that she is deed but I,—
So mony men as in her tyme hir knewe;
And yet she dyed not so sodeynly,
For I have sought her ever ful besily
Sith I first hadde wit or mannes mynde,
But she was deed er that I coude hir fynde.

I beg to call attention to this punctuation of this stanza; it differs from that of the editions, though agreeing in the main with that of ten Brink's (*Essays on Chaucer*, p. 171). The parenthetic affirmation (in construction akin to the simple absolute) of the third line unites it with what precedes not with what follows. This may be illustrated by a possible modern *as*-clause: 'I am surprised to hear that this has now happened,—as many men as have been trying to prevent it.' In this same construction are ll. 110–111 of the *Compleint to his Lady: And so hool, swete*, etc.

It will be observed that the remaining four lines of the stanza now become clear and logical after the removal of the semicolons of Prof. Skeat's text.

JAMES W. BRIGHT.

[1] Mr. B. A. Wise, a member of my Seminary, refers me to a discussion of these lines by Schroeter in *Jahresbericht des Königlichen Gymnasiums zu Cr.-Strehlitz, O. S.*, 1874–75, p. 7.

## *ROMANCE VERSIFICATION.*

*Die Technik des romantischen Verses* von OSKAR MÜLLER. Berlin: E. Ebering, 1901. 96 pp. Leipzig diss.

IT seems rather strange that up to the present day there is no thorough study of the verse-technique of Victor Hugo nor of any of the Romantic poets; and now, in one monograph, we are offered what purports to be an exhaustive investigation of the four principal poets of the Romantic school: V. Hugo, Lamartine, de Musset, de Vigny. Unfor-

tunately, however, the work under review is a disappointment, for the following reasons: 1. its bibliographical inadequacy; 2. the endeavor to compass too vast a field in its treatment; 3. lack of a thorough knowledge of the subject of versification on the part of the author; 4. much useless work here presented, work that belongs in a treatise of verse.

The bibliography which the author has consulted is meager in the extreme, consisting of only thirteen works; among these, Tobler, Becq de Fouquières, de Banville are frequently referred to, Tobler being the author's basis. To mention the bibliography of V. Hugo alone, necessary to a study such as this purports to be, would take up too much space. The reviewer is of the opinion that no investigation of this nature is conclusive, or even valuable, if it does not examine *all* the works of an author and these in chronological order, as far as this is possible; this has not been done in the present thesis. Especially in V. Hugo would such a study bring out many points of interest in the development of verse-technique and make possible many valuable chronological comparisons in the use of the hemistich and overflow. For such a study the works of Biré become invaluable, and these have not been consulted by Müller.

The subject is treated under eight headings: 1. syllable count; 2. hiatus; 3. overflow; 4. cesura; 5. rhythm; 6. rhyme; 7. euphony; 8. meaning of words.

Under each of these headings the rule, or rules, as posited by Tobler, are quoted and the exceptions cited. It may be said at this point, that throughout this thesis too many data are presented as apparently new, but which are so well known that they give the work the appearance of an elementary treatise rather than of an original investigation; all these facts might have served as an introduction to the monograph.

Verse bibliography shows that no poet is consistent in the use of monosyllabic and dissyllabic words; such words as *hier*, etc., may be either. To devote fourteen pages to such a comparatively unimportant and even useless investigation seems a pity. That *ce* and *je* are not elided, that *le* is used before a vowel and not elided nor counted as a syllable are facts that we seek in a treatise of versification.

The thirteen-syllable verse in *Cromwell* ii, 10, l. 13, is interesting.

The conclusion from this study is that V. Hugo is more conservative than de Musset, clinging closer to tradition; Lamartine belongs to the modern poets because he uses *voient* in the interior of the verse. The writer, however, doubts the validity of such an assertion.

With regard to the use of hiatus the author finds that the poets examined, for the most part, observe the law of hiatus more closely; de Musset is somewhat lax; but outside of the familiar *çà et là*, *peu à peu*, *une à une*, only one case of hiatus is noted, the famous—*folle que tu es*.

In the works examined, a few of each poet, Müller discovers that V. Hugo and de Musset indulge in the the use of the overflow frequently and possibly too frequently. In *Cromwell* 2%, in *Hernani* 3½% are irregular or non-classical overflow lines. It would certainly be interesting to have statistics of all of Hugo's works in chronological order. The discoveries of Müller have long been well known facts.

The term cesura in French versification is no longer used; hemistich has replaced it. This chapter on cesura forms one of the most interesting and valuable chapters of the monograph. Müller states that he has found only a few cases of possessive and demonstrative pronouns, articles and monosyllabic prepositions at the hemistich; even *si* is objectionable and one example is cited, p. 38; but such lines are frequent, for example:

Hideuse, comme si le même coup d'épée.

Outside of these facts, which, if true of all the works of Hugo, would be interesting, too much space is given to discussing points of no value. The conclusion is again a known fact—the Romantic poets preserve the classical hemistich in the main, by preserving the sixth syllable stressed.

As to rhythm, six pages are required to explain the difference between the classical and Romantic verse. The results obtained are not conclusive because they hold only for a few works. The reviewer differs from Müller and others in the fundamental analysis of a French Alexandrine; he believes that every verse ought to be read as classical unless the logi-

cal sense and the verse rhythm require that it be otherwise read. Thus, on this basis, for example, p. 56, out of twelve lines six are perfect classical Alexandrines. To cite two lines given as Romantic:

Laissez.—Tous ces enfants sont bien là.—Qui vous dit.
Pleure. Les pleurs sont bien, même au bonheur; tes chants.

From this view-point the statistics, as given by the author, would be lower by at least 40%. The works which the author has examined of V. Hugo belong to his first period of authorship: in the *Odes et Ballades* 1/10%, in the *Orientales* 1%, in the *Feuilles d'Automne* 1 2/5% are Romantic lines. Of the 2176 lines in *Hernani* 175 are Romantic; Dr. Matzke's results are quite different; he finds 553 Romantic lines. Müller evidently did not know of this investigation.

As striking rhymes in V. Hugo, the following are cited: mer-blasphemer; apostasier-hier. They are frequent in Lamartine; one example in de Musset and Vigny. Monsieur-crieur found in Hugo and Lamartine. Rich rhyme is more frequent in the Romantic than in the classical poetry; but these statistics are based on only a few poems. In V. Hugo rich rhyme is used especially in poems in which beauty of form is aimed at.

General conclusion: the Romantic poets, in the main, adhere to the general laws of versification; we have occasional variations. Hiatus law is strictly observed. French verse received from the Romantic school, especially from V. Hugo, a greater pliability and freedom by the free use of the hemistich, frequent use of overflow, and rich rhyme.

From this review we are led to the question: What results are here obtained? The answer is, the work *est à refaire*. The most serious defect is the failure to consult and apply verse bibliography, and to examine all the works of the poets under question and in chronological order.

HUGO P. THIEME.

*University of Michigan.*

## *ENGLISH LITERATURE.*

*The Works of Thomas Kyd.* Edited from the original texts, with introduction, notes, and facsimiles. By FREDERICK S. BOAS, M. A. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1901. 8vo, pp. cxvi, 470.

THE edition of Kyd's works by Prof. Boas will be of very great service to students of the Elizabethan drama. During the past few years the way has been prepared for such a collection by the biographical researches of Prof. Schick and Mr. Sidney Lee; by many investigations in respect to Kyd's authorship of various plays, notably Prof. Sarrazin's *Thomas Kyd und sein Kreis;* and by scholarly editions of the *Spanish Tragedy* by Prof. Schick and Prof. Manly. In a long introduction Prof. Boas has discussed and added to the results of these preceding investigators. While many problems in regard to Kyd are perplexing and do not admit of conclusive demonstration, Prof. Boas has in general shown accuracy and judgment in his discussion of conflicting evidence, and a thorough knowledge of the work of his predecessors, except of Prof. Manly's edition of the *Spanish Tragedy*, which strangely enough is not even mentioned. Particularly interesting is his discussion of Kyd's biography. He has discovered among the Harleian MSS. documents bearing on the charges of atheism made against Kyd and Marlowe shortly before the death of the latter. Kyd appears in the unenviable position of casting all the blame upon Marlowe. The chief value of the book, however, naturally lies in the trustworthy texts of the *Spanish Tragedy*, *Cornelia*, *Soliman and Perseda*, the *House holders Philosophie* (a translation from Tasso), the *Murder of John Brewen*, and *the First Part of Jeronimo*.

Prof. Boas has retained the spelling of the original texts and carefully collated all extant editions. A comparison of his texts with those in volume V of Hazlitt's *Dodsley* affords an interesting illustration of the advance made in the last thirty years in this field of English scholarship. It is to be hoped that the bulk of the Elizabethan plays may eventually be reprinted with similar accuracy. In one or two particulars, however, there is room for a word of criticism. Prof. Boas in a few cases changes the spelling of proper names in order to preserve uniformity. It is difficult to see what advantage there is in uniformity of spelling Elizabethan proper names. On the other hand, Mr. Fleay and Mr. Boyle have found in different spellings of the same name indications of different authors. While the value of this test may not be well established, still any variation in text which may offer the slightest aid to critical research might well be retained.

In the division of the plays into acts and scenes Prof. Boas's practice is also open to question. The main purpose of the division into scenes in a modern edition is to facilitate reference; but in the four modern editions of the *Spanish Tragedy* we have four different arrangements. Reference to the play is consequently not facilitated in the least. Prof. Boas differs in only a few cases from Prof. Manly and Prof. Schick, but these cases raise questions on which there might well be a consensus of opinion for the benefit of future editors of Elizabethan plays. The Choruses at the beginning or end of each act are marked as scenes by Boas and Schick but not by Manly, whose practice is in accord with precedent in the case of Shakespeare. Several other divergences will be noted; Schick certainly is contrary to Elizabethan custom in marking scene xv in Act iii; the preference between the divisions of Manly and Boas is hard to determine. The notes supplied by Prof. Boas for the texts are excellent.

In regard to the most debated questions of authorship, he comes to the conclusions that Kyd was the author of *Soliman and Perseda*, and the *Ur Hamlet*, but not of the *First Part of Jeronimo*.

Of the last conclusion he is the most certain and advances a number of arguments in addition to those proposed by Dr. Rudolf Fischer[1] against Kyd's authorship. The *First Part of Jeronimo* seems to Prof. Boas utterly unworthy of the author of the *Spanish Tragedy*, very different from that play in style and characterization, and incompatible with it in the account of the love affair of Andrea and Bellimperia. Differences in style and characterization cannot be considered of much weight in the case of an author known by one play, especially when we remember similar differences in the plays of Greene, or the two parts of the *Honest Whore*, or in the plays of other dramatists. Prof. Boas's other arguments are, if anything, less conclusive.

The entries in Henslow's *Diary* for 1592 indicate, as Prof. Boas concludes, that there was a companion piece to the *Spanish Tragedy*, produced by way of introduction on the afternoon before, or a day or two earlier. It is styled by Henslow, "the comodey of done oracio," "the comodey of Jeronymo," "spanes comodye donne oracoe." The version of the *First Part of Jeronimo* which we have was printed in 1605, the year in which the Queen's Revels (Children of the Chapel) were in serious difficulties and in which a number of their plays were printed.[2] The allusions to the short stature of Jeronimo show that the play was acted by a children's company, and we learn from the Induction to the *Malcontent* that the Queen's Revels had misappropriated *Jeronimo* (either one or both of the Jeronimo plays). The date when the *First Part* was first acted by the children probably was not 1604, as Boas assumes, for the *Malcontent* was acted 1603-4 in retaliation[3] by the King's men, and *Jeronimo* must have been acted earlier by the children of the chapel—probably about 1600 as stated by Fleay[4] and Small,[5] and as indicated by the allusion to the year of Jubilee (1600) in Act 1, scene 1.

The play, as we have it, then, seems likely to be the early "comodey of Jeronymo," altered and abridged for the children. Alterations may be found in the references to Jeronimo's size and the year of jubilee, surely on no "purely arbitrary hypothesis" (Boas xlii). Indications of abridgment are the shortness of the play, less than one-half the length of the *Spanish Tragedy*, the combination of a short and a long line in rhyming couplets, and the very short parts assigned to some important personages. Don Pedro, Duke Medina, Vollupo, and the Duke of Castile have but a few words each. Some of the divergences between the *First Part* and the *Spanish Tragedy* may be plausibly laid to such abridgment, especially the failure of the *First Part* to set forth the secret nature of the love of Bellimperia and Andrea—a divergence to which Prof. Boas attaches great importance. He observes:

1 Zur Kunstentwicklung der Englischen Tragödie. Strassburg, 1893.

2 In 1605-6. The Dutch Courtesan, All Fools, Eastward Ho, the Fleire, the Fawn, the Gentleman Usher, Isle of Gulls, Monsieur D'Olive, Sir Giles Goosecappe, Sophonisba.

3 Cf. *The Stage Quarrel between Ben Jonson and the Poetasters*. R. A. Small, 1899, pp. 114-5.

4 *Chronicle of the Drama*, ii. 27. Fleay finds a plausible argument in a reference in *Cynthia's Revels*.

5 Small, *The Stage Quarrel*, etc., p. 124, note.

"when Lazarotto reveals the whole story in the presence of Castile, [Bell-imperia's father] the Duke utters no word of surprise or anger" [xlii].

But the only words which the duke utters in the whole course of the play are, "I, Don Rogero" (i, 1). The part had presumably been greatly cut. Now, the *Spanish Tragedy* refers to many events prior to the opening of the action and these cannot be said "to relate chiefly to the secret love between Andrea and Bell-Imperia" [Boas, xli.], but rather to the whole love-affair, the war and the death of Andrea. Whatever discrepancies may be noted between the two plays, nevertheless the *First Part* does present in the main the story of the events which the *Spanish Tragedy* requires. Surely, then, we are justified in accepting the 1605 quarto as representing the companion piece of the *Spanish Tragedy* of 1592.

Whether this version in any way represents Kyd is a more complex question, but the facts of the stage-history incline one to exercise much more caution than does Prof. Boas in rejecting it as spurious. The natural inferences from those facts seem to forbid his endorsement of the conclusion of Rudolf Fischer,

"that it is the work of a journeyman playwright who found in the Induction to *The Spanish Tragedy* hints from which he manufactured this crude melodrama, whose title served as a decoy to the theatre-going public, and which has had the effect, doubtless unforeseen by its author, of fatally injuring the fame of Kyd." [Introduction xliv.]

When a few pages later on the evidence of an allusion to "Cues and Cees," Prof. Boas declares, "Some 'wit' reared at Cambridge was responsible for *The First Part of Jeronimo*," one must note this as one of the very few occasions when he has confused doubtful conjecture and fact.

His discussion of *Soliman and Perseda* is not open to this charge. On the contrary, the evidences, wholly internal, are presented with a discriminating sense of their values. The chief objection to assigning the play to Kyd is the character of Basilisco. If we must rely on æsthetic opinions, many will probably find it easier to believe that Kyd wrote a good deal of the melodramatic *First Part* than to believe that even with the aid of classical prototypes he could have created this admirably humorous braggart, whom Prof. Schick has with justice called "by far the most remarkable Elizabethan precursor of Falstaff." Prof. Boas, however, credits Kyd with "Sophoclean dramatic irony" and other traits not very evident to most of us; consequently he makes little difficulty of Basilisco and concludes that the play was by Kyd or—less probably—a disciple.

In the discussion of the *Ur-Hamlet*—as in that of *Soliman and Perseda*—while Prof. Boas agrees with Sarrazin's main conclusion, he submits the evidence advanced by the latter to a thorough reconsideration. He rules the German *Bestrafte Brudermord* out of consideration, resting on Tanger's conclusion

"that this piece is nothing more than a version of the *First Quarto*, with probably a few later additions due to actors familiar with Shakespeare's play in its later form" (xlviii).

Even if Tanger's criticism of Creizenach's analysis seems more conclusive than it does to the present writer, it is still difficult to believe that the pirated and mangled *First Quarto* was largely responsible for the German play. The hypothesis that it goes back to the *Ur-Hamlet* seems more plausible; and the theory that the *Ur-Hamlet* was by Kyd in the style of the *Spanish Tragedy* adds considerably to the probability of this hypothesis. Whatever view is assumed in regard to the German play, however, there is plenty of chance for objection; and Prof. Boas's course at least has the advantage of ruling that troublesome abridgment out of the discussion. It has, on the other hand, the very serious disadvantage of compelling him to confine the internal evidences of Kyd's authorship of the *Ur-Hamlet* to the resemblances between Kyd's plays and the *First Quarto*. The resting of any case on the *First Quarto* is precarious business, and this part of the introduction will doubtless encounter much dissent, especially from those who find it difficult to believe that there is anything in *Hamlet* not due to Shakespeare's genius. Even those who agree with Boas in finding resemblances to Kyd in the quarto will have some trouble in accepting his sweeping statement:

"The bulk of the blank verse in the three later Acts is, in my opinion, unmistakably pre-

Shakespearean. The vocabulary and the rhythm are not those of the master-dramatist at any stage of his career, while in Kyd's works they may be frequently paralleled" (Introd. xlix).

His list of parallels, however, is certainly valuable and, perhaps, as convincing as such evidence can be.

The main evidence for Kyd's authorship is, of course, Nash's allusion in his Epistle to Greene's *Menaphon*. Boas makes rather too much difficulty out of phrases which Prof. Ward has thought to point to Kyd as expressing "the University man's contempt for Latin not learnt on the Cam or Isis."[6] Though Prof. MacCallum has recently summed up effectively the objections to Kyd,[7] most students now probably agree with him that the balance of evidence is in favor of Kyd. Prof. Boas has added to the evidence offered by Sarrazin, but the case for Kyd still stands substantially where Sarrazin left it. Nash's allusion fits Kyd better than anyone else. The early *Hamlet* in plot and general character was probably similar to the *Spanish Tragedy*. Similarities to Kyd may plausibly be discovered in the *First Quarto*, the German play, and for that matter in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*.

The nature of Shakespeare's treatment of the early play is a problem too complex for discussion here, but we may note a dissent from the conjectures of Prof. Boas in regard to the history of the early play. The allusions to it, covering fifteen years, indicate a greater popularity than he grants it. Moreover, while it "probably underwent in manuscript form a certain amount of adaptation," we can by no means assent to the surmise that its "popularized stage version" which Shakespeare had for a basis,

"would have had something of the same relation to the *Ur-Hamlet* as Ayrer's German adaptation of the *Spanish Tragedie* has to its original" (liii note).

This conjecture is as unfounded as it is unnecessary. Boas is driven to it because "we do not find in the Quarto some features of style characteristic of the author of *The Spanish Tragedie*" (liii). But why should we? Almost all "features of style" are lacking in that production. The early *Hamlet* may have been as much altered as the *First Part of Jeronimo* seems to have been, or it may have had as unmolested an existence as did many other Elizabethan plays, which remained for years in MS. So far as probabilities go, we may conjecture that if Kyd wrote a *Hamlet* in 1588, Shakespeare was tolerably familiar with the play and could have found a fairly integral copy in 1601.

In discussing the *Spanish Tragedy*, Prof. Boas is on less debatable ground. This is the one play which we can certainly ascribe to Kyd, at least until some ingenious critic twists Heywood's lines. If the authorship, however, is settled, the date is not. Prof. Boas concludes that the evidence suggests a date 1585–7, but he does not consider an interesting question which this early date raises. *Tamburlaine* is generally assigned to 1587, and if the *Spanish Tragedy* preceded *Tamburlaine*, we must make some important changes in our notions of the extent and importance of Marlowe's innovations. If the *Spanish Tragedy* with its blank-verse, its central heroic figure, its partial success in infusing passion into an old narrative, its blood and thunder, its soliloquies, and its "high astounding terms," preceded *Tamburlaine*, Prof. Boas would be justified in giving much more attention than he does to Kyd's influence on Elizabethan tragedy. As a matter of fact, the evidence for the date is very uncertain and by no means forbids a later date than 1587.

In examining this evidence, Prof. Boas has surely been led into an error in thinking that

"when Nash speaks of the authors who 'attract infection' by spending 'two or three howers in turning over French *Doudie*' he may be referring to Kyd's imitation"

of a passage in *Cornelie* (Int. xxix). He has perhaps been misled by an unfortunate passage in Prof. Schick's introduction to the play. He declared that in Nash's jest, "a splendid vista of literary connection is opened to our imagination,"[8] and

"there is hardly any doubt that the passage in the main refers to the translation of certain

6 *A History of English Dramatic Literature*, ed. 1899. i. 312, note.

7 *The Furnivall Miscellany*. "The Authorship of the Early *Hamlet*," p. 282 ff.

8 *The Spanish Tragedy*, ed. by Schick. Introd. xiii. The whole passage is a notable example of perverted ingenuity.

plays in French by the head of the French Senecans, Robert Garnier."

He also indulged in an astonishing identification of 'Dowdy' and 'Didon'; "the Dowdy may refer to a play with the title 'Didon'—Jodelle's, for instance (cf. 'Dido a Dowdy,' *Romeo and Juliet*, ii, iv, 43)." The meaning of 'Dowdy' is plain enough as the passage from *Romeo and Juliet* might suggest, and the rest of Nash's joke has an unmistakable meaning which need not be dwelt on. Surely there is no literary reference. If one must look for literary connections, attention might be called to Mr. Fleay's mention of a parallel passage in Greene's Address prefixed to *Perimedes* (1588), alluding to Marlowe and possibly Kyd as "too much frequenting the hot-house;"[9] this is enough to recall the abundance of such "unpleasantries" as Nash's in Elizabethan plays and pamphlets.

In general, it may be added, Prof. Boas is somewhat too eager to find something in Kyd's career to fit every word of Nash's oft-discussed paragraph. It may possibly refer to more than one dramatist; and at all events our knowledge of Kyd's life is still too meagre to enable us to determine all the references with any certainty. Mr. Fleay's example ought to be a warning against exercising too much ingenuity over Elizabethan allusions.

It may be questioned, however, whether Fleay's theories in regard to Kyd should be dismissed as summarily as they are by Boas. No subject in connection with the Elizabethan drama offers a more valuable field for research than the works of Mr. Fleay; the first step in any investigation may well be to search out what he has discovered, conjectured, misplaced, or forgotten. His ascription to Kyd of the *Taming of the Shrew* might at least have received some attention. Prof. Boas barely mentions this and occupies only three pages in rejecting *Titus Andronicus*, partly on the ground of "a significant difference of atmosphere" between it and the *Spanish Tragedy*. Apart from the suggestion that Kyd may have influenced for the better Marlowe's technique and coustruction of plots during their association 1590–2, the rest of the discussion of Kyd's influence on the drama is confined largely to tracing parallel passages and allusions to the *Spanish Tragedy*. After such a list of parallels in Shakespeare, we are surprised to learn that "his debt to Kyd is scarcely, if at all, less than to Marlowe himself" (p. lxxxiii). But the real extent of this indebtedness is hardly hinted at. Shakespeare and the rest of the Elizabethan dramatists owe more to Marlowe than to Kyd, but they owe much to the innovator who adapted Seneca into a genuine English drama, and who created an important type of tragedy. The influence of Kyd's technique and his choice and treatment of dramatic motives might be traced in the plays of Marston, Chapman, Tourneur, and Webster as well as Shakespeare. The omission of any mention of *Antonio and Mellida* in Prof. Boas' discussion is at least curious. But he does not see fit to pay much attention to Kyd's historical position and importance, either his relation to the preceding followers of Seneca or his influence on succeeding authors of 'revenge' tragedies.

This neglect is not because of a slight estimate of Kyd's genius. On the contrary, the introduction exhibits an enthusiastic and sympathetic appreciation of both his work and his personality. We may find the enthusiasm justified which defends the *Spanish Tragedy* against the contempt which it has frequently received, for the play has irony, and a sense of fate, and some genuine passion. But Prof. Boas occasionally forgets that its dramatic art is crude, and that it is æsthetically interesting more for what it tries to express than for what it actually achieves. In a single page (xxxvii) we are told that "Kyd displays incontestable dramatic genius," that "he reproduces something of that Sophoclean dramatic irony which is among the crowning glories of the Attic stage," that

"beneath the ripple of gay discourse on so trivial a theme as the arrangements for an amateur performance we catch the solemn undertone of an ever-nearing catastrophe."

In the epilogue, we learn,

"echoes of Virgilian music temper the harsher strain, and glimpses are given us of Hieronimo and his loved ones amidst the Elysian fields—glimpses that help to make us less forlorn" (p. xxxix).

May not the discovery of such emotions in so wooden a production as the *Spanish Tragedy* be attributed to the Pathetic Fallacy?

9 *Chronicle of the Drama* ii, 31–2.

Kyd himself has become a very real figure to his editor. From the meagre facts of his career, a picture is drawn to move our pity. His plays are found to illuminate his personality. He is discovered to have been "a man of sombre and rigid temperament"—possibly on the external evidence of Nash's jest already alluded to, and the internal evidence in the character of Basilisco. He had a "quickened sensibility of vision into the darker phases of human character and destiny;" and this inference we may more surely refer to the character of Lorenzo, in which Prof. Boas takes a psychological interest. Some readers may find relief from the careful examination of facts and balancing of evidence in such flights into the region of sentimental fancy. The funeral oration pronounced on Kyd (pp. lxxvii, lxxviii) is certainly both imaginative and eloquent.

Other readers will not have enough sensibility of vision to seek in the plays of Kyd for either hidden gems or indications of the author's view of life; and these will regret that Prof. Boas has occasionally abandoned the historical point of view for that of modern æsthetic criticism. His aberrations in literary judgment, we must hasten to add, give only a momentary annoyance and by no means affect an appreciation of the painstaking and judicious scholarship manifest throughout the book. And if this review has emphasized some points which occasion dissent, instead of dwelling on the many additions which have been made to our knowledge of Kyd, it is only because even slight corrections and trivial criticisms seem worth noting in the case of a book which must in many respects serve as a model for future editors of the dramatists.

In the note on the Earl of Gloucester's invasion of Portugal (p. 397) mention should be made of the play "the Honorable Life of the Humourous Earl of Gloster, with his conquest of Portugal" (Henslow's *Diary*, 1601) and of the reference to this expedition at the end of *Look About You* (cf. Fleay, *Chronicle* ii, 226, 227). References to Tanger's discussions of the first quarto of Hamlet in *Anglia* and *the Transactions of the New Shakspere Society*, might well accompany the reference to his article in the *Shakespeare Jahrbuch* (xlviii). The statement that in Lorenzo "the Machiavellian 'politician' makes his entry upon the Elizabethan stage" (xxxiii)—might well have a reference to the discussion of this matter by Dr. Edward Meyer in his *Machiavelli and the Elizabethan Drama*. The quotation from Nash (xx, xxi) is without reference. The entry for "7 of jenewary" (p. xl) in Henslow's *Diary* occurs twice in Collier's edition; on p. 79 for £7 and on p. 84 for £3. On p. xxxi, l. 15; for 1. x, read 1. i. 10. On p. xciv, l. 12; for iii. ii, 43, read iii. xi, 43.

A. H. THORNDIKE.
*Western Reserve University.*

## *GERMAN LITERATURE.*

*Der Arme Heinrich* by HARTMANN VON DER AUE, edited with an Introduction, Notes and Glossary, by JOHN G. ROBERTSON, M. A., B. Sc., Ph. D., London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.; New York: Macmillan & Co., 1895. 8vo, pp. xviii, 122.*

THE editor's expression of fear (Preface, p. i), lest his edition of *Der Arme Heinrich* in English be considered superfluous and unwarranted, together with his subsequent vindication of his undertaking, call to mind such work as the translation into English of Kluge's *Etymol. Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache* and of certain German monographs and treatises on Germanic subjects, also the compiling of Grammars of Germanic dialects in the face of most excellent books on those subjects in German. One cannot help thinking, in the same connection, of the rapid multiplication of text editions and grammars, both in Germany and in this country. Existing conditions render much of this work inevitable, yet one is led to question most seriously the advisability and value of doing a large portion of it. However, the same objection that one feels here, cannot quite be urged against an English edition of *Der Arme Heinrich*, so long as, for the better or the worse, MHG. remains the first Germanic dialect to which *angehende Germanisten* are introduced, and so long as *Der Arme Heinrich* maintains its position as the first MHG. text *par excellence*. We believe, therefore, with the editor that there is room for a book like his, but the presumption in such a case certainly is with the older standard editions, and the burden of proof rests upon the new book

* See Vol. xii, 1897, pp. 93-94, of this Journal.

trying to establish a place for itself by the side of its predecessors. It should at least be reasonably free from errors, and it is in this respect that the book under discussion fails to maintain itself.

The editor, of course, makes due acknowledgment of his indebtedness to the existing editions of *Der A. H.*, of the annotations to which he makes most liberal use,—which, indeed, he at times follows so closely, that, forgetting the deviations in the readings, his Text and Vocabulary or Notes come to be at variance with each other. So, for example, in the vocabulary, p. 77, sub *alels* (which is, of course, a misprint for *alles*) his reference is to line 953. Here he borrows the note of the Wackernagel-Toischer edition (p. 109) on the word *alles* found in that text, but in his own text adopts Paul's reading which runs, with the Strassburg MS., *allen* instead of *alles* (*allez*) of W.-T. and Haupt. So also, p. 96, sub *komen* pret. subj. [this, I take it, is again an error, for *quœme* or *kœme* must be *indic.* pret., though this line is at best difficult, as is shown by the various readings of the MSS. and interpretations of editors, and W.-T.'s translation of *loch* as 'Grube, Grab' may be considered, if not incorrect, at least misleading] (*quœme*) 584 is borrowed from W.-T., while the editor's text reads with Paul *kœme*. So again, on page 76 of the Notes, he incorporates in his last annotation ll. 1523-1530 from Bech, forgetting that the latter's line-numbering differs from that of the other editions. The line-numbers should be 1513-1520.

The editor's Introduction is, on the whole, quite satisfactory. He leans, to be sure, rather conspicuously heavily on Toischer; but no one would be likely to expect him to adduce any new and original material from a field so thoroughly, not to say exhaustively, gone over by Grimm, Bech, Wackernagel, and Toischer before him. But one does miss some treatment, however brief, of the versification, especially since it is not an easy matter to refer students to a very simple treatise on this subject, which is too important to be entirely neglected. It seems that a page on scansion might well have been added. Another omission, which Toischer also makes, but which one misses more keenly in the English edition, is the failure to mention the translation of our poem by D. G. Rossetti: *Henry the Leper. A Swabian Miracle-Rhyme: By Hartmann von Auë* (*A. D. 1100-1200*), which is printed in vol. ii, pp. 420–460, of *The Collected Works of Dante Gabriel Rossetti*, 2 vols., Ellis and Elvey, London, 1890. This should be inserted on p. xviii of the Introduction, where the editor says: "A prose version in Italian by A. Barragiola (should be Baragiola), etc., seems to be the only translation into a foreign tongue." The statement on p. ii of the Preface: "the editions of Grimm, Bech, Wackernagel and Toischer" misleads students to believe that there are separate editions, one by Wackernagel and one by Toischer, as is the case with Grimm and with Bech. An unambiguous statement would be an improvement. The disparaging statements on p. xiv of the Introduction and in the note on line 681 f. (p. 65 of Notes) anent the pronounced "religious element" and "didactic tone" seem rather ill-conceived and are wholly out of keeping with the high and unstinted praise elsewhere bestowed upon the poem. Mediæval poetry cannot be judged according to the severe canons of modern literary art any more than certain elements of Greek tragedy can. If we apply rigidly the inexorable norm of modern psychology and realism, our poem becomes an insipidly stupid yarn; but if we judge it from the naïve point of view of the Middle Ages and allow the element of the miraculous its proper and normal place, we have in *Der A. H.*, as we do in Schiller's *Jungfrau von Orleans*, an inspired and inspiring poem of surpassing beauty.

The Text of this edition is based upon that of Paul (*Altdeut. Textbibl.*), Halle, 1882; 2nd edit., 1893, "but in several instances Haupt's readings have been preferred" (p. xviii, Introduct.). Quite frequently, however, the editor's variants are chosen from Wackernagel-Toischer or from Bech, as in ll. 168, 330, 786, 827, 869, 870, 1115, 1134, etc. Moreover, the editor curiously *cites* the second edition of Paul above, but *uses* apparently only the first edition in his textual criticism. In a foot-note to p. xviii "the principal variants from Paul's text" are enumerated, an examination of which yields the following results: In the very first variant: "l. 24 *bitende* for *bittende*," as well

as the ones on ll. 168 and 190 *genislich* for *gnislich*, the editor has overlooked the fact, that Paul has emended the readings of his first edition in the second, so that in reality these are not variants. In l. 231 he reads *maget* with Haupt instead of the *megede* of Paul, but why adopt Haupt's *maget* here, when in ll. 1020 and 1026 *et passim* Paul's *megede* is chosen in preference to Haupt's *maget*? 370 *dem kinde*, etc., is an error; he means l. 330; 447 *êrbære* for *manbære*—this is the reading of Paul's first edit.; the second edit. has *vrîbære*. Line 877 should read 827. I subjoin several other variants that are omitted in the editor's list: l. 225 *êrbære* for *vrîbære* (second edit.); l. 291 *willeclichen* for *willecliche;* l. 308 *umb* for *umbe* (second edit.); l. 332 *gap* for *gab;* l. 363 the editor puts a comma at end of line with Bech and W.-T., Paul and Haupt omit it; ll. 459 and 460 *gesagt* and *magt* for *gesaget* and *maget;* l. 509 *gesweigeten* for *gesweigten* (second edit.); l. 740 *so* for *sô* (second edit.); l. 865 *sante* for *sente* (second edit.); l. 926 *iwer* for *iuwer;* l. 927 *gnâdete* for *genâdete* (second edit.) [cf. also ll. 965, 1014, 1305, etc.]; l. 935 *hülfest* for *hulfest* (second edit.); l. 959 *geriuwez* for *gerüwez* and *gerûwez* (second edit.); l. 964 *ich* for *ichn* (second edit.); l. 977 *engültenz* for *engultenz* (second edit.); l. 981 *ez* for *es;* l. 1007 *weinte* for *weinde* (second edit.); l. 1109 *hülfe* for *hulfe* (second edit.); l. 1201 *gar sêre* for *sô sêre;* l. 1275 *sînen tôt* for *sînes tôdes;* l. 1280 a, b, c, d added in second edit.; l. 1284 *unde* for *und;* l. 1284 a, b added in second edit.; l. 1296 order of words is different in second edit.; l. 1309 *sî* for *sich* (second edit.); l. 1319 *al* for *alle* (second edit.); l. 1320 quite different reading in second edit.; l. 1323 *dulden* for *verdulden* (second edit.); l. 1326 *ez* for *nu* (second edit.); l. 1332 a, b, c, d added in second edit.; ll. 1339 and 1340 second edition inverts lines; l. 1353 second edit. inserts *ouch;* l. 1354 second edit. inserts *gar;* ll. 1353 and 1354 *magt, klagt* for *maget, klaget;* ll. 1493 and 1494 *gesagt, magt* for *gesaget, maget* (second edit.); l. 1500 *mir* for *iuch wol.*

The chief criticism on the Notes is that the editor's translations of difficult passages are too free to be of real assistance to the thoughtful student in understanding the construction. On p. 52, note to line 13, the editor says: "The subject of *töhte* is to be supplied from *iht* in l. 9, and in the Vocabulary he gives *daz* of l. 13 as conjunction and not as art. and pron. This is an error caused, perhaps, by a misinterpretation of W.-T.'s note to the line. This *daz* is not the conjunction 'dass,' but the relative pron. 'das' (='welches'), which, somewhat unlogically, is used in MHG. to introduce conditional, concessive, and modal clauses. For other passages in which the relative pronoun, the masc. and fem. forms as well, have this peculiar use, cf. ll. 202, 411, 443, 498, and in the W.-T. text also l. 741. For a fuller treatment of the subject cf. Paul, *Mhd. Gram.* §347, 1, 2, 3, and esp. 4. The subject of *töhte* is not to be supplied, therefore, but is the relative *daz*. P. 54, note to l. 74, *törperlich* should read *törperheit*. P. 56, note to l. 121, reference might have been made to Paul, *Mhd. Gram.* §305 f. and §371 f. for a fuller statement of the use of *ge-*. P. 57, note to l. 131, *sterquelino* should, I believe, read *sterquilinio*. Without even taking cognizance of the customs in vogue at the time here described, the wind is quite taken out of the sails of the editor's argument on p. 58, note to l. 225, by the ending of our poem. P. 61, note to l. 359, is incorrectly translated. P. 61, note to ll. 372 f., *sô vil* is incorrectly interpreted as conditional; it should be causal. P. 64, l. 560 is wrongly translated. Indeed, the editor does not show familiarity with the use of *danne* (Mod.H.G. 'denn') in this construction, and of the negative *ne, en* with the subjunctive having the same force of 'denn', 'wofern nicht,' 'es sei denn,dass,' 'wenn nicht' (cf. also his transl. of *danne* in vocab., p. 82), which is so common in MHG. For this construction cf. Paul, *Mhd. Gram.* §338, and V. Michels, *Mittelhochdeutsches Elementarbuch*, §282, Anmerkung. Other cases of this usage in our poem are found in ll. 204, 560, 834, 1105, 1146, 1398, etc., only the first and last of which the editor has translated at all adequately. P. 64, l. 920 is, if not incorrectly, certainly very freely translated. P. 64, note to l. 646, B is not quoted quite correctly; it should be *lanch leben*. P. 65, note to l. 657, Tobit seems to be incorrectly quoted. P. 66, note to l. 724, the quotation from the *Nibelungenlied* is not quite accurate, and the reference to Zupitza, at least in the 5th edition, should be p. 63 in-

stead of p. 69. P. 69, l. 896 is incorrectly translated. The editor overlooks the inverted order in the text and so makes an impossible translation of the passage. P. 69, note to l. 900 might better read: *the phrases are* instead of *the phrase is*. P. 74, ll. 1330 and 1331 seem to me incorrectly translated and interpreted.

I shall add but briefly a few errors that came under my notice in the Vocabulary: p. 99 sub *michel*, the editor says: Compar. 603. The form *michelre* (l. 603) is not the comparative, but the dat. sing. fem. of the positive degree. For the form cf. Weinhold, § 502, p. 557, and for the identical form with an adj., ending in *-er* (instead of *-el*), cf. l. 109 *bitterre* and the editor's quotation from *Gregorius*, p. 57, note to ll. 155–156: *mit tôtvinsterre naht* and *Büchlein* 2, 20. Likewise p. 114 sub *veste*: compar. (*vester*): 1140; this is not compar. but the inflected form of the positive. On p. 116 sub *wan*, etc., the form *wand* which occurs l. 572 should have been added.

Of misprints I note the following (aside from those that have already been pointed out): p. vi bottom and p. x bottom for *Krone* read *Krône*; p. vi, foot-note, for 144;155 read 144–155; p. xv, second last line of foot-note, for 162 ff. read 160 ff.; p. xvii for *Jahrhunderts* read *Jahrhundert*; p. xviii, foot-note, for *siz* read *sîz*. In the text l. 340 for *si* read *sî*; l. 413 for *biderden* read *biderben*; l. 425 for *minen* read *mînen*; l. 651 b for *werltlich* read *werltlich*; l. 662a quotation mark is omitted; l. 700 for *führte* read *fürhte*; l. 704 for *hat* read *hât*; l. 807 for *zu* read *ze*; l. 832 for *so* read *sô*; l. 855 for *sahen* read *sâhen*; l. 863 for *si* read *sî*; ll. 871 and 872 for *si* read *sî*; l. 878 strike out period at end of line; l. 890 for *so* read *sô*, and for *nith* read *niht*; l. 899 for *verveingen* read *verviengen*; l. 1006 for *sin* read *sîn*; l. 1094 for *fröuwelin* read *fröuwelîn*; l. 1152 omit period; l. 1206 for *si* read *sî*; l. 1213 insert period at end of line; l. 1215 instead of period insert comma at end of line; l. 1264 quotation marks before and after *sprach er* are omitted, and the comma at end of line should be replaced by period; l. 1280 for *lazen* read *lâzen*; l. 1386 insert period at end of line; l. 1446 strike out period at end of line; l. 1487 for *sprachen* read *sprâchen*; p. 52, note to l. 21, for § 372 read § 375; p. 53, note to l. 24, for 637 read 673; p. 55, note to ll. 86–88, for *Ps.* read *Is.*; p. 58, note to l. 225, for *vriebære* read *vriebere*; p. 59, note to l. 257, for pp. 162 ff. read 160; p. 60, note to ll. 312–314, for *wætliche* read *wætliche*; p. 62, note to ll. 395–396, for *tuont* read *tuot*; p. 63, note to l. 485, for 940 read 930, and, note to l. 506, for *hat* read *hât*; p. 64, note to l. 546, for *invariable* read *invariably*; p. 64, second last line, for 449 read 649; p. 65, note to l. 674, for *si* read *sî*; p. 66, note to l. 729, for 14 read 24; p. 66, note to l. 775, for *frier* read *frîer*; p. 68, note to l. 852, in second line of quotation from A for *helle* read *hellen*; p. 72, note to ll. 1183–1184, for *do* read *dô*; p. 73, note to l. 1196, for 1111 read 1101; p. 73, note to l. 1230: See note to l. 463 is a misprint for some other number. I was unable to find the note the editor has reference to. There is no note to l. 463; p. 75 note to l. 1460 for *und* read *unde*; p. 75 bottom for 1483–1486 read 1482–1486, and, in this same note, for *in* read *is*; p. 77 *alels* for *alles* has already been referred to; p. 78 first line of first column for *also* read *alsô*; p. 79, sub *bedenken*, for *bedahte* read *bedâhte*; p. 81, sub *biten*, for *prt.* read *pret.*; p. 82 first line of first column for 756 read 576, and 13, sub *daz*, remove to sub *der*; p. 84, sub *durch*, for 1154 read 1155, and, sub *êlich*, for 1452 read 1453, and *êlich* itself should read *êlîch*; p. 98, sub *mâc*, 474 is a misprint—the word does not occur in that line; p. 108, sub *sunne*, for *stf.* read *wf.*; p. 114, sub *verwâzen*, add 798.

It is unfortunate that so many faults and errors have crept into this book, which ought to prove thoroughly serviceable in many schools. Many instructors will naturally prefer to use the German text-books in teaching Middle High German, yet to many others this edition might seem to have distinct advantages. It is to be hoped that in future editions the errors of the first one will be corrected.

J. B. E. Jonas.
*Brown University.*

## *FRENCH LITERATURE.*

*Le Voyage de M. Perrichon*, Comédie en quatre Actes, par Eugène Labiche et M. E. Martin. Edited for school use by G. Castegnier, B. ès S., B. ès L., of the A. H. Cutler School. New York: The American Book Co., 1901.

This entertaining, instructive, and even philo-

sophical comedy by Labiche has for several years been a favorite with teachers of French, both on account of its value in language-study, and for the glimpses it affords of the life of the rich bourgeois of forty years ago. An excellent school-edition of the play already exists, but it would be a pleasure to welcome another, if the new one were in any way an improvement. Such is not the case, however, with the book in hand. The book is full of errors, seemingly following a reprint rather than an early edition, such as that of A. Bourdilliat et Cie., Paris, 1860; numerous specimens of incorrect English appear, such as: "something like everybody writes," "annexed since 1860," etc.; many translations are inaccurate, the worst perhaps being: *remonter*, "to come towards the audience," a meaning which is just the opposite of the right one; and finally, the edition is encumbered with a very faulty vocabulary, in which simple and natural renderings are, it would seem, carefully avoided. In the Introduction, consisting of two pages, several points are open to criticism: the title of the first play of Labiche, given as *M. de Goislin*, was, according to the *Magasin Théâtral* of Marchant, Paris, 1843, *Monsieur de Coyllin*. The statement that "his plays form a collection of ten volumes, bearing the name of *Théâtre Complet*," is misleading, for out of the vast number of plays written by Labiche, only the best are preserved in his so-called *Théâtre Complet*. In two places the editor's phraseology is unsatisfactory; it is not easy to see just what is meant by: "Labiche's style is mainly comical," while the phrase in which we are told that Edouard Martin "soon crossed the threshold of the temple of fame" is so ponderous as decidedly to over-balance the seven lines devoted to the associate.

In the text itself there are several misprints: one which occurs more than once is the omission of the accent-mark in the word *çà*, while in the Vocabulary no distinction is made between *çà*, the adverb, and *ça*, the contraction of the pronoun *cela*, p. 25, l. 1; and Vocabulary. On the other hand, in two places *çà* should be *ça*, 77, 14; 79, 10. *Remerciments*, 32, 8, should be *remercîments*, or else changed to agree with the spelling of the Vocabulary, *remerciements*: both are in good use, but the editor should confine himself to one. An important point is to change *impatiente*, 42, 22, to *impatientée*, since a difference in meaning is involved. *Fatigant*, 51, 7, should be *fatiguant*, as in the edition of 1860; the adjective drops the *u*, while the participle retains it, although the meaning may be identical. An interesting and peculiar error is found, 35, 21; *mère* should read: *r e, re;* that is, to call attention to the fact that Perrichon has misspelled *mer*, Daniel says: *Il a écrit mère, r e, re.* Thus he spells aloud the last syllable, and then pronounces it, but does not spell the whole word. *Evènement*, 55, 4, and Vocabulary, and *événement*, 59, 1, as well as *complétement*, 78, 5, should have a consistent spelling; the *é* is preferable nowadays. The use of quotation marks, 52, 26; 53, 2; 56, 25, is unnecessary. The spelling *dalhias*, 72, 8, is found also in other editions, but is obviously incorrect, since the word is derived from the name of the Swedish botanist, Dahl; the correct form, *dahlias*, is found in the Vocabulary. Minor errata are: the capital letter in *exposition*, 60, 32; the omission of the hyphen in *là-dedans*, 21, 5; *Crusoe* for *Crusoé*, 20, 31; and a few irregularities in the punctuation of exclamatory phrases, 21, 5, etc.

The editor does not state that he has made any changes in the text, yet we find several passages expurgated, while others are arbitrarily and unnecessarily altered in a way which many teachers will criticize. In act ii, scene viii, there is a perfectly allowable paraphrase of five lines, which, however, suffers by comparison with the original; but in act i, scene vii, many of the changes are unwarrantable. For instance, *Mademoiselle Anita*, 16, 16, should be *elle;* Labiche wanted to awaken the interest of the audience in the character referred to as *elle* before naming her; the effect is weakened by the substitution. *Mademoiselle Anita*, 16, 20, should be *Anita; redeviendra amoureux de*, 17, 4, should be *reprendra; Mademoiselle Anita*, 17, 22, should read: *elle! Anita!; reverrez*, 17, 23, should be *reprendrez;* after *jamais*, 17, 24, should be inserted *Allons! C'est bien!; je suis amoureux*, 38, 2, should be *j'aime.* The four or five lines which are omitted entirely, p. 17, might perhaps have been paraphrased, as in act ii,

scene viii. Throughout the play are omissions of certain harmless expletives, which are most inconsistently dealt with in this edition. The word *diable* is omitted or changed four times, 15, 18; 25, 4; 30, 4; 62, 16; *dame* is omitted once, 77, 14; *ta montre* takes the place of *ta diablesse de montre*, 52, 28; *Dieu* is omitted once, 8. 26. It is amusing to note that of these, *dame*, *Dieu*, *diable*, all occur in the Vocabulary, where the last-mentioned figures as "Satan," while *diable* is found twice in this text, 21, 5; 23, 25, in places similar to those in which an omission has been pointed out.

There are one hundred and fifteen Notes, of which forty-nine consist merely of a direction to "see Vocab.;" several of the others might be improved. The word *tortue*, 26, note, sometimes means "turtle," but our old friend of the Fable has for so many years been known to us as "the Tortoise," that we dislike to admit the *alias*. The residence of the Empress Josephine at Malmaison ought not to be called a "castle," p. 64; it is nothing more than a villa, a country-house. *Sel*, 26, 21, means "smelling-salts;" the context here and in scene x proves it. The English in the following places in the Notes is unsatisfactory: "revolutionary," p. 56 (for: revolutionist); "annexed since 1860," p. 77 (for: in 1860); and in the Vocabulary: "to wish good-by," p. 89; "in a low voice," p. 92: "luggage check," p. 93; "to poke one's nose in," p. 102 (for: into); "something like everybody writes," p. 109; "between us now," p. 120.

Words found in the text, but omitted in the Vocabulary: *avancé*, which has a double meaning, 82, 13; *billet*, meaning "note," 70, 7; *complètement; s'imposer; las*, (given as *lasse*); *marchande*, (given as *marchand*); *poignée; poudrière; sixième*. Incorrect or unsatisfactory renderings: *affiche*, "time-table" (a more general meaning should first be given); *pas de banque*, "no humbug;" *si l'on a eu du chagrin*, "if Anita has expressed grief" (to translate *l'on* by "Anita" spoils the effect of the question which follows: *Qui ça?*); *bonne chance;*" "happiness;" *centime*, "one-fifth of a cent," (why not: one-hundredth of a franc?); *comme ça*, to translate the passage, 77, 28; *sur le compte du hasard*, "haphazard;" *tiens*, "hello" (surely Henriette would not say that); *maman*, "Mother;" *préfet de police*, "superintendent of police;" *remonter*, "to come towards the audience;" *senti*, "sentimental" (this is not a satisfactory first meaning); *sieur*, "Mr." (better: one, as legal term): *voyage*, supply "journey."

Several remarks found in the Vocabulary belong in the Notes: *Bouilly*, *code*, *communication*. Other points: *dévergondage* and *deviner* should precede *devoir; employé* should precede *emporter; Français* should be *français; hola* should be *holà; si*, "if," and *si*, "yes," should be separate words. Carelessness is shown in making the English rendering cover more than is expressed by the French quoted: *cinquante ans*, "fifty years old," should be *avoir cinquante ans*, "to be fifty years old;" *endroit là*, "that very place," should be *cet endroit là*, etc.

W. O. Farnsworth.
*Yale University.*

## *SCANDINAVIAN BIBLIOGRAPHY.*

*Arkiv för Nordisk Filologi, utgivet genom Axel Kock. Register zu Band i—xvi...* von August Gebhardt. I. Lieferung. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1901. 100 pp.

The value of the *Arkiv* has been immensely increased by the publication of this *Register*. Although the pamphlet bears on its title-page the words *I. Lieferung*, it is hard to see what can be added to its full treatment. The arrangement is as follows. The first division, which is preceded by a page of explanation, like the rest of the rubric, in German, contains a list of original articles and reviews, arranged under the authors' names in alphabetical order. An admirable feature of this list is the attempt to give the names exactly in the form in which they occur at the ends of the articles, thus, *Brate*, *Erik*, but *Brekke*, *K.* Where a name occurs in two different forms after different articles the longer form is given, as *Ferdinand Detter*. Under *Friðriksson* the initials should be *H. K.*, not *H. Kr.* The letters are given in the order in which they occur in modern scientific German works, the non-German characters *þ* and *đ* being given at the end. *á* and *é*, on the other hand, are treated as variants of the corresponding German characters. Here and elsewhere, in the

case of Icelanders, in addition to the family name before the entry a cross reference is given under the christian name, as *Finnur s. Jónsson.* When more than one article follows an author's name the different articles are preceded by Arabic numerals, Roman numerals being used to indicate subdivisions of articles. Thus, under *Ebbe Hertzberg's Tvivlsomme ord i Norges gamle love*, each word discussed is preceded by a Roman numeral and is followed by the number of the page on which it begins. This method is applied even to the annual bibliographies. Throughout the *Register* the volume numbering of the *Arkiv* is continuous, no attention being paid to the division into old and new series. The wisdom of this is self-evident.

Part two contains a list of the books reviewed, arranged in the alphabetical order of the authors' names, with the names of the reviewers in brackets. The total number of reviews recorded is eighty-three. In the case of two authors the entry is given under the first, with a cross reference under the second name. Part three gives a list of the necrologies, together with the place and date of birth and death, the name of the writer being in brackets. Only nineteen entries, covering slightly over one page, are found here, but they include only the most considerable Scandinavian scholars, and few if any additional names would be entitled to a place there. It may be of interest to note that of the nineteen, four are Icelanders, five Norwegians, four Danes, three Swedes, and three Germans.

Part four is altogether the most important feature of the bibliography as it aims at giving references to all words discussed in the different articles, classified according to the languages to which they belong. This division takes up the last sixty-five pages. The largest sub-division is, of course, the West Northern, from p. 36 to p. 91, and the language most generously represented is the Swedish, from p. 63 to p. 85. On account of their large number, Swedish dialect words are given in a class by themselves, other dialect words are distinguished by daggers. Doubtful forms are followed by interrogation points. Old Norwegian are distinguished from Old Icelandic forms by an *N.* Words cited merely as examples are not given. These lists of Scandinavian words may be regarded as valuable supplements to the existing etymological dictionaries in the respective languages.

But the value of a work of this kind depends not so much upon skill of classification as upon accuracy of execution. Absolute accuracy is not looked for, is indeed hardly possible, in an undertaking of such extent and variety. As a test of the work on this crucial point several numbers of the *Arkiv*, chosen at random, were carefully examined, and the following slight inaccuracies were noted. The page references are to the *Register*. *litr* should be *litr*, p. 6: *nær-nár* should be *nær-nár*, p. 26: *rättskrivning*, should be *rättstavning*, p. 19. In the bibliography for 1897 occur the printer's errors *tidskrifter* and *i almidelighet*, p. 10. *Gýðingr*, 135 should be *G.* 134, p. 26. In the other parts examined not a single error was noted. Similar proof of careful work was found in connection with part four, where mistakes would be of more moment. A large number of forms was compared and only a few trifling orthographical mistakes were found.

This *Register* may be regarded as a distinct contribution to Germanic philology of that unselfish kind which will be found of value by all students of the Scandinavian languages, but which can be fully appreciated only by those who have themselves engaged in the difficult work of indexing. If other scholars are led by Herr Gebhardt's example to deal with other journals in the same generous and scientific spirit the good cause will indeed be helped.

DANIEL KILHAM DODGE.
*University of Illinois.*

## *FRENCH LITERATURE.*

*Le mouvement littéraire contemporain* par GEORGES PELLISSIER. Plon-Nourrit & Cie, Paris: 1901. vii–302 pp.

M. PELLISSIER is one of the rare critics of our day who do not waste their whole strength in numberless magazine or newspaper articles. From time to time he feels the necessity to stop, and take a synthetic view of the field just left behind. Nothing can be more useful for men of our generation, so exclusively given

up to specialization, than such books as *Le mouvement littéraire au xix. siècle* (1890) and *Le mouvement littéraire contemporain.*

Everything seems to indicate that the success of the later volume will be as complete as that of the earlier. This is perfectly legitimate as far as the treatment of separate topics is concerned. We certainly find criticism as strikingly just and suggestive in the *xix. siècle*, as in the *Mouvement contemporain.* Bourget and de Régnier, for instance, are given as brilliant an appreciation as Sainte-Beuve, G. Sand, Flaubert, or the Goncourts. The same remarkable independence of judgment which had been highly praised ten years ago, is shown now in the author's attitude towards men like Rod and Rostand, so unduly overdone by the public. But, considered as a whole, the new work does not seem to be quite up to the standard of the first. It is not always the fault of the author. Perhaps the chief reason for it, he himself gives in his Preface:

"Le xix. siècle appartient au romantisme dans sa première moitié. C'est ensuite le réalisme ou naturalisme qui domine depuis 1850 environ jusque vers 1875 ou 1880. Chacune de ces deux écoles a successivement marqué à son empreinte la littérature contemporaine. Il y eut un état d'âme général qu'on peut appeler romantique; il y eut un état d'esprit général qu'on peut appeler réaliste" (p. v).

General views were, therefore, possible; authors could be duly classified and their works explained as manifestations of the one or the other current of thought in literature. Moreover, the second of these currents being in many respects a mere reaction against the first, a natural connection existed between the two, which constituted another element of unity in the book. But,

"dans le dernier quart de ce siècle, notre littérature n'a pas d'unité . . . Il y a eu de nos jours beaucoup d'écoles: c'est justement parce-qu'aucune n'a pu s'imposer" (p. vi).

And the first words of the *Conclusion* are:

"Sauf dans l'histoire, qui, devenant objective, sort aussi de la littérature, l'évolution littéraire aboutit, de notre temps, au triomphe de l'individualisme dans tous les genres" (p. 296).

In such conditions a book on contemporary literature is bound to be more or less a mere enumeration of authors and examination of their separate works. There is, in consequence, almost no connection between the different chapters; and even within the chapters themselves unity obtains only in the first few pages treating of Naturalism, which for a while continued to be in fashion, but soon, however, gave way to individualism. An exception can be made in favor of poetry, where an altogether new school has been in existence for over ten years.

We are obliged in this review to follow M. Pellissier and consider each chapter as a whole in itself.

Chap. I. *Le roman.* The first half is devoted to the last representatives of the naturalistic school. Zola, in fact, has never been a true naturalist; he has never taken nature exactly as it is, but has always adapted it to his special purposes. Our author strongly insists upon this. We frequently meet sentences like: "A vrai dire l'auteur des Rougon-Macquart ne mérita jamais le nom de naturaliste." Or: "M. Émile Zola fut de tout temps un romantique." Or again: "Il a le tempérament aussi peu naturaliste que possible." Furthermore, in the last volumes of the *Rougon-Macquart* (ended 1893) the materialism and the pessimism based upon science give way to optimism and utopianism, a tendency which only becomes more accentuated in *Les trois villes* and *Les quatre Évangiles.* Zola remains true to science, but sees in it now the instrument of progress and a cause for hope.

Maupassant and Ferdinand Fabre, rather than their master, deserve, in recent years, the name of Naturalists. And if the distinction frequently made between naturalism and realism is observed, the former meaning the faithful reproduction of nature, and the latter the artistic production based upon faithful observation of reality, Maupassant will be found to be the true naturalist, and Fabre the true realist.

There is a third kind of naturalism which M. Pellissier calls (p. 25) "naturalisme sectaire;" under the guise of sincerity and of reaction against romantic tendencies, it would emphasize the ugly side of nature. Zola at the beginning of his career indulged in it a good deal. A number of his younger disciples, of whom were Huysmans, Rod, Rosny, and Paul Margueritte, carried his theories to extremes, but after a short time abandoned them altogether.

Two causes favored the decline of French realism: the introduction in France of the English, Russian, and Scandinavian literatures (which M. Pellissier mentions only very briefly), and the so-called "banqueroute de la science," science and naturalism being for many intimately associated.

M. Pellissier is himself an admirer of realism. French art, he holds, owes much to Zola's school; something will and must remain of it:

"Quand on dit que le naturalisme fit banqueroute, on a raison si l'on veut parler du naturalisme doctrinaire et scolastique; on se trompe si l'on entend par là cette conception de l'art saine, probe, vaillante, qui consiste à rendre la nature avec autant de vérité que possible" (p. vi.).

I will try to show later that the tribute he renders to a sound realism seems to prevent him from perceiving what other literary tendencies have contributed towards progress in art.

The only "school" which can be cited, besides the Naturalistic, is that of Psychology, and the only representative of this school is Bourget. Pellissier opposes the Psychological and Naturalistic; this is hardly correct. They are parallel tendencies. Bourget was a disciple of Taine, just as Zola is. Both applied the master's theories, the only difference being that Zola takes the body, and Bourget the mind. Both are absolute determinists, as M. Pellissier himself well remarks; and once he goes so far as to say: "Le psychologisme n'est vraiment qu'une naturalisme de la vie mentale." Where, then, lies the opposition? We are further surprised to find Bourget considered as the "unique représentant" of the modern Psychological school. We should have expected to see Rod, also, classified as a psychologist. On what ground should a place be refused to the author of *Au milieu du chemin*, when one is given to the author of *La duchesse bleue?* The same argument may be maintained for others, Estaunié, for instance. If a "psychologist" writes *Le disciple*, what is the author of *L'empreinte?* The pages (45-53) on Bourget, in the work before us, are nevertheless the best I have hitherto seen.

Loti as impressionist; France as dilettante; Huysmans as "mystique sensuel;" Rod as moralist; P. and V. Margueritte as analysts; J and H. Rosny as humanists; Paul Adam "d'intentions peu nettes" but with "certaines velléités symboliques", Marcel Prevost as the great casuist in "feminism" and, much more than Bourget, "romancier des mondaines;" Hervieu as the cold and severe ironist; Barrès as the subtle and after all shallow egotist; Capus as a "pince sans rire;" Estaunié as the systematic psychologist; finally, Pouvillon, Theuriet, Bazin as novelists of rustic life, are successively treated, being too different from one another to allow any classification.

Perhaps M. Pellissier has too strong an inclination to see differences. Besides Rod and Estaunié, who might very well be classed as "psychologists," we wonder why the brothers J. and H. Rosny—"peut-être le plus original de nos romanciers contemporains"[?]—are not considered as Naturalists. What is the difference between *L'impérieuse bonté* and *La charpente* on the one hand, and the novels of Zola in his second period on the other?

Chap. II. *Le théâtre.* The victory of Naturalism on the stage was won much later than in the novel. There are, M. Pellissier says, three great dates in the French theatre of the nineteenth century, those of the production of *Hernani*, of *La dame aux Camélias*, and of *Les corbeaux*. Dumas and Augier had started a reaction against Romanticism on the stage, but did not accomplish much towards realism. Their ethics were *bourgeois* and their treatment of subjects just as remote from true nature as can be imagined; the evolution of their plays reminds one of geometric theorems.

"Augier et Dumas avaient présidé, voilà quarante ans, à l'évolution réaliste de notre comédie: elle se fit d'abord avec eux, elle dut ensuite se faire contre eux."

But changes of literary standards do not take place so easily on the stage as in written works. One can think over a novel, take time to understand, and thus appreciate new ideas. On the stage one has no time to reflect: thus, the new piece must succeed at once or not at all. In vain did Goncourt, Villiers de l'Isle Adam, Daudet and Zola try to put on the stage dramas animated by the spirit of the naturalistic novel. One after the other failed. Even *L'Arlésienne*, which is realistic in the very best sense of the term, was unsuccessful. Ten years more

elapsed, and Henry Becque offered *Les corbeaux* (Sept. 14, 1882). It had just the regular representations at the Comédie française, and then had to be withdrawn. It was the masterpiece of the realistic school; but the public was not ready for it.

In 1887 the "Théâtre libre" was founded by M. Antoine, which went to the extremes of Naturalism and imposed on the Parisians the so-called *théâtre rosse*. This could not last, but because it went so far, it forced, so to speak, the attention of the public; whatever good there was in realism could henceforth remain. After a few years M. Antoine gave up the "théâtre libre" and founded instead the "Théâtre Antoine," in which no preference was given to any *genre*.

When the realistic drama had finally won the victory, it was just about the time when everywhere else other tendencies had begun to prevail. So it came that soon after Ancey, who was perhaps the best writer for the "théâtre libre," we have again a series of dramatic, or comic, authors who seem to have no aim or method in common: de Porto Riche, Lemaître, Lavedan, Brieux, de Curel, Hervieu, Donnay. The only tendency that perhaps slightly prevails is the "comédie d'analyse."

Owing to the great and noisy success of *Cyrano de Bergerac*, it is not possible to omit mention of the "drame historique," of Coppée, Hennique and Rostand. This enthusiasm is an accident, which will not last:

"il se peut bien que le drame lyrique et la comédie romanesque retrouvent place dans notre théâtre, mais comme quelque chose d'accessoire, comme une diversion passagère."

In this chapter, as in the former, the one thing which is to be regretted, is a disposition to emphasize to an unnecessary degree slight differences among the writers. It does not seem to me that the drama has undergone such radical changes since Dumas. Brieux and Hervieu, to mention only two of the most famous playwriters of to-day, have very much the same fashion of composition as Dumas, the first with his moral theories: "morale moyenne," as M. Pellissier says himself, and "qui s'inspire du sens commun;" the second, by the systematic arrangement of his dramas, which excludes any kind of incident and leads straight to the end by a sort of mathematical deduction.

There is nothing surprising in this. Theatrical pieces that are meant for the stage will always have to fulfil certain requirements which, although entirely exterior, will forever restrict within rather narrow limits the evolutions and revolutions in the literature of the stage.

Chap. III. *La poèsie.* Poetry was the *genre* most refractory to Naturalism. The naturalists in poetry were the Parnassians. However, a reaction started rather soon, about 1885, and not only have we anti-naturalists, as elsewhere, but a positive new creed in art has already been proposed. The Parnassians had banished imagination and subjectivism from their works; they aimed at an artistic, bright, but exact reproduction of reality. The Symbolists declared that, in doing so, those poets excluded the very essence of poetry, which is spontaneity and freedom; and in order to express plainly the ideal of their own art, they not only avoided any faithful description of nature and of their emotions, but they did away with description itself. They proceeded by suggestion. Instead of their actual thoughts and visions, they expressed only the symbols of them.

M. Pellissier takes great pains to be fair to the Symbolists and he succeeds well enough, better than many before him. The pages devoted to the revolution in the language of poetry seem to be done with special care. They deal with changes in the syntax, in the vocabulary (such as the attempt of the "romanistes" to use words of the Middle Ages), and changes especially in the versification. Everything is not new in the new poetry. The Symbolists were not the first to discover that:

"plus il y a de règles, et plus les vers du grand poète ressemblent à ceux du rimeur; plus il y a de règles, et moins l'originalité personnelle trouve dans le rithme un moyen d'expression, moins le vers peut se diversifier, s'infléchir, s'approprier à l'idée ou au sentiment."

Nor were they the first to refuse to comply with strict rules. No sooner had Malherbes firmly established the classical construction of the "Alexandrin," than already the two most original verse writers of the seventeenth century, Racine and La Fontaine, proceeded to break it up. And when a new era in poetry

began, Victor Hugo again took up the work. Even the Parnassians were not too strict; Banville proved revolutionary.

This is true elsewhere as well. Verses of more than twelve syllables had been used before our time. Baïf wrote some of fifteen (*vers bäifins*). Verses of an odd number of syllables can be found in the sixteenth century and later, in Malherbe, in Scarron, in Voltaire, in Banville.

M. Pellissier might have found even "vers libres" previous to Gustave Kahn. Remy de Gourmont, in his essay on *Le Vers libre*, shows a kind of "vers libre" in Latin as early as the ninth century. In the same essay de Gourmont shows that the rule of the alternation of feminine and masculine rimes is of no avail so far as the ear is concerned; except the endings in nasals (*on*, *ent*, *ant*), there are no masculine rimes in French. Therefore the rule, of course given up by the Symbolists, had as a matter of fact been a simple illusion. If the masculine rime *seuil*, for instance, be supposed to alternate with the feminine rime *cueille*, only the eye can notice the difference. Let me add here that, while M. Pellissier approves of the fact ("et rien de mieux sans doute pourvu que nous puissions faire toujours une différence entre la poésie et la prose"), he refuses to go so far as to recognize the "vers libre." Now, several critics have observed that what is called "vers libre" almost always has some rhythm in it. De Gourmont gives a few striking examples. But it will suffice to read Paul Fort's "ballades en prose" to be soon convinced.

Chap. V. *La critique:* Contains not only a statement of the actual conditions of criticism, but a discussion of its nature. There are two opposed critical methods, dogmatism and impressionism. The great representative of the dogmatists is Brunetière, who, after Taine, though in an altogether different spirit, judges productions of literature according to a definite doctrine. An opposition that should exist, according to our author, between the doctrines of Brunetière and his method is not brought forth very clearly. We understand M. Pellissier better when he expounds the so-called application of "evolution" to literature as not amounting to much more than the introduction of some scientific terms into criticism. Who has ever doubted that an evolution took place in literature? I venture to say that the idea, if not the word, had existed in the domain of literature long before it was introduced into that of the natural sciences. However that may be, the great weakness, as well as the strength, of Brunetière lies in his application of reason alone to his judgments in literature. He ignores, theoretically at least, taste and feeling as means of artistic appreciation.

Faguet's place is between the dogmatists and the impressionists. He understands and interprets admirably the authors with whom he is dealing. He has no theory of his own like Brunetière, he is free in his criticism. He is, however, too exclusively intellectual.

The two impressionists are Anatole France and J. Lemaître; they do not enjoy literary works from the intellectual but from the artistic view-point. Sentiment, which does not deceive, is their criterion. This is especially the case with France, whose intellectual scepticism even makes him indifferent to an occasional self-contradiction. As to Lemaître, his impressionism is often more apparent than real. "Il joue au scepticisme pour se préserver du pédantisme." He has a literary as well as a moral creed, but he does not declare it. His vigorous, though unjust, protest against the invasion of foreign literatures a few years ago would suffice to show that there are firmly established convictions between the ironist and the sceptic.

M. Pellissier, as said above, enters into a lengthy discussion of the superiority of those two kinds of criticism. Though not always very clear, his idea seems to be about this: a good impressionist must always be intelligent, and a good dogmatist must always prove that he has some literary taste—else neither would amount to anything. Sainte-Beuve was about the ideal. Our author seems particularly afraid of the triumph of dogmatism, for then, he says, "la critique ne consisterait plus que dans l'application des règles et l'application des règles dispenserait de talent." This argument is not very convincing. Suppose dogmatism were good, what would be the objection to it? Or, is there any advantage in having the criterion of good and bad art remain unconscious? That there is a criterion is a fact; otherwise there would be no superior or inferior criticism. M. Pellissier himself has shown that, under a good impressionism, there must be a theory of some kind or other.

Chap. VI. *L'histoire.* Naturalism has won here a great and decisive victory. History is no more to belong to literature. The scientific spirit in its treatment had already taken a firm hold on Taine and Renan. Neither of them, however, allowed himself to be bound altogether; the former used a strictly scientific method, but only to establish preconceived theories, especially to strengthen his attacks on the French revolution; the latter supplemented his scholarly researches, by drawing on his imagination wherever there was a gap in the documents. Fustel de Coulanges certainly went further in the same direction, but his syntheses were sometimes based on insufficient data. Sorel and Lavisse have both shown a spirit of great independence, the latter with a slightly moralizing touch.

M. Pellissier is very much inclined towards retaining history in the domain of art. You can hardly know all the facts, he says, and if you do, you cannot produce them all; you pick out those which go to prove you own personal views. "L'histoire, c'est la réalité vue à travers un tempérament." That may be true; but is it not the same in all sciences? Does not a biologist, or a philologist, pick out the facts that help him to enforce his theory on a subject? Are we going, therefore, to deny the name of science to biology, or to philology? It may be that historians will still for a long time be artists, but I venture to say that it will certainly not be from their own choice.

I have pointed out several times the lack of "vues d'ensemble" in the new volume of M. Pellissier. We miss them all the more, since a work of this kind ought to make them its principal object. Of course the author maintains that "individualism" is the salient feature of our modern literature. But this is altogether too easy. There are limits to individualism; and to say that individualism has developed is a different thing from saying that there is no connection worth noticing among all these individuals. My impression is that the *lack* of individuality is a very general accusation made against our epoch. Would there be such a gap between literature and life?

It is surely a commonplace idea that modern literature is in a perfect state of anarchy. But men of such wide reading as M. Pellissier ought to see beyond commonplace criticism. Only once in his book does he make an allusion to what seems to him might be considered a universal trait: "Ce qui paraîtrait au premier coup d'œil caractériser la période moderne, c'est une réaction contre le naturalisme." And even that he would retract as far as possible. Now, certainly the chief characteristic of French literature at the end of the nineteenth century was anti-naturalism. It does not everywhere appear at exactly the same time. In the novel and the drama, Naturalism still obtain, whereas for several years it had not existed in poetry. But everywhere the tendency to anti-naturalism prevails, everywhere it may be seen by whoever chooses to open his eyes.

This is not all; besides this negative current of contemporary French literature, positive standards, new ideals, have come in. But, except in the chapter on poetry, where it was impossible not to see it, M. Pellissier does not seem to have noticed any of them. Yet, not only do they exist, but they are all more or less connected. If our modern authors do not walk hand in hand, they march in the same direction. There is a wide range of *nuances*, but one idea; namely, instead of holding fast to dry realism, let us once more try idealism. It will not be the idealism of yore; it cannot be, for science has closed many paths formerly open to the imagination. It must be some other. Some writers have been very cautious not to commit themselves; they advocate only what has been called "une douce folie," like A. France in his novels, or like Rostand in his drama, they react against realism by playing with romantic ideals; or again, like Loti, they try to overcome the sad, hopeless reality by some fugitive sensations which induce, at least, temporary forgetfulness.

Some go further, they would not be content, by only deceiving themselves by artistic sensations, but, believing that science does not explain everything, they try to get hold of what is left untouched by it; they realize some æsthetic ideal which is almost necessarily vague and indefinite, but which nevertheless exists. Indeed, there are innumerable authors who have tried this. Poetry, rather than anything else, has been their field: there they have best succeeded in leaving their mark. Symbolism ought to be the central chapter of a book on contemporary French literature. Not because the productions of

this school are ahead of others—they perhaps are not—but because they express in the most characteristic manner the general aspirations of the new-comers. Instead of bringing out this special spirit, M. Pellissier devotes the greatest part of his chapter on poetry to the *form* of the new verses and poems, which, as can easily be seen, was a secondary result of the whole movement. He is not unjust to the symbolists, but he praises them timidly, and seems to understand their efforts with regret. In other chapters he does not so much as mention symbolist writers, he ignores them entirely. To give only a few examples. In the chapter on the drama, what mention is there of Villiers de l'Isle Adam, the author of *Axel*, and most of all of Maeterlink? Nothing is said of Saint Pol Roux nor of Paul Claudel. In the chapter on the novel, Villiers de l'Isle Adam (*Nouvelle Eve*); de Régnier, de Gourmont, Louys are ignored. M. Pellissier belongs himself to the generation of the realists and has accustomed himself to see only realists about him. His book is very characteristic from the point of view of its omissions. How was it possible not to speak of Mirbeau, the author of *Le jardin des supplices*, so much more original than Rod, Prévost, Pouvillon, Theuriet, and even Rosny?

It is the same ignorance of the aspiration of the young generation which leads M. Pellissier to pay so little attention to foreign literature in France. A page here and there is all he devotes to it. And yet its influence has been and still is great, owing to the fact that it possesses this note of peculiar mysticism favored by French authors as well.

Finally, another manifestation in literature, which again lies in the same line, and of which M. Pellissier does not say a word, is the alliance in the past years of several authors of mark with the Church. Not only have we the noisy Catholicism of Brunetière, but also a strong current towards upholding moral standards on religious principles, Bourget being the most illustrious example. (Huysmans has been mentioned by M. Pellissier.) This movement is far from new. As early as 1890 Jean Honcey called attention to it in a famous article in the *Revue Bleue* (Jan. 3, 1890): "Les chrétiens de lettres—le réveil religieux en France."

These few remarks will be enough to show that there is more unity than is generally admitted in contemporary French literature, that the book of M. Pellissier ought to have expressed this unity and would thus have escaped the danger of being, in so many parts, nothing but a mere catalogue of appreciations on the work of different authors.

ALBERT SCHINZ.
*Bryn Mawr College.*

## *GERMAN LITERATURE.*

*Lessings Hamburgische Dramaturgie.* Abridged and edited with introduction and notes by CHARLES HARRIS. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1901. xl+356 pp.

MOODS and tastes and fashions change. Is it true that we fancy the same kind of a school edition we did twenty-five or fifty years ago? Can a given text be edited in but one way and in no other? Is it hazardous to deviate from the time-hallowed and petrified method? These are some of the questions we ask ourselves after a perusal of the above edition. The *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* has never been edited in this country before. How gratifying it would have been to find the new dressed up in new clothes! Why increase the number of text-books upon the shelves of teachers and professors, in general a mere aggregation of staleness and dullness, most of them born of the desire to edit some book or other, few of them begotten of genuine enthusiasm and profound interest?

From the point of view of greater independence on the part of the student in the pursuit of his work, little can be said in favor of most introductions to the classics. Instead of teaching the student reliance upon himself, instead of leaving him to grapple with the subject alone, and instead of giving him an opportunity to run it down in hours of vigorous absorbed attention, it offers him certain ready-made results prepared by the teacher, permitting him to take the information by an almost effortless contact with it. The same thing may be said of Prof. Harris' Introduction.

A further abridgment of the text would have been profitable. As long as translation monopolized the bulk of the student's time in and out of the class-room, and facility in translation was regarded as a sufficient index of intellectual power, it may have been feasible to

cover a large amount of material in the recitation period. But now that that highly specialized and one-sided method is losing ground, only a portion of the hour is devoted to it and more time is left for a thorough discussion of the text. This method of procedure would also leave the student with more time for individual study upon assigned portions of the book not found in the edition he is using and would serve to emancipate him from an altogether too servile acquiescence in the editor's and instructor's standpoint.

Prof. Harris observes the strictest silence with regard to the end to be obtained by the study of the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*. In the Preface to his edition, he conscientiously records that the Lachmann-Muncker edition is the basis of the text, that a few typographical errors have been corrected, that the Prussian rules have been followed in the orthography, that passages have been omitted and explained, but says not a word concerning the motive for editing the work. Nor does the Introduction contain a clear enunciation of the design of the work. In fact some of the statements made here offer us plausible arguments for not reading it at all. It may be contended that I have torn Prof. Harris' sentences from their connection and have twisted them to suit my own purpose. Granted that this has been done. My aim is simply to show that objections can be raised and are being raised to admitting the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* to the class-room at all, and, therefore, Prof. Harris should at least have made a definite reference to that fact.

1. The *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* lacks unity of purpose. On p. xviii Prof. Harris says: "It is, in a way, a haphazard production." 2. There is much in it that is worthless. On p. xviii we read:

"If we were compelled to judge the Dramaturgie by the number of pages which are well nigh worthless to-day, we should consider it of little value."

Any one who will take the pains to read the little book of Friedrich Seiler, *Der Gegenwartswert der Hamburgischen Dramaturgie*, Berlin, Weidmann, 1901, will easily be convinced that it has less actual intrinsic worth than Prof. Harris is here willing to admit. 3. Out of fifty-two plays criticized only eighteen were German and "of these eighteen it is fair to say that only Lessing's *Miss Sara Sampon* is of interest to the cultivated reader of to-day." How profitable to read the criticism of worthless plays! We may not assume that the student has read any of the French plays examined by the reviewer Lessing. The student is entirely dependent upon Lessing's prejudice against the French and, perhaps, the prejudice of his instructor also. There is surely no justice in such a one-sided procedure. 4. "As it stands, the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* is not to be taken blindly as the deliberate statement of his own views," p. xxvi. What are his serious convictions? Will the editor leave the student in a state of confusion? 5. One of the most important topics discussed has no present value. P. xxxiii:

"For both the English and the German reader this keen discussion of the unities has no present importance; for the former, because the example of the great dramatists of the Elizabethan age made such a discussion unnecessary; for the other, because Lessing's victory was complete in his own country."

P. xxxv:

"The lapse of time and the shifting of the point of view makes much that was most valuable in the Dramaturgie for its day of less worth to us."

P. xxxvi: "Indeed his own mature dramas are in part flat contradictions of the theories of the Greek philosopher," Aristotle.

These statements of a derogatory character are hardly balanced by others of a more encouraging nature. P. xviii we read: "we might question whether any other critical work has ever surpassed it." P. xix: "As regards vocabulary, inflection and syntactical construction Lessing's language is a rich and comparatively unworked mine." P. xxxi:

"Lessing's interpretation (of Aristotle) holds in the main: in a few points the consensus of opinion is against him, in others it is fair to assume that no agreement will ever be reached."

P. xxxvi: "The Dramaturgie does in passing touch upon a considerable body of theory in a way that gives to it enduring value." P. xxxix: "a noteworthy pamphlet of a literary compaign." P. xl: "The superadded something of which this Introduction can give no account is the touch of genius which makes imperishable."

Janus-like we find ourselves looking in two directions at the same time, standing between two fires. What shall we do with the book? Let us assume for a moment

that there are no serious objections to be raised to the study of the book, that only the most favorable comment can be made upon it. Even then we should be at sea; for the passages last cited suggest many different methods of study. Shall we study Lessing's critical method? Shall we devote ourselves solely to philological considerations? Shall we make the æsthetic theories of the unities and of fear and pity, etc., the subject of our investigations? Or shall we treat it from the point of view of history? If the Introduction is to be made a *pons asinorum* for the instructor as well as for the student in any case, why fail to make even a suggestion as to didactic possibilities?

Strikingly strange is the fact that the editor nowhere designates the class of students by whom the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* might profitably be read. The only hint as to the previous preparation of students is given in a paragraph prefatory to the notes, in which Prof. Harris says, that an acquaintance with the life of Lessing and the most general facts of German literature are assumed. Such a regulation would debar many students otherwise eligible; for few students possess, or can be expected to possess, the biographical and historical knowledge which the editor regards as essential. In the case of such students it would have been fair to suggest where the suitable material may be found.

Some passages of the original have been omitted. The reason given for the omission is very unsatisfactory. Everything is excluded that seemed to the editor of little or no present value and interest. To relieve himself of all responsibility in the matter of selection, it would have been wiser to say, that the retention or rejection of a chapter was largely influenced by the example of German editors. If, however, the work of choosing was done independently of his predecessors, an illustration of his method of choice would have been welcome.

As introductions go, the Introduction covering thirty pages is well done. Looking toward perspicuity, much would have been gained by a separation of the different portions of it into chapters with appropriate titles. Pp. ix to xxii touch upon the genesis of the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*. The aim of the remaining pages is to give an insight into its purpose. Lessing's original plan was to criticize the plays represented, and also to pass judgment upon the merit or demerit of the actor's interpretation. But the perversity of the players compelled Lessing to dispense with the histrionic phase of his reviews. The mediocrity of some of the dramas often served merely as a starting-point for the discussion of serious dramatic principles. The paragraph which refers to the *Dramaturgie* as a prose master-piece (p. xviii) is an episode in the consistent development of the essay and ought, therefore, to have been introduced elsewhere. In his treatment of the *Dramaturgie* as a polemic against French tragedy, against Gottsched as the representative of French taste in Germany, against Corneille and Voltaire, the editor's attitude toward Gottsched, whose service to German literature has been underestimated since Lessing's time and is just beginning to be appreciated, is the attitude of prejudiced tradition. His collocation of the passages referring to Shakespere is valuable; it would have been more pedagogical to permit the student to make the collocation for himself. The question of the inquiring student, "what theories are held to-day with reference to tragedy" is left entirely unanswered. There is hardly a hint anywhere that there are *modern* problems of the tragedy. The omission of any mention of the name Bernays in connection with the question of *purification*, of such books as Theodor Lipps, *Der Streit über die Tragödie*, Hamburg and Leipzig, 1891, or Johannes Volkelt, *Aesthetik des Tragischen*, München, 1897, books very helpful and indispensable to the maturer student in case of a desired orientation, marks a sad and inexplicable neglect. The editor had a splendid opportunity to explain the doctrine of *art for art's sake*, but failed to grasp it, and so the obscurity of the phrase will continue to be a source of perplexity to the student.

But few typographical errors are to be found. The notes are trustworthy in almost every instance, and in only a few cases have translations been offered where the dictionary would have served just as well.

J. A. C. Hildner.

*University of Michigan.*

## (1) *BEOWULF'S CHARACTER.*

To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes,

Sirs:—John R. Clark Hall, in his prose translation of *Bēowulf* (1901), pp. 189 ff., has presented a sketch of the hero's character, at the close of which he briefly refers to its "darker side." "In some respects," he observes,

"it is evident that his ethical standard was low; for he takes great credit to himself for not having sworn *many* false oaths or murdered his relatives (2738–2740)."

It would be a pity, indeed, if Bēowulf had sworn some false oaths, and it would be surprising, to say the least, if in the face of death he should have derived comfort from the thought that they were only few in number. Dr. Hall's plea that in fulfilling "the sacred duty" of vengeance (*þæt hē his frēond wrece*, 1385) "the custom of the times permitted every sort of treachery" is not particularly convincing as applied to this case; for if the code of honor sanctioned such behavior, there would be no cause for any uneasy feeling about it. But happily for the hero, his reputation has suffered merely through inadequate interpretation: no, Bēowulf was no *wǣrloga!* When the messenger announced to the Gēats the death of their lord,—*hē ne lēag fela wyrda ne worda*, l. 3029, who can doubt that he kept strictly to the truth? In the same way, *(ic)ne mē swōr fela āða on unriht* in the mouth of the dying Bēowulf means quite the same as 'I kept all my oaths.' Similarly, *lȳt swigian*, 2897, is='not be silent at all,' 'speak out;' *lythwōn lēan*, 203='heartily approve;' *mǣte weorode*, Dream of the Rood 69, 124='alone'; and when we are told that Unferð—*his māgum nǣre ārfæst æt ecga gelācum*, Bēow. 1167, we are to understand that he—[*his*] *brōðrum tō banan wurde*, *hēafodmǣgum* (587); and possibly some of us will be put in mind of 'The cunning speech of Drumtochty'? There is no need of further exemplifying the use of *Litotes* by the Anglo-Saxon poets.

As to the shortcomings of Bēowulf the hero, there is without question one serious defect—though not a moral blemish—of which his most ardent admirers could not acquit him: he talks too much! But, then, this is a common constitutional fault of the poem.

## (2) *CHAUCER'S BOOK OF THE DUCHESSE 405 ff.*

*For hit was on to beholde,*
*As thogh the erthe envye wolde*
*To be gayer than the heven,*
*To have mo floures, swiche seven*
*As in the welken sterres be.*

[Based on ll. 8465 ff. of the Roman de la Rose:

*Qu'il vous fust avis que la terre*
*Vosist emprendre estrif et guerre*
*Au ciel d'estre miex estelée,*
*Tant iert par ses flors revelée.*]

In the Globe Chaucer, H. Frank Heath changes *swiche seven* to *sithes seven*, arguing that the former "makes no sense." This is an emendation at once needless and grammatically impossible. The *as* of the following line clearly warns the critical reader that the correlative *swiche* cannot be dropped without serious syntactical consequences.[1] It is true, Skeat's explanation of the MSS. reading is more confusing than helpful. "To have more flowers than the heaven (has stars, so as even to rival) seven such planets as there are in the sky." But if we just leave the planets out of the interpretation, everything is as smooth as it could be. *Swiche seven* means precisely what it should mean in this context: ['seven such,' that is] 'seven times as (much, *or*) many.' Cf. Robert of Gloucester, p. 19, l. 8: *For heo hadde suche þritti men as were on þe oþer.* (From Mätzner's Grammar iii, p. 232, where other examples are mentioned.) That this idiom is inherited from the Old English period, may be seen from 'Leechdoms' i, 400.17 *selle him twā swylc swylce man æt him nime* (quoted by Toller); cf. *ōðer swylc*, as in Bēowulf 1582 f.: *fȳftȳne men—ōðer swylc.*

The meaning of ll. 407 f. is thus simply: 'to have more flowers, [even] seven times as many as there are stars in the heaven.'

Regarding the introduction of the numerical element, which may largely be due to the exigencies of the rime (cf. Canterb. Tales, G 974: *Though it as greet were as was Ninivee, Rome, Alisaundre, Troye, and othere three*), but at the same time intensifies the comparison, we refer to our monograph *Das Bild bei Chaucer*, pp. 360, 385 f.

Frederick Klaeber.

*University of Minnesota.*

1 On the other hand, *Troil.* v. 1380:

*Which with your cominge hoom ayein to Troye*
*Ye may redresse, and, more a thousand sythe*
*Than ever ich hadde, encresen in me joye.*

## *COMPOSITION WORK IN MODERN LANGUAGES.*

To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes,

Sirs:—It is unnecessary to discuss the value and usefulness of Composition work in the class-room. No up-to-date teacher would dare claim that it suffices for his students to be able to translate French or German into English. If modern languages are to be called upon to take up the task of Greek and Latin in adorning and disciplining the minds of young people, while improving their knowledge of their native tongue, the rôle of Composition will become still more important, for it is especially through this kind of work that these various aims will be attained.

It is also a well-known fact that Composition is unpopular at large. The best proof of it is that, out of four or five hours a week devoted to French or German, only one hour is grudgingly set aside in most schools for the translation of English into the foreign language to be acquired.

But why is composition so unpopular with both teachers and pupils, while translation of the foreign language into English is generally liked?

Because the former is done at the wrong time; it is done too early. Because the pupils have had no time to assimilate the rules to be applied and the words to be used. They find the translation of French or German into English comparatively easy, pleasant and profitable, because their command of the English lightens the work. They dislike Composition and find it hard, uninteresting and unprofitable because they have no vocabulary to depend upon and are obliged to stumble along groping their way in the dark, because it is mechanical, and they feel, as one of my colleagues puts it, like children playing with blocks of wood.

Let us illustrate the case; let us visit a French class, for instance, as taught through the present system. To make things very plain, suppose it is the first lesson in Grammar, either in a high school or a university, for the method will vary but little, if any.

The teacher will probably explain the rules with as great a display of knowledge as possible, although, by the way, it would be much easier for him and better for the members of his class if he would manage to make them find out these very rules by means of a few well-chosen examples. Next, he reads the vocabulary and the French text; he may go so far as to ask the pupils to repeat what he has just read, and finally he assigns the lesson for the next day: 1. the study of the rules; 2. of the words of the vocabulary; 3. the translation at sight, or on paper, of the French text into English and 4. the translation on paper of the English into French.

In the next recitation, the translation of the French sentences will go on smoothly, but not so with that of the English. Whatever system may be selected to correct it, the numerous mistakes will tax the patience of the master and, worse than that, will breed dislike and distrust in the minds of the students. This kind of work will be carried on for one or two years on the same plan, the number of mistakes and the dissatisfaction of the whole class increasing in a direct ratio as they proceed.

Now, how can we remedy this state of affairs? How can we make Composition work attractive? Shall we postpone it to the second semester, or the second year as is advised by some German scholars? It would certainly be better to do so than to adhere to the present method? But we do not need to postpone it to so late a date. Composition work may go hand in hand almost from the beginning with Grammar and translation of French into English.

This is how it can be done: Whatever book the teacher uses, let him first go carefully over the rules, the vocabulary and the French text of every exercise; if there is any spare time, let him devote it to a thorough review of the preceding exercises, *leaving entirely aside the English sentences until he reaches, say, the tenth or the twelfth lesson.*

By this time, the horizon of the pupil will have been broadened; he will have met again and again with the application of the rules of the first lesson; he will have heard, repeated and translated so many times the words of the first vocabulary that he will have mastered them; he will have assimilated them to such a degree that they will look almost as familiar to him as expressions of his own language.

When this stage has been reached, the time has come to make him translate the English sentences of the first lesson. First, ask him to do it at sight. It will be a good drill for him in the pronunciation of words he knows, in the application of principles he has already grasped, in the immediate use of moods, tenses and endings with which he is thoroughly acquainted. He will translate them all in a very short time, unhesitatingly, intelligently, pleased with the idea that he is able to express English ideas in the new language in such an easy way. Confidence—the most important feeling to create and to develop in a class—is aroused at once. Frequent reviews will materially increase it.

The teacher should then ask his class to write out the translation of the English sentences for the next day in order to make sure that they know the spelling of the words and to impress still better the expressions on their minds. Whether he corrects the Composition exercise at home, or on the board in the class room, or dictates his own translation, his task will be very light, for the mistakes will be few. His pupils will be able to apply rules and words in an intelligent way because the principles will have ripened in their minds and they will have a small but sufficient vocabulary at hand.

It is hardly necessary to add that the study of rules and French texts should be kept two or three weeks ahead of the Composition work throughout the year and chances for reviewing should be generously offered.

If the above suggestions are followed, Composition work will no longer be the "bête noire" of teachers and students. They will be elated with the success of their efforts and the road before them will be smooth and alluring.

VICTOR E. FRANÇOIS.
*University of Michigan.*

---

## *REFERENCE BOOKS FOR FRENCH.*

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—I have only just seen the review of my *Books of reference for students and teachers of French* published in the January number of your journal. Allow me to say that, in my opinion, your critic hardly makes it sufficiently clear to your readers what the scope and purpose of the book is. The last paragraph of his review might indeed lead them to conclude that it aimed at covering the same ground as the well-known and valuable books of Koschwitz (*Anleitung zum Studium der französischen Philologie*) and Rossmann (*Ein Studienaufenthalt in Paris*). This is not the case. My book differs from theirs in not giving any instructions as to the object and methods of the scientific and practical study of French: it contains a list, accompanied in many cases by brief appreciative or critical remarks, of such books on French language, literature, and life in its various aspects as students and teachers will do well to refer to.

The list is divided into twenty-eight chapters with the following headings: Bibliographies; Encyclopædias; Periodicals; Literature generally; Books and Manuscripts; Collections of extracts; French folklore; Language generally; Phonetics; History of the French language; Old French; French dialects; Provençal; the teaching of French; French pronunciation; French spelling; Modern French grammar; various hand books for the study of French; Colloquial French; French composition; French dictionaries; French metre; Education in France; French society, institutions and manners; French history; French art; Geography of France.

I have endeavoured to include in my list all such publications (especially such written in French, English, and German) as will be most helpful to students and teachers, without desiring to provide a bibliography for scholars pursuing research in any particular branch of the study of French. I do not doubt that my selection could be improved by omissions as well as additions, nor do I expect the book to be free from errors, either material or typographical.

I wish, therefore, in conclusion to repeat what I said in the preface of my publication: that any corrections from persons interested in the study of French will be gratefully received and used by me to improve the book, should a second edition of it become necessary.

E. G. W. BRAUNHOLTZ.
37, *Chesterton Road,*
*Cambridge, England.*

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

**Baltimore, June, 1902.**

## *THE LEODILLA EPISODE IN BOJARDO'S ORLANDO INNAMORATO.* (*I, xx-xxii.*) I.

THE poem of Bojardo was written to be read for the entertainment of friends, or for the court of the Este at Ferrara. The poet tried by the fullness and variety of his material to keep his hearers in suspense, and to gain this end he sought his material everywhere. The Old-French narrative poetry, the *Chansons de Geste*, the so-called Breton romances, the *Fabliaux* furnished much, and the tales of Classical antiquity are no less in evidence.

The *Orlando Innamorato* is, in reality, a poetic *Rahmenerzählung* like the *Decamerone*, except that the scheme or frame into which the stories are woven is a little better concealed and less artificial. This framework is furnished by the wars of the Saracens against Charlemagne, and they are brought on with convenient regularity. But the cantos which describe these wars are interrupted and interspersed with all sorts of stories, Classical and Mediæval, with adventures from the romances of chivalry, with *fabliaux*, an occasional theological discussion between some Christian hero and Saracen warrior, with numerous examples of wonderful and direful magic. It would be difficult to choose an example which would better illustrate Bojardo's method in utilizing these different and remote materials than the Leodilla episode which takes up the greater part of cantos xx–xxii of the First Part.

Brandimarte and Fiordelisa are sleeping peacefully in the forest. An old hermit comes and, seeing the beauty of the lady, is enamored and carries her off. The knight sleeps on, but is soon aroused by the noise of three giants who are coming through the woods carrying with them a maiden who is wailing loudly and praying that God in his mercy give her death. The knight of course attacks them, but finds the odds too great. However, Orlando comes along at the opportune moment, and between them they dispose of the three giants and release the hapless maiden. This sort of an adventure is often met with in the romances of adventure, especially in those of the Arthurian cycle. So, for example, *Roman de la Charrette*, v. 728 sq; *Perceval ou la Quête de la Sainte Graal*, Potvin's ed., vol. i, p. 429; *Le Bel Inconnu*, v. 444, and again v. 699. We will compare the latter example of this sort of an adventure with Bojardo's narrative, not that there is necessarily any direct connection between them, although there is a rather striking coincidence.

In the Old-French story *Li Biaus Desconus ou Giglain Fils de Messire Gauvain et de la Fée aux blanches Mains*, the hero is riding through the forest and comes to an open place where he sees a fire. V. 699.

> Au feu avoit li grans gaians,
> Lais et hisdels et mescreans,
> Li uns tenoit une pucèle.
> Ja nus hom ne demant plus bièle,
> Se ele n'eust tel paor;
> Mais molt demenoit grant dolor;
> Molt se complaint et plore et brait,
> Comme la riens qui paine trait.
> Car uns gaians moult la pressoit
> A force baisier le voloit.

And in the *Orl. Inn.*, I. xx. 10:

> Come fu giunto, vide tre giganti
> Che avean molti gambeli in su la strata;
> Due venian dietro ed un giva davanti
> Menando una donzella scapigliata;
> E parve a Brandimarte ne'sembianti
> Che Fiordelisa sia la sciagurata,
> Che sopra quel gambel gridava forte,
> Chiedendo in grazia a Dio sempre la morte.

*Li Biaus Desconus* disposes of the first of these giants without much difficulty; his fight with the second is described as follows; V. 777 sq.

> Li jaians sa maçue prist
> Navré se sent, tost en fremist,
> Venge se au demaintenant!
> Si est venus vers lui corant,
> Si entoissé por lui férir.
> Cil vit le cop vers lui venir;
> Le ceval guencist d'autre part.
> Ce ne fu pas fait de musart.
> Fuir vaut mieus que de fol atendre,
> Puis qu'il n'i a mestier desfendre.
> Car li jaians a si féru,
> En un arbre par tel vertu,
> Que il fist tot l'arbre croller,
> Et les branches fist avaler.

This corresponds to the fight between Orlando

and Ranchera, one of the three giants who were carrying off the maiden, I. xx. 23 and 24.

Da l'altra parte è la pugna maggiore
Tra il feroce Ranchera 'l conte Orlando:
Quel mena del bastone a gran furore:
Già combattuto avean più di quattr'ore,
Sempre l'un l'altro gran colpi menando:
Quando Ranchera getta il scudo in terra
E ad ambe man il gran bastone afferra.

E'menò un colpo sì dismisurato,
Che se dritto giungeva quel gigante,
Non saria giammai più raffigurato
Per uomo vivo quel signor d'Anglante;
Giunse ad un arbor ch'era ivi da lato,
E tutto lo spezzò sino a le piante,
Le rame e il tronco da la cima al basso;
Odito non fu mai tanto fracasso.

The coincidence of a wild blow striking the tree at one side is striking and tempts us to draw conclusions, especially since the main event of *Li Biaus Desconus* appears also in the *Orlando Innamorato*, II. xxvi. Here Brandimarte, after having slain a terrible giant who is also a magician, comes to a tomb upon the cover of which he reads that he must kiss whatever comes out. He lifts this cover and a terrible dragon springs out, which upon being kissed turns into a beautiful maiden. In *Li Biaus Desconus* the hero Giglain comes to the Cité Gasté to free a lady from a terrible magic spell. He kills a couple of giants, the last of whom is also a magician, and enters the room. A dragon of terrible appearance approaches but acting with wonderful humility and mildness of demeanor. While the knight hesitates to strike down such a mild-mannered monster the dragon darts up and kisses him upon the mouth and is thereupon transformed into a beautiful maiden. However, it is doubtful whether Bojardo derived the latter story from Old-French sources, as there is an Italian poem which contains the same episode, namely the *Carduino*, a composition belonging to the latter part of the fourteenth century.

*Li Biaus Desconus* is a later composition of the Arthurian cycle of romances, corresponding in a general way to the *Enfances* of the *Chansons de Geste*, and was written during the thirteenth century. It seems hardly probable that it would have been incorporated in any of the numerous romances whose titles appear in the catalogues of the library belonging to the house of Este, which were published in the second volume of the *Romania* by Pio Rajna. But Renaud de Beaujeu, the author of the poem, may very likely have taken his description of the fight with the giants from some of the older romances, such affairs being something of a commonplace in these works. The comparison shows at least how closely Bojardo's method resembles that employed in the Old-French narrative poems of the so-called Breton or Arthurian cycle.

Our story is then dropped for the twentieth canto, and is not resumed until the thirty-seventh stanza of the following, where it is taken up characteristically at the crucial point of a terrible battle which is in progress between Ranaldo and the champions of the traitor Truffaldino.

Ma nel presente io voglio differire
Il fin di questa pugna sì rubesta:
Di Orlando e Brandimarte vi vo' dire,
Che son con quella dama a la foresta,
Qual han campata da crudel martire,
E tre giganti uccisi con tempesta,
Come dovete aver ne la memoria,
Or di quel fatto io vo' seguir l'istoria.

Thereupon the lady goes on to tell them who she is, after having attended to the wounds of Brandimarte with the medical skill with which the heroines of the romances were so often accredited. I. xxi.

50. Di re figliuola e bella mi trovai,
Ricca d'avere e di stato giocondo;
E ciò mi fu cagion di molti guai,
Come ti conteraggio il tutto a tondo,
Perchè conosci a quel che m'è incontrado,
Che anzi a la morte alcun non è beato.

51. Era la fama già sparta d'intorno
De la richezza del mio padre antico;
E nominanza del mio viso adorno,
O vera o falsa pur com'io ti dico,
Menò due amanti a chiedermi in un giorno,
Ordauro il biondo, e il vecchio Folderico:
Bello era il primo dal ciuffo a la pianta,
L'altro de gli anni avea più di sessanta.

Naturally Leodilla's choice was soon made. "Il vecchio lascio, e al giovene m'appiglio," as she says (52, last verse) neatly parodying the celebrated verse of Petrarch. However, as she is not entirely free to choose she determines to compass her desires by trickery, so she goes to her father and prays that he grant her one last wish.

56. Questo sarà che non mi dia marito,
Che prima meco al corso non contenda,
E fia per legge fermo e stabilito,

Che il vincitor per sua moglie mi prenda;
Ma fa ch'il vinto sappia che il partito
Sia di lasciar la vita per ammenda,
E sia palese per tutte le bande;
Chi non è corridor, non mi domande.

Thereupon she tells the knights that she was so swift of foot that once near the city of Damosire she had overtaken a stag and caught it. On the day of the contest the two suitors appear; the great contrast in their appearance giving rise to much comment and the belief that on this day the old Folderico will surely lose his head. The conditions are read over and Folderico who is to run first takes his place. At his side he carries a sack. As they run and the lady is about to pass her aged contestant he drops a round and smoothly polished apple, she stoops to pick it up and is delayed. This happens twice. The end approaches and she is gaining on the old man and is already thinking of the bliss in store for her with Ordauro:

66. Cosl parlava meco, nel mio core
Allegra, già vicina a la speranza,
Quando il vecchio malvagio e traditore,
Il terzo pomo de la tasca lanza,
E tanto m'abbagliò col suo splendore,
Che, ben che tempo al corso non m'avanza,
Pur venni a dietro e quel pomo pigliai,
Nè Folderico più giunsi giammai.

67. Lui forte ansando a le tende arrivava,
E i suoi gli sono intorno con letizia
Tutta la gente di fora gridava;
Adoprata ha'l volpone alta malizia.
Or tu puoi mo pensar, se io biastemmava,
Che io piansi il sangue vivo per gran stizia;
E nel mio cor dicea: S'egli è volpone,
Farollo esser un becco, per Macone.

This is, of course, the fable of Atalanta and Ipomene which Venus tells to Adonis in the sixth fable of the tenth book of the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid.

Atalanta is warned by the oracle that if she marries it will be the cause of her ruin. Then v. 567:

Territa sorte dei per opacas innuba silvas
Vivit et instantem turbam violenta procorum
Condicione fugat, nec "sum potiunda, nisi" inquit,
"Victa prius cursu. Pedibus contendite mecum:
Præmia veloci coniunx thalamique dabuntur,
Mor pretium tardis. Ea lex certaminis esto."

Many are enamored of her great beauty and contend with her in running. All are conquered. Among those who look on is Ipomene, who also falls a prey to her charms, and the maiden too for the first time feels the pangs of love. They contend. Venus being invoked by the youth gives him three golden apples plucked from the tree which grows in the Tamasenian fields. These three apples are used in about the same way that Folderico used those with which he had provided himself for his race. As they approach the end Ipomene throws the last apple far to one side and v. 676:

virgo visa est dubitare: coegi
tollere et adieci sublato pondera malo
impediique oneris pariter gravitate moraque
neve meus sermo cursu sit tardior ipso,
præterita est virgo: duxit sua præmia victor.

The liberties taken by Bojardo with his Classical source are too evident to require much comment. That there was any intermediate link between his work and that of the Latin poet is improbable. Bojardo simply vulgarized the story in matter as well as in language. In the one, the maiden prescribes the running contests to avert an impending disaster; in the other to be able to possess the youth and conveniently to dispose of the aged suitor. It is a parody on the story of Venus—a parody necessitated by the difference between the characters of Leodilla and Atalanta, who is here transfigured into the form of the gay heroine of the Italian novella. The transformation would be incomplete did not a similar change take place in regard to the person of the lover, and so Ipomene gives way to the decrepit Folderico, who, in his turn, as will shortly appear, represents the very familiar type of the jealous husband.

It becomes then a sort of preparation for the novella of the *Moglie Involata*, since it tends to make the action possible by showing Leodilla's swiftness of foot, and it also gives a motive for the husband's jealousy. These are matters very lightly touched upon in the other versions of this story. Leodilla relates the story to Orlando and Brandimarte as they ride on in quest of Fiordelisa. Folderico brings his wife in pomp and triumph to a strong castle of his called Alta Mura, in which his treasure is hidden. In a chamber worse than a prison he locks up his young bride. Her case is a very sad one indeed. The room can only be entered by one way. The castle has seven walls, and it is entered by narrow entrances

through seven towers and seven gates to which Folderico carries the only key. He is insanely jealous, so much so that, according to the heroine, xxii, 17:

> Perciò che, sempre che la torre entrava,
> Le pulici scotea del vestimento,
> E tutte fuor de l' uscio le cacciava;
> Nè stava per quel dì più mai contento,
> Se una mosca con meco ritrovava;
> Anzi diceva con molto tormento;
> È femina ovver maschio questa mosca?
> Non la tenere, o fa ch'io la conosca.

The heroine languishes for some time in this sad condition, when her lover finally appears on the scene. He is unable to get into the tower in any way, but buys an estate some two miles away and settles there. In the course of time he succeeds in making an underground passage which enables him to enter Leodilla's room. Although the two lovers enjoy blissful moments together they are not satisfied and plan a means of escape. Ordauro prepares a banquet to which he invites Folderico, representing that he is married to allay the husband's suspicion. When the latter arrives at the knight's castle he is confronted at the table by his own wife who has come through the underground passage and now sits there dressed in garments which the lover had procured for her. Naturally the husband is greatly excited, storming and cursing with great fury. Ordauro professes to be unable to make anything out of his conduct, but suggests that his anxiety may be due to a fancied resemblance, and that, as a matter of fact, his wife had had a twin sister so much like her that their parents could not tell them apart. Folderico is decidedly skeptical but hastens back to his castle where he finds his wife in a state of deep melancholia. This experience having been repeated several times, Folderico at last comes to the conclusion that he must have been mistaken. Soon Ordauro announces that he must leave the country as the climate does not agree with him. Folderico is vastly relieved and proposes to accompany him and his supposed wife. He does so and after having gone some six miles returns to find that his wife has been stolen from him in spite of all his precautions.

This *novella* is borrowed, at least in part, from the very popular Mediæval collection of stories known as the *Historia Septem Sapientum*, and it is also found in some versions of the Latin *Dolopathos*, though not in Oesterley's edition. The story in question frequently bears the name *Inclusa*, but I have adopted the name given it by D'Ancona in his edition of the Italian version of this work, *Il Libro dei Sette Savi*, Pisa, 1864, *La Moglie Involata*, since this name corresponds better to the contents of the narrative. The story of the *Stolen Wife* in the version of the *Seven Wise Men* is about as follows:

A knight of the king Montbergis dreamed one night that he was enamored of a beautiful lady whom he did not know, nor had he ever seen her. The lady of whom he dreamed was visited by the same sort of a vision in which she on her side fell in love with the knight. On the next day the knight rode forth in quest of her of whom he had dreamed. After riding three weeks he comes to the sea where he beholds a strong, beautiful castle, well-walled and with a high and massive tower. Now the lord of this castle had a young and beautiful wife of whom he was very jealous, so that he kept her locked up in this tower. To go to her one had to pass through ten doors, and the lord entrusted the key to no one. The lady was sitting in her window as the knight rode up, their eyes met and their hearts were thrown into a most violent perturbation, for each recognizes in the other the object of the passion which had come to them in their dreams.

The count being at war with a neighboring lord, it is an easy matter for the knight to get into his service and thus win his favor. As a reward for his assistance in bringing the war to a close the knight obtains a piece of land near the count's castle and builds thereon a fine mansion. He has the master mason construct an underground passage which communicates with the lady's room. The work accomplished, he kills the master mason that he may tell no tales. The knight then visits his mistress and as he leaves her she gives him a ring which she had received from her husband, and this he slips on his finger. The knight soon entertains the count who is greatly startled at seeing his ring on his host's finger. He hurries back to the castle and asks to see

the ring. In the meantime the knight has carried the ring back by way of the passage, so the lady is able to show it to her husband with a great display of innocence. He is amazed, of course, but reflects that there are many rings and that these two may very well have resembled each other. The next morning the knight informs him that a friend (Amica) has arrived bringing good tidings from his country and he will soon return, but before he goes he wishes that the count may come and dine with him once more. The count comes to the banquet and is astounded to see his own wife sitting at the table opposite him. He is utterly cast down and cannot eat. He asks who she is and the knight states that she is his friend. Thereupon the count reflects that the tower is strong and that women as well as rings resemble each other, and indeed, when he gets back to his room he finds his wife awaiting him in her chamber. The next morning he is invited by the knight to be present at the marriage of himself with this friend, which is to take place just before they set sail for their own country. The count is present and actually gives away his own wife to the other. He sees them off and returns to find that his wife also is gone in spite of his many precautions.

This is the story of the *Moglie Involata*, or the *Inclusa*, as it occurs with slight variations in the various versions of this very popular collection of stories. There can be no doubt but that Bojardo knew this work, or at least that he had plenty of opportunity for knowing it. There are several Italian versions of the narrative in question; so in the *Crudele Matrigna*, *Il Libro dei Sette Savi di Roma*, in a Latin text of the *Dolopathos*, discovered by Mussafia, and published in the *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Bd. 57, S. 37 sq.; a version in *ottave rime* discovered and discussed by Pio Rajna in *Romania*, vols. vii and x; and the *Erasto*. The version in *ottave rime* offers some strong proof of the popularity of the poem. Its composition shows it to be the work of a poet who probably put it together to recite in public places. There is, for example, a great freedom in the use of rimes. Thus *Soprana* rimes with *magna* (i, 24); *accorto* with *doto* which stands for *dotto* (iv, 5); these and similar examples are frequently to be found in this style of poetry wherever it has been preserved. But there are even worse rimes than these, so *sane* rimes with *bene* (i, 62), *pelo* with *duolo* (88, 13), etc. There are even some bad grammatical blunders, so *hai* (i, 61); *fui* (iii, 17; vi, 2); *trovai* (vii, 11) are used as third persons. The poet was looking for some rimes with *Ipocràs*, and so with a nonchalance characteristic of his trade he writes *fas debàs*, *fa dimoràs* and *parlàs*, which for him mean the same as *fa* or *fece*, *tu debba*, *fa dimora* and *parlò* (iii, 16; iv, 3 and 13). These are all plain signs of the playman's art, or lack of it, and indicate that these stories were familiar to the people at that time. Rajna believes that this poem was composed between 1440 and 1480. The first two books of the *Orlando Innamorato* were completed by 1482, as is shown by the fact that the poet interrupted his work on account of the war which had broken out around Ferrara in that year. The stories of the *Seven Wise Men*, then, were being recited before the people at the time when the *Orlando* was being composed. According to D'Ancona (cf. edition, p. 120) our story is the thirteenth *novella* of Sercambi, and traces of its influence also appear in the fortieth *novella* of Masuccio. It was a story, then, that was generally known and as such Bojardo would have levied his contributions upon it and so would probably have followed no version in particular. According to Rajna, *Romania*, vol. viii, 377, the *Crudele Matrigna* and *Il Libro dei Sette Savi* were translated from the Latin version discovered by Mussafia. He believes that the rimed version may have come from the Latin, but indirectly and under the influence of the French. There are two statements common to Bojardo and the Latin text which do not occur in the other versions, and this would indicate that if Bojardo used any of these versions he must have had the Latin one before him. So the Latin version states that the castle had seven gates to which the husband carried the key, *op. cit.*, p. 108:

"Et illa turris erat altissima nec poterat intrari ad eam nisi per septem ostia quibus omnibus maritus suus claves portabat,"

which corresponds to the second verse of the fifteenth stanza of the *Orlando:*

Per sette torrioni e sette porte,

and the sixteenth stanza, sixth verse:

Sempre tenea le chiavi a la cintura.

In the Latin version the youth is said to be very rich, *op. cit.*, p. 109:

Juvenis vero quia ditissimus erat,

while *Il Libro dei Sette Savi* has nothing to say in that respect. But Leodilla says, St. 19, first verse:

Egli era ricco di molto tesoro.

The points of contact are:—The jealous husband who imprisons his beautiful young wife; the lover who comes, builds a castle in the neighborhood and tunnels underground to the apartments of his mistress; then the dinner at which the husband eats at the table with his own wife; and finally in a somewhat general way the last scene of the little comedy where the husband is a party to the abduction of his own wife.

The passages in which these events are narrated are quite similar, as will appear from a hasty comparison. Cf. *Orl. Inn.* I. xxii,

14. Là mi stava io, d'ogni diletto priva,
I campi e la marina a riguardare,
Perchè la terra è posta in su la riva
D'una spiaggia deserta, a lato al mare;
Non vi potria salir persona viva
Che non avesse l'ale da volare,
E sol da un lato a quel castello altiero
Salir si può per un stretto sentiero.

15. Ha sette cinte, e sempre nova entrata,
Per sette torrioni e sette porte,
Ciascuna piccioletta e ben ferrata:
Dentro questo giron cotanto forte
Fu io piacevolmente imprigionata,
Sempre chiamando notte e giorno morte,

16. . . . . .
Il vecchio, che avea ben di ciò sospetto,
Sempre tenea le chiavi a la cintura,
Ed era sì geloso divenuto,
Che avendol visto non saria creduto.

In *Il Libro dei Sette Savi di Roma*, p. 78:

"E tanto andò ch'egli (il cavaliere)venne in Ungheria in una terra molto ricca, e bella, e in costa del mare trovò uno castello molto bello, chiuso di buon muro, e la torre bene alta e forte. E quegli di cui era quel castello era un conte d'alto stato, e avea una bella moglie la quale egli amava molto, e erane forte gieloso e avevala per gielosia serrata dentro della torre dove avea dieci usci innanzi che a lei si potesse venire, di che il signiore medesimo portava le chiavi, chè non s'affidava di niuno."

The general facts as to the lover's arrival and the erection of the castle by the lover also resemble each other, except that Bojardo places it farther away and says nothing as to the master mason. The scene at the banquet, which is the real climax of the piece, is thus described in the *Orlando*, I. xxii:

30. Ordauro Folderico ebbe invitato
Al suo palagio assai piacevolmente,
Mostrandogli che s'era maritato
Per trargli ogni sospetto de la mente.
Lui da poi ch'ebbe il castel ben serrato,
Ch'io non potessi uscirne per niente,
Nè sapendo di che, pur sbigottito
N'andò dov'era fatto il gran convito.

31. Io già prima di lui n'era venuta,
Per quella tomba sotterra nascosa,
E d'altri panni ornata e provveduta,
Sì come io fossi la novella sposa;
Ma come il vecchio m'ebbe qui veduta,
Morir credette in pena dolorosa;
E volto a Ordauro disse: Ahimè tapino!
Chè ben ciò mi stimai, per Dio divino!

32. Io non uccisi già il tuo padre antico
Nè abbruciai la tua terra con ruina,
Ch'esser dovessi a me crudel nemico
A far la vita mia tanto meschina.
Ahi tristo e sventurato Folderico,
Che sia gabbato alfin da una fantina:
. . . . . .
. . . . . .

34. Gridava il vecchio ognor più disperato:
Questa è la cortesia, questo è l'onore?
Tu m'hai mia moglie, mio tesor rubato,
E poi per darmi tormento maggiore,
M'hai ad inganno in tua casa menato,
Ladro, ribaldo, falso, traditore,
Perch'io vegga il mio danno a compimento
E la mia onta, e muora di tormento.

35. Ordauro si mostrava stupefatto,
Dicendo: O Dio che reggi il ciel sereno,
Come hai costui de l'intelletto tratto,
Che fu di tal prudenza e senno pieno?
Or d'ogni sentimento è sì disfatto,
Come occhi non avesse, più nè meno;
Odi, diceva, Folderico e vedi;
Questa è mia moglie, e che sia tua tu credi.

The scene is continued in this way for some time, then the old man hurries off to the tower "trottando forte" (39). As he enters his wife's chamber and sees her there he cannot control his amazement and breaks out in exclamations of wonder and stupefaction.

In the *Sette Savi*, on the other hand, this scene is comparatively very tame. The count returning from the chase is met by the knight who leads him into the banquet hall. P. 84: "E quando e' furon posti a tavola, egli fecie mangiare a una tavola il signiore e la dama.

E'l signiore la guatava e parevali pure ch'ella somigliasse la moglie. La dama il pregava e sforzava di mangiare, ma egli nol poteva fare, sì forte era abbaito; ma la torre ch'era sì forte lo'ingannava, perochè non potea per niuna cosa pensare della cava ch'era fatta, ma sempre pensava che sono molte femmine che si somigliano insieme, com'egli avea fatta dello anello. Il cavaliere fecie buono ciera e onorò molto il signiore; e'l signiore il domandò chi era quella dama e'l cavaliere disse: Messer, ella è una mia amica di mio paese, e àmi portate novelle ch'io rià pacie dal mio paese; il perchè e'mi converrà tostamente andare là. E quand'eglino ebbono mangiato e la tavola levata, il signiore prese suo congio, chè gran volontà avea di rivedere la moglie per quella ch'egli avea veduta col cavaliere. E quando il signiore si fu partito, il cavaliere fecie spogliare alla dama i panni ch'ella avea vestiti e rimettersi i suoi medesimi e mandònnela nella torre per la cava sotterra. E quand 'ella fu nella torre, e il signiore venne all'uscio e diserrò l'uno appresso all'altro-; e quando e'vide la sua moglie n'ebbe gran meraviglia e gioia e si meravigliò di quella ch'egli avea lasciata in compagnia del cavaliere che sì forte la somigliava, e la notte dormì con lei con gran gioia."

However, in making use of this old material it was necessary to add some new elements in order to make it more entertaining. It will have been noted that there are some considerable differences between this Italian version of the *Septem Sapientes* (*Versio Italica* as Mussafia calls it) and the story of Bojardo. In the first place the fable of Ipomene and Atalanta is substituted to explain the relation of the heroine to Ordauro and Folderico. Bojardo may have adopted the Latin story in order to do away with the former clumsy method of introducing the story, as well as to prepare his hearers for the astonishing feats of running which Leodilla has to display in passing over the intervening two miles between Ordauro's castle and her lonely tower. The poet makes no mention of the ring or the clothes of the Latin version, which are used as a preparatory step toward allaying the violent suspicions of the husband.

In all of the older versions of this story the husband seems to be ignorant of the fact that his wife has a lover, while in the *Orlando* Folderico is very well aware whom he had to fear, and when Ordauro appears in the neighborhood, he is thrown into a terrible state of mind. II. xxiii.

19. . . . . .
Fe'comprare un palagio in quel confino,
Dove mi tenea chiusa il barbassoro,
E manco di due miglia era vicino:
Non dimandate mo se al mio marito
Crebbe sospetto e se fu sbiggottito.

20. Esso temea del vento che soffiava,
E del sol che lucea da quella parte
Dove Ordauro al presente dimorava;
E con gran cura, diligenza ed arte
Ogni piccol pertugio vi serrava,
Nè mai d'intorno dal giron si parte;
E se un uccello o nebbia nel ciel vede,
Che sia Ordauro fermamente crede.

The character of the jealous husband is quite in harmony with the typical jealous husband as he exists in Italian literature. One trait, however, is entirely new in Bojardo's version of this story, it being found in none of the other versions of the stories told by the seven wise men. This is Ordauro's suggestion that his alleged wife is the twin sister of Folderico's wife: st. 36.

Essa è la figlia del re Manodante,
Che signoreggia l'isole lontane;
Forse che in vista t'inganna il sembiante,
Perchè aggio inteso che fur due germane
Tanto di faccia e membre simigliante,
Che vedendole il padre la dimane
E la sua madre che fatte l'avia,
L'una da l'altra non riconoscia.

COLBERT SEARLES.
*Leland Stanford Jr. University.*

---

## *THE FIRST TRANSCRIPT OF THE VERCELLI BOOK.*

APPARENTLY Kemble is chiefly responsible for the accepted tradition that the first transcript of the Vercelli Book was made by Dr. Blume. In the preface to his edition (p. v), Kemble tells us that in 1834 he made an unsuccessful endeavor to reach Vercelli, and that on returning to England, he found that the

"then existing Record Commission had employed Dr. Blum [Kemble's version of Dr Blume's name] to copy the manuscript, and had caused the poems to be extracted and printed under the care of Mr. Thorpe."

This edition, usually referred to as *Appendix B to Mr. Cooper's Report* (the full title is given in the British Museum catalogue under Cooper, Charles Purton) gives a bare text of the poetical parts of the manuscript. As neither the name of the editor nor the original transcriber of the text is given, Kemble's statement

evidently rests on hearsay. Grimm (*Andreas und Elene*, p. iii) does, as he considers, tardy justice to the name of Dr. Blume by dedicating his edition to him; he says nothing, however, about the origin of the text which is the basis of the first edition, and in consequence of his own and Kemble's. Later commentators have uniformly followed Kemble; Wülker (*Grundriss*, p. 240; see also p. 55), for example, credits Dr. Blume with the discovery of the manuscript, and also with the first transcription of the poetical portions of it.

Dr. Blume's own statement with regard to the matter appears hitherto to have been overlooked. In the fourth volume of his *Iter Italicum*, p. 133, Halle, 1836, which appeared the same year as *Mr. Cooper's Report*, we find the following supplementary note to vol. i, p. 99, at which place, twelve years before, Dr. Blume had announced the discovery of the manuscript:

"Das angelsäxische Homilarium ist vor Kurzem auf Veranstaltung Englischer Geschichtsforscher, von (dem nun schon verstorbenen) Dr. Maier volständig abgeschrieben worden; es haben sich wichtige angelsäxische Lieder darin gefunden (Jac. Grimm)."

Evidently then Dr. Blume's knowledge of the contents of the manuscript, beyond the general impression that it was a book of homilies, was not derived through reading it. How innocent he was of any understanding of Anglo-Saxon can be seen from his attempted transcription of the opening lines of the homily on the *Purification of the Virgin* (quoted by Wülker, *Grundriss*, p. 240).

It follows that we must free the shade of Dr. Blume from the charge (Wülker, *Codex Vercellensis*, p. viii; Skeat, *English Miscellany*, p. 409) of having defaced the interesting fragment on f. $54^a$, which contains the runes forming the name of Cynewulf. But it does not follow, I think, that the blame is to be passed on to Dr. Maier. An examination of the manuscript in Wülker's photographic reproduction makes it plain that this folio, when it left the hands of the original scribe, was as clean and perfect as any other folio of the manuscript; for, in some places, the original writing can be clearly seen under the blot. If Dr. Maier was able to read the other folios of the manuscript without the help of chemical re-agents, he should have had no difficulty in reading this one. The blot which now disfigures the folio extends somewhat slantingly from right to left through all except the last line of the folio; in width it covers about one third of the lines and is serrate at the edges. Now any re-agent which a reader might use in order more easily to decipher the manuscript would not be applied in such a way as to make a blot of the kind described. The blot evidently was on the manuscript when the first copy was made. For this reason Dr. Maier probably did not attempt to transcribe this folio; in consequence it did not appear in the first edition of the manuscript, and the poem of which it supposedly formed a part was printed by Thorpe as "a fragment." The most plausible explanation of the blot seems to be that of Siever's (*Anglia* xiii, p. 25): after the scribe had copied out the lines on f. $54^b$, either he himself or some later reader thought it necessary to strike out what was there written, and the blot is a mark of his disapproval.

GEORGE PHILIP KRAPP.
*Columbia University.*

---

## "*MOBLED QUEEN*," *Hamlet*, *ii*, *2*.

A note may be added to the Furness Variorum comment upon *mobled*. Sir Henry Ellis's edition of Brand's *Antiquities*, vol. iii, p. 397 (Bohn) has a Warwickshire use of *mab-led*, pronounced *mob-led*, the expression meaning 'led astray by a Will o' the wisp.' Earlier editions of the play read *mob-led* where the accepted text to-day has *mobled*. This reading was noted by a writer in *Notes and Queries*, third series, vi, 66. In the same volume, p. 180, P. S. C. adds the following:

"I am old enough to remember what a mob cap was, and I have no doubt that *mobled* means *muffled up*. The whole description clearly applies to the Queen's outward appearance, and not to the state of her mind. 'Mob-led' was nothing but 'clap-trap' that came into vogue among second-rate actors in country towns about the year 1830, being meant as a hit at Queen Caroline. Low as the joke was, it seldom failed to draw applause from the good people who flattered themselves that in siding with the King's Majesty they were upholding the cause of sound morality; and when the empty Polonius added in his oracular

manner—'Mob-led is good'—it amuses me still to think how they clapped and grunted. Little did I imagine that I should live to see this miserable piece of buffoonery trotted out in the garb of sober criticism."

'St. Swithin' on page 342 of the same series recalls the Warwickshire use noted in Brand, and adds a reference to Longstaffe, who in his *History of Darlington*, page 14, gives a long list of aliases borne by the *ignis fatuus*.

"The Warwickshire poet may have applied the word to Hecuba because she ran wildly about, *mab-led*, or *mob-led*, as it were, by the dreadful fascination of the flames."

*Mob-led* finds no favor with conservative editors. *Mobled* is clearly defined in the *Oxford Shakespeare* as 'having the head bound up.' Still the use noted in Brand and in Longstaffe should be given in an examination of the text. To these examples I add another from Allies's *Antiquities and Folk Lore of Worcestershire* (1856):

"'Oh then I see Queen Mab, etc.'

So said the immortal bard, and I was curious to ascertain whether her majesty had honoured the fair Midlands with her presence. That she had done so will appear as follows: There is a piece of ground near the village of Upton Snodsbury, in Worcestershire, called Mob's Close, or Mop's Close; and an orchard at Hale's End, near Herold's Copse, in Cradley, in Herefordshire, adjoining the western side of Old Storage, in Worcestershire, called Mabbled Pleck,[1] meaning Mab led Pleck, or a plat where one was liable to be mab-led."

After giving the reference to Brand, Allies continues:

"The place in Cradley was in early times called Little Pleck, afterwards Mablee Pleck, and subsequently Mabbled Pleck, as appears by the title deeds of Richard Yapp, Sen. Esq., the owner of the estate" (p. 437).

Such a use might be explained, perhaps, as a popular extension of Queen Mab's powers; or again, as it was pronounced *mob*, as perhaps connected with some French form in *mob* (mobilis): but why, if the latter supposition, should the word have been written *mab?*

W. P. Reeves.

*Kenyon College.*

1 A country term for a small piece of ground.

## *GOLDSMITH AND THE NOTIONS Grille AND Wandrer IN WERTHERS LEIDEN.*

It is the aim of the following discussion to throw light on the signification of these words in Goethe's novel, and to show that the two are causally related. The final determination of their meaning would, of course, require, according to a well-known canon of exegesis,[1] an exhaustive investigation of the literature at and preceding the period when *Werther* was written. This is not the scope of the present essay, which, limiting itself to an examination of Goldsmith's writings and those of Goethe in the Werther period, endeavors to prove that, whatever might be the result of a more comprehensive research, Goldsmith must be taken into account; and that German scholars, and those very eminent ones, have in the present instance failed to do so. In my argument, appeal is also made to the external evidence of Goethe's autobiography; for, though composed much later and containing *Dichtung* as well as *Wahrheit*, it was confessedly written to aid in the interpretation of the author's works, and is in the case before us strongly supported by the internal testimony of the writings in question. The familiar accounts of Goethe's relations to Herder and Goldsmith, found in DW.[2] and in the histories of German literature, it is hardly necessary here to reiterate.

A remark made by Goethe in the autobiography forms my point of departure. To

1 Alles was noch einer näheren Bestimmung bedarf in einer gegebenen Rede, darf nur aus dem dem Verfasser und seinem ursprünglichen Publikum gemeinsamen Sprachgebiet bestimmt werden.—Schleiermacher, *Hermeneutik*.

2 The abbreviations here used are:

DW. . . . . *Dichtung und Wahrheit.*

WA. i. (ii., iii., iv.) . . . . Goethes Werke, Weimarer Ausgabe, Abteilung 1 (2, 3, 4). The volume containing *Werther* (i., vol. 19), is cited WA. without further specification.

RRG. . . . . *Richardson, Rousseau und Goethe* von Erich Schmidt. Jena, 1875.

DjG. . . . . *Der junge Goethe* von Michael Bernays. Leipzig, 1875.

HA. . . . . Goethes Werke, Hempelsche Ausgabe.

AGF. . . . . *Aus Goethes Frühzeit* von Wilhelm Scherer. Strassburg, 1879.

*Erl.* . . . . . Goethe's *Leiden des jungen Werthers* erläutert von Heinrich Düntzer. Leipzig, 1880.

describe Lenz' *Sinnesart*, which enabled him to imitate successfully the *Ausschweifungen und Auswüchse* of Shakespere's genius, the author of DW. could find no more suitable term than the English "whimsical." Had Goethe known a German word that expressed the trait he had observed in his young Strassburg friend, he would have used it. We are justified, therefore, in appealing to an English dictionary, to determine the meaning of the English word. The corresponding noun, "whim," is defined by Webster as: "A sudden turn or start of the mind; a temporary eccentricity; a freak; a fancy; a capricious notion; a humor; a caprice." The adjective signifies: "Full of, or characterized by, whims; actuated by a whim; having peculiar notions; queer; strange; freakish." "Fanciful, capricious, eccentric, odd," are among its synonyms.

In a letter to Johanna Fahlmer, written in March, 1773, Goethe wrote:

"Grüsse Sie also und schicke Worte und Wackefield und Was mehr ist—Wörterbuch. Wo sie Bedeutung und Aussprache nach selbst beliebigem Gefallen forschen und finden können" (DjG., vol. i, p. 356).

Were this dictionary, which was probably the one he had used himself, accessible, it would be interesting to note the German equivalents given in it of "whim" and "whimsical." In default of this, I have consulted Flügel. The nearest equivalent to "whim" seems to be *Grille*, which has likewise the connotation of mental irregularity, and may also be of a serious as well as of a ludicrous nature. At any rate, there is reason to believe that Goethe regarded this word as at least approximately conveying the same meaning. The corresponding adjective he employed in another characterization of the whimsical Lenz, who, he says, had made him the object "einer abenteuerlichen und *grillenhaften* Verfolgung." As "whimsical" means "full of whims," *grillenhaft* signifies "voller Raupen oder Grillen."

Now, it is an interesting fact that Goldsmith, in his *Vicar of Wakefield*, which the young Goethe, as well as the old, read and greatly admired, makes use of the term "whimsical" to characterize his Sir William Thornhill (Mr. Burchell), whose part Goethe re-enacted in Sesenheim. Goldsmith writes:

"I have heard Sir William Thornhill represented as one of the most generous yet *whimsical* men in the kingdom; a man of consummate benevolence" (Chap. 3).

One of Burchell's *whims* was his fancy for travelling on foot (*wandern*) alone and in disguise:

"For this purpose, in his own *whimsical* manner, he travelled through Europe on foot, and now, though he has scarcely attained the age of thirty, his circumstances are more affluent than ever" (Chap. 3).

With reference to Burchell's incognito excursions and his own similar adventure in Sesenheim, Goethe remarks:

"Es ist eine verzeihliche *Grille* bedeutender Menschen, gelegentlich einmal äussere Vorzüge in's Verborgene zu stellen, um den eigenen innern menschlichen Gehalt desto reiner wirken zu lassen; . . . ." (DW., WA., i., vol. 27, p. 247).

From a comparison of this passage with what has just been said of Lenz and Burchell, it may be inferred: first, that Goethe regarded the word *Grille*, in the case referred to at least, as an equivalent in meaning to the English "whim"; secondly, that, with respect to the *Grille* or "whim" of roving about in disguise, a "Geistes- und Gefühlsverwandschaft" existed between Burchell and his youthful understudy in Alsace. The inference is corroborated by another statement of Goethe's in DW. (WA., i., vol. 28, p. 142):

"Was mich betraf, so fuhr ich fort, die Dichtkunst zum Ausdruck meiner *Gefühle und Grillen* zu benutzen. Kleine Gedichte, wie *der Wanderer*, fallen in diese Zeit; . . . ."

*Wandern* belonged, then, to the *Grillen* that found expression in the works of Goethe during the Werther period. It will be remembered that Goethe's *Wanderer* shows unmistakable traces of the influence of Goldsmith's *Traveller*. To this fact Scherer has already called attention.

Eccentricity and the tendency to go to romantic extremes (*romantische Ueberspannung*), traits closely akin to whimsicality, the young Goethe had also in common with Goldsmith's Burchell. Of himself, as he returned home from Strassburg, he tells us:

"*Der Wanderer* war nun endlich gesünder und froher nach Hause gelangt als das erste Mal, aber *in seinem ganzen Wesen zeigte sich*

*doch etwas Ueberspanntes, welches nicht völlig auf geistige Gesundheit deutete.* Gleich zu Anfang brachte ich meine Mutter in den Fall, dass sie zwischen meines Vaters rechtlichem Ordnungsgeist und meiner vielfachen Excentricität die Vorfälle in ein gewisses Mittel zu richten und zu schlichten beschäftigt sein musste" (DW., WA., i., vol. 28, p. 91).

He then relates as an example of his eccentricity the incident of the harper boy. In like manner, eccentric virtues form part of Burchell's "whims":

"At present his bounties are more rational and moderate than before; but still he preserves *the character of a humorist, and finds most pleasure in eccentric virtues*" (Chap. 3).

With an extravagant generosity worthy of poor Noll himself, Burchell pays out all his ready cash to save an old sailor from jail, and is left in pecuniary embarrassment. His liberality he had carried to a still farther extreme in his youth:

"he carried benevolence to an excess when young: *for his passions were then strong*, and as they were all on the side of virtue, they *led to a romantic extreme*" (Chap. 3).

If we now turn to Werther, we shall find him marked by precisely the same traits as Burchell and, according to DW., as Goethe himself when he wrote his novel. Of Lotte's *Leiblied* Werther writes: "mich stellt es von aller Pein, Verwirrung und *Grillen* her, wenn sie nur die erste Note greift" (WA., p. 55). In the account of his dispute with Albert about suicide, we read:

"Und bei diesem Anlass kam er [Albert] sehr tief in Text: ich hörte endlich gar nicht weiter auf ihn, *verfiel in Grillen, und mit einer auffahrenden Gebärde drückte ich mir die Mündung der Pistole über's rechte Aug' an die Stirn*" (WA., p. 65).

The passage throws light on the psychology of Werther's self-destruction, and coincides exactly with the author's account of himself in DW. in connecting the hero's whimsical disposition with his suicidal tendencies.[3] Again, Werther, in the same letter, inveighs against the "vernünftigen Leute," acknowledging that he had been drunk more than once, and that his passions bordered on insanity; but all men that had accomplished anything extraordinary had been regarded as drunken and insane. "Das sind wieder *von deinen Grillen*," Albert replies, "du *überspannst alles*." Furthermore, Burchell's eccentric virtues and the romantic extremes to which he carried his generosity in his youth, find a parallel in Werther's *überspannten Ideen* and *jugendlichem guten Muth*. Upon the censure received from the minister, he makes the following comment:

"Wie er meine allzugrosse Empfindlichkeit zurechtweiset, wie er meine *überspannten Ideen von Wirksamkeit, von Einfluss auf andere*, von Durchdringen in Geschäften als *jugendlichen guten Muth zwar ehrt...*" (WA., p. 99).

Once more, like George in the *Vicar of Wakefield*, he takes it into his head to go into the army—another of his *Grillen* (WA., p. 111). Finally, we read in his last letter to Charlotte:

"Es ist beschlossen, Lotte, ich will sterben, und das schreibe ich dir ohne *romantische Ueberspannung*, gelassen, an dem Morgen des Tages, an dem ich dich zum letztenmal sehen werde" (WA., p. 159).

*Romantisch überspannt* he was for all that and this in the highest degree.

To conclude: like Lenz, like the youthful Goethe, like Goldsmith himself as well as his Burchell, whimsicality was a characteristic trait of Werther; and what proved the ruin of the weaker natures was happily overcome by the stronger ones.

Human nature is at bottom the same the world over. "There is no fiercer hell," says Keats, "than the failure in a noble enterprise." And how often does the seething mind seek relief in a restless, errant activity! Inordinate susceptibility coupled with a romantic and whimsical view of men and things, goaded on to despair by disappointed ambition or unrequited love, finds a natural vent often in a roving existence, sometimes even in self-murder. There was, undoubtedly, a causal relation between Goldsmith's restless mind and his wandering life; and the same is true of his Traveller, his Philosophic Vagabond, George, and his Burchell. In his youth, it was true also of Goethe, who testifies to the affinity that at that time existed between himself and the

3 According to DW., the thought of suicide was a *Grille* of Goethe's in the Werther years:

"Durch diese Ueberzeugung rettete ich mich nicht sowohl von dem Vorsatz als von *der Grille des Selbstmordes*, welche sich in jenen herrlichen Friedenszeiten bei einer müssigen Jugend eingeschlichen hatte" (WA., i., vol. 28, p. 220).

Irish poet's hero. In a passage of DW. (WA., i, vol. 27, p. 345), he designates Burchell *den armen kümmerlichen Wanderer;* and we know that, in the Darmstadt circle, he himself received the appellation *der Wanderer*. In his poem of this title, he gave, we have seen, expression to his *Gefühle und Grillen*, as Goldsmith had done in his *Traveller*. Can it, now, be shown that his *Doppelgänger*, Werther, was also in a sense analogous to Goldsmith's a *Wanderer* as well as a *Grillenfänger?*

The hero exclaims (WA., p. 112): "Ja wohl bin ich nur ein Wandrer, ein Waller auf der Erde! Seid ihr denn mehr?" These few words constitute the entire letter, which, according to Düntzer (*Erl.*, p. 122), is an interpolation of the Carlsbad revision. Its connection with the preceding and the following ones is not obvious, and so the interpretations are conflicting. Erich Schmidt (RRG., p. 221) is of opinion that *Wandrer* here stands *für Mensch*, and is to be referred to *Ossian*, while *Waller* is a reminiscence of Klopstock. Düntzer (*Erl.*, p. 122), affirming that Schmidt is in error, thinks of the familiar religious conception of, "die Wallfahrt auf Erden nach der bessern Heimat." I hope it will not be thought an unpardonable temerity if I venture to maintain that the explanations of both these eminent scholars are inadequate. Neither of them takes Goldsmith into account.

Where is the explanation of Werther's meaning to be sought? Naturally, in the preceding context; if not found there, then in what follows. If the expression is still obscure, the next step will be to collate all the passages of the work in which the expression or its synonyms occurs, and to interpret the passage in question in the light of these. Still further help may be obtained from the other works of the author written in the same period, from explanatory hints given by him at that time or subsequently, and from the writings containing analogous conceptions that he is known to have previously read. In the case before us, Düntzer concludes from the context that the letter is an "entbehrlicher Zusatz," considering its relation to the contiguous letters one of "Abgerissenheit." He cites but one passage from *Werther;* and, to say nothing of Klopstock, makes no account whatever of the possible influence of *Ossian* or of Goldsmith. Schmidt quotes no parallel passage at all from the novel itself, simply referring to *Ossian's* frequent use of *Wandrer für Mensch*, and making one quotation from Klopstock.

Düntzer and Schmidt seem to me to be both partly correct; in other words, to err by omission rather than by commission. The reason of this is that the words *ein Wandrer*, *ein Waller*, in their application to Werther, have more senses than one; and, if I may venture an opinion, were meant by Goethe himself to admit of more than one interpretation. So much at least can be gleaned from the context. In the immediately preceding letters, we find the discontented hero determined after unpleasant experiences to leave the town of D., and to accept the invitation of the prince to spend the spring with him on the latter's estates. Beforehand, however, he makes a pilgrimage to his birthplace and revives the memories of his happy childhood. Arrived at the prince's, he next conceives the whimsical idea of going into the army. Dissuaded from this, he is resolved in his dissatisfaction to remain only a few days longer and to resume his aimless wanderings. Then comes the very brief epistle in which he styles himself "ein Wandrer, ein Waller auf der Erde." This letter must be conceived to be the answer to one from his monitor upbraiding him with his unsettled, wandering life, and either employing or implying the words, which Werther repeats. In that case, the word, or words, was a term of reproach. Werther, generalizing, connects this sense with a more comprehensive one, not derogatory, and including all mankind, and applies the word in that acceptation to his moralizing friend, as well as to himself. "You say I am a wanderer," he suggests; "'tis true, but no one, yourself among the rest, has a settled abode here below." He thus emphasizes at the same time the brevity and uncertainty of human existence.

Collating herewith the remaining passages of the novel that contain the terms or their synonyms, it will be found that the restless and high-strung hero represents himself as a *Wandrer* in at least three clearly distinguishable senses.

Werther regards himself, in the first place,

as a pilgrim or traveler in a sentimental religious acceptation. The twenty-fourth letter following the exclamatory one we are discussing, closes with a prayer addressed by the hero to his father, and containing these words:

"Vater! den ich nicht kenne! Vater! der sonst meine ganze Seele füllte, und nun sein Angesicht von mir gewendet hat! rufe mich zu dir! schweige nicht länger! dein Schweigen wird diese dürstende Seele nicht aufhalten— Und würde ein Mensch, ein Vater zürnen können, dem sein unvermuthet rückkehrender Sohn um den Hals fiele und riefe: Ich bin wieder, da mein Vater! Zürne nicht, dass ich die *Wanderschaft* abbreche, die ich nach deinem Willen länger aushalten sollte" (WA., p. 138).

Here it is perfectly clear that Werther, contemplating the speedy ending of his life by suicide, considers it a *Wanderschaft*, and so himself a *Wandrer;* and Düntzer's inference from the passage that the hero is to be supposed to have had such a notion in mind when calling himself, in the previous letter of the 16th of July, *ein Wandrer*, *ein Waller*, is legitimate. But why limit one's self to a single parallel passage? Could not Werther have thought of himself as *ein Wandrer*, *ein Waller auf der Erde* in more senses than one? The third letter preceding that of July 16th, more closely connected with it in thought as well as position than the one just quoted and, as I shall show, replete with reminiscences of Goldsmith, begins:

"Ich habe die Wallfahrt nach meiner Heimat mit aller Andacht eines Pilgrims vollendet, und manche unerwarteten Gefühle haben mich ergriffen" (WA., p. 108).

*Wallfahrt* answers to *Waller*, as *Wanderschaft* to *Wandrer*. *Pilgrim*, it will be observed, is the exact equivalent in form and sense of the English "pilgrim." The usual German form *Pilger* occurs also in another part of the same letter:

"Ein Pilger im heiligen Lande trifft nicht so viele Stätten religiöser Erinnerungen an, und seine Seele ist schwerlich so voll heiliger Bewegung."

Werther is, then, *ein Waller*, not alone *nach der bessern Heimat;* he wishes also to be viewed as such when returning, disappointed in hopes and broken in spirit, to the scenes of his happy youth. In both cases, a coloring of religious sentimentality is thrown about him.

The poetical application of the biblical notion of our earthly life as a pilgrimage from the cradle to the grave, solemnly impressing upon us the transitoriness and comparative worthlessness of our present existence, might well have been suggested to the youthful Goethe by Young's *Night Thoughts*—one of the English poetical works mentioned by him in DW. as having fostered his gloomy ideas concerning the *Vergänglichkeit* and the *Unwerth* of all earthly things. But I find no passage in our novel that, as in the two cases about to be considered, could connect this earnest thought directly with the English poet. Young was probably less to his taste than *Ossian* and Goldsmith. The latter's Dr. Primrose gives expression to the thought in the following terms: "Almost all men have been taught to call life a passage, and themselves the travellers" (Chap. 23).

In the second place, Werther is represented as a wanderer in the Ossianic sense of an unhappy lover who, in his despair, seeks in lonely wanderings, often made in the night, relief for his aching heart. Although the influence of the Scottish bard on *Werther*, which I hope to discuss fully at another time, does not lie within the scope of this essay, yet I will so far deviate therefrom as is necessary to show that the German *Wandrer* is to be applied to our hero in the specific sense of the English "wanderer" here stated. The English word signifies properly one who roves with no definite object, who is astray or away from home. Its German equivalent is not *Mensch*, as Erich Schmidt erroneously supposes, but "der ohne bestimmtes Ziel Umherschweifende, Umherirrende." That Goethe himself, during the period when Werther came into being, received the appellation of the *Wanderer* in this sense precisely, for that we have his own words. In the twelfth book of DW., the author, referring to the period between his return from Strassburg and his sojourn in Wetzlar, affirms that he was so called because of his *Umherschweifens in der Gegend*. If we now open the novel, we shall find that the author's *alter ego* is a *Wandrer* in the same acceptation of the term, and that the passages where he is so represented are for the most part Ossianic in character. *Ossian*, it will be remembered, contains many accounts of unhappy lovers who

are described as lonely wanderers. This is exactly the case with our hero:

"Und,—wenn nicht manchmal die Wehmuth das Uebergewicht nimmt, und Lotte mir den elenden Trost erlaubt auf ihrer Hand meine Beklemmung auszuweinen,—so muss ich fort, muss hinaus! und *schweife dann weit im Feld umher; . . .* " (WA., p. 79).

The scene of his *Umherschweifens* is then described, presenting the typical features of an Ossianic landscape: a steep mountain, a pathless forest, hedges, thorns, night, full moon. In the following passage, which likewise bears distinct traces of the influence of the Caledonian poet, we find Werther in the same situation:

"Manchmal ergreift mich's; es ist nicht Angst, nicht Begier—es ist ein inneres unbekanntes Toben, das meine Brust zu zerreissen droht, das mir die Gurgel zupresst! Wehe! Wehe! *Und dann schweife ich umher in den furchtbaren nächtlichen Scenen dieser menschenfeindlichen Jahreszeit*" (WA., p. 150).

Every student of the bard will recognize the Ossianic character of this scene also: winter, storm, flood, night, moonlight. Once more:

"Er kam wieder nach Hause, ging wieder aus vor's Thor, ungeachtet des Regens, in den gräflichen Garten, *schweifte weiter in der Gegend umher* und kam mit anbrechender Nacht zurück und schrieb" (WA., p. 186).

This occurs not long after having read to Lotte his translation of some songs of the Scottish bard.

To the above quotations I will add one or two others in which Werther appears as a *Wandrer* in a sense nearly akin to the English cognate term, but which do not show traces of *Ossian's* influence. The close connection between the hero's whimsical turn of mind and his wandering propensity is made manifest by the following passage:

"Ich beisse die Zähne aufeinander und spotte über mein Elend . . . . *Ich laufe in den Wäldern herum*, und wenn ich zu Lotten komme und Albert bei ihr sitzt im Gärtchen unter der Laube und ich nicht weiter kann, *so bin ich ausgelassen närrisch, und fange viel Possen, viel verwirrtes Zeug an*" (WA., p. 60).

Again, on the 11th of July (June), he writes: "Noch acht Tage bleibe ich und dann *ziehe ich wieder in der Irre herum*" (WA., p. 112).[4] Immediately following is our letter of July 16th.

The English "wanderer" and the German *Wanderer*, though identical in form, differ in their ordinary acceptations. *Wanderer* does not generally mean *der ohne bestimmtes Ziel Umherschweifende.* That, however, in the Darmstadt circle, in which the works of Goldsmith and Ossian were received with enthusiasm, the German word was used in this unusual sense—adding to the idea of *der grosse Strecken zu Fuss Zurücklegende* (traveler on foot) the notion of *der Umherschweifende, Umherirrende* (wanderer)—for this we have, as we have seen, Goethe's direct testimony; and an examination of our novel proves that Werther is a *Wandrer* in the same sense as its author was. Had Düntzer observed these facts, he would not have charged the author with a lack of coherence or have excluded the influence of *Ossian.* Erich Schmidt, had he noticed them, would not have ascribed to the words "wanderer" or "traveller" in *Ossian* the signification *Mensch.*

Werther regards himself as a *Wanderer* from still another point of view. He is represented, in the third place, as wandering forth from his birthplace, in a spirit of adventure and with great expectations, into the wide world; then as coming home again, disappointed in hopes and broken in spirit, to the scenes of his childhood. The influence of Goldsmith in this case, which the commentators have overlooked, is clearly manifest; the evidence of it, external and internal, is abundant and conclusive.

Schäfer, with whom Loeper agrees, is of opinion that Goethe was not called the *Wanderer* till after he had recited in the Darmstadt circle his poem of the same name. Loeper is further of opinion that the title of the poem (and so also Goethe's appellation) was borrowed from Goldsmith; while Scherer observes, as I have already intimated, that some of the *Motive* of Goethe's poem were derived from the same source. There is, then, a consensus of opinion connecting Goethe's *Wandrer* with Goldsmith's *Traveller.*

(To be continued.)

ROBERT FERGUSON.

*Brooklyn.*

4 It may be of interest to note here that in the earliest, prose form of Faust, Gretchen is described as "erbärmlich auf der Erde lange verirrt" (AGF., p. 81). In the same sense, the Vicar of Wakefield describes the unfortunate Olivia as "a poor deluded wanderer" (Chap. 23).

## *THE CURIOUS-IMPERTINENT IN ENGLISH DRAMATIC LITERATURE BEFORE SHELTON'S TRANSLATION OF DON QUIXOTE.*

ALTHOUGH the introduction of *Don Quixote* to English readers has long occupied the attention of those interested in the literary relations of Spain and England,[1] little or nothing has been written concerning the influence of the *Curious-Impertinent*, the celebrated novel that is preserved in the amber of the great Spanish romance. The chroniclers of the English drama,[2] have equally neglected *The Second Maiden's Tragedy*, the first play in our literature, with the possible exception of *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, that was indebted to the genius of Cervantes for its plot and romantic atmosphere.

*The Second Maiden's Tragedy* was first printed from MS. Lansdowne, No. 807, in *The Old English Drama; a Selection of Plays from the Old English Dramatists* (London, 1825), Vol. i. Mr. W. Carew Hazlitt has incorporated it into his edition of *Dodsley*, Vol. x. It belongs to the category of plays that escaped the hands of Warburton's infamous cook. As originally written it contained allusions that were not suited to the sacred ears of royalty, and it was only after the obnoxious passages had been removed that the licenser permitted it to be given upon the stage. This we learn from the following license:

"This Second Maiden's Tragedy (for it hath no name inscribed) may, with the reformations, bee acted publickly. 31 October, 1611. G. Buc."

The name of the play was probably given to it, as Mr. Fleay suggests, by the Master of the Revels (the title is in a different hand from the play itself) in order to distinguish it from the *Maid's Tragedy* of Beaumont and Fletcher which had just been licensed.[3]

The plot of *The Second Maiden's Tragedy* can be divided into two parts—the love of the Ursurping Tyrant for the daughter of Helvetius, and that of the "curious impertinent" Votarius and the fatal termination of his foolish quest. The latter is lifted directly from the famous and witty story that was first published in *Don Quixote* (1605) and later included in the *Novelas Exemplares*,—*El Curioso Impertinente*. *The Second Maiden's Tragedy* is the first of a chain of plays that had interwoven in its plot the story of the husband, who, in order to discover whether his wife is proof against the solicitations of others, asks his dearest friend to put her to the test.

When the play was written Thomas Shelton's translation (1612) of *Don Quixote* had not appeared, although a license for it had been issued as early as January 19, 1611-12. Shelton states, in the matter prefatory to his version, that he translated the work five or six years before "in the space of forty days." Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelly, in his sumptuous reprint of the first englishing of *Don Quixote*, has shown that Shelton made use of the Brussels edition of the Spanish text issued by Roger Velpius in 1607. If the author of *The Second Maiden's Tragedy* was unacquainted with Castilian, he might have consulted Shelton's manuscript version, which, if we are to believe the translator's assertion, had already been written, although it had been cast aside by its maker, "where it lay long time neglected in a corner." In 1608, three years before the date of the first English translation, there was published, separately, in Paris, the first non-Spanish edition of Cervantes' story: "*Le Curieux Impertinent. El Curioso Impertinente. Traduict d'Espagnol en Francois par Ni. Baudouin, a Paris*, 1608." This contained the

1 See Koeppel "Don Quixote, Sancho Panza und Dulcinea in der englischen Litteratur bis zur Restauration," *Archiv für d. Studium d. neueren Sprachen*, Vol. ci (1899), p. 87 ff.; L. Bahlsen, "Spanische Quellen der englischen Litteratur, besonders Englands zu Shakespeares Zeit," *Zeitschrift vgl. Lit.*, N. F., Vol. vi (1893), and the same author's "Eine Komödie Fletchers, ihre span. Quelle," etc., *Englische Studien*, Vol. xxiii (1897); Fitzmaurice-Kelly, *Life of Cervantes*, London, 1892; *The History of Don Quixote of the Mancha, Translated from the Spanish of Miguel de Cervantes* by Thomas Shelton, Annis 1612, 1620, with introductions by James Fitzmaurice-Kelly, London, 1896 (*The Tudor Translation Series*), and the other articles cited below.

2 A. W. Ward, *History of English Dramatic Literature*, London, 1899, vol. ii, p. 672, note; F. G. Fleay, *Chronicle of the English Drama*, London, 1890, Vol. ii, pp. 330-31; J. P. Collier, *History of English Dramatic Poetry*, London, 1831, Vol. iii, p. 390.

3 Tieck, who translated this play, thought it was the lost play by Massinger, *The Tyrant*. The hero of the *S. M. T.* is known simply as The Usurping Tyrant. See R. Sachs, *Shakspere Jahrbuch*, Vol. xxvii (1892), p. 194; see also Fleay, *Chronicle*, Vol. ii, p. 331.

French on one page, the Spanish on the other.[4] The English adaptator could have made use of this edition, or of the original which was readily accessible in *Don Quixote*.

This dramatic rendering of the *Curious-Impertinent* follows the original with great exactness in the action as well as in the dialogue. It is, however, much condensed, the long speeches of Anselmo and Lothario being unsuited to the sterner requirements of the stage. The plot, up to the catastrophe, is the same in the play and story; it is unfolded with skill and ingenuity, the clever intrigue of the wife Camila in feigning to repulse Lothario, while the husband looks on from behind a curtain, being given with even greater effect than in its Spanish original. The climax of the tragedy (*Act v, scene i*) differs from the conclusion of the story. In Cervantes' novel the husband, on discovering that his extravagant curiosity has lost him his wife, dies from grief and shame; Camila, his unworthy consort, and Lothario, the unfaithful friend, are rigorously punished—one retiring to a convent only to die of remorse, the other, going to the wars, meets an ignominious death in battle. The unknown author of *The Second Maiden's Tragedy*, recognizing the dramatic weakness of this conclusion and perhaps attempting a Senecan ending, or following in the footsteps of Hamlet or of Chettle's "Hoffman," kills off the five unfortunate characters, all the actors in the play. It is this terrible carnage in the last act that leads one to suspect that it came from the pen of Cyril Tourneur. If, in the conclusion the author has departed, owing to the requirements of his art, from *El Curioso Impertinente*, he has faithfully adhered to the minor details of the story and has preserved the exact number of *dramatis personæ*. The following comparison between the characters in the play and novel reveals the fact that the English adaptator has preserved the names of two of the actors in the Spanish original,—Anselmo, the husband, and Leonella, Camila's servant.

| *The Second Maiden's Tragedy.* | *El Curioso Impertinente* |
|---|---|
| Anselmus, *the husband* | Anselmo |
| Votarius, *his friend* | Lotario |
| Bellarius, *lover of Leonella* | Lover of Leonela |
| The Wife of Anselmus | Camila |
| Leonella, *her woman* | Leonela |

Many of the felicitous metaphors that Cervantes was so partial to have crept into the tragedy. A parallel will show the method pursued by the dramatist in transforming a Castilian story into an English play:

*El Curioso Impertinente.*

"Díme Anselmo, si el cielo, ò
la fuerte buena, te uviéra hecho
Señor, y legitimo possessor de
un finissimo diamante de
cuya bondad, y quilates estuviessen
satisfechos quantos lapidarios le
viessen, y que todos à una voz,
y de comun parecer dixessen,
que llegava en quilates, bondad
y fineza, à quanto se podia
estender la naturaleza de tal
piedra, y tu mesmo lo creyesses
assi, sin saber otracosa en
contrario, seria justo que te viniesse
en desseo de tomar aquel diamante,
y ponerle entre un ayunque, y
un martillo, y alli à pura fuerça
de golpes y braços, provar si es
tan duro, y tan fino como dizen?"[5]

*The Second Maiden's Tragedy.*

*Vot.* Must a man needs, in having a rich diamond,
Put it between a hammer and an anvil,
And not believing the true worth and value,
Break it in pieces to find out the goodness,
And in the finding loose it?
Good sir, think on't, etc.[6]

4 Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelly doubts the existence of this edition, cf. his *Life of Cervantes*, p. 228. Ticknor (*History of Spanish Literature*, Boston, 1866, Vol. ii, p. 119, note) states that Cesar Oudin printed the *Curious-Impertinent*, without the author's name at the end of a volume entitled *Silva curiosa de Julian de Medrano, cavallero Navarro, ec., corregida en esta nueva edicion, ec., por Cesar Oudin*, Paris, 1608. See Salvá, *Catélogo*, Vol. ii, no. 2106. There is a copy of Baudoin's translation, mentioned above, in the Hofbibliothek at Munich. See Schneider, *Spaniens Antheil an der deutschen Litteratur*, Strassburg, 1898, p. 305.

5 *Novelas Exemplares*, Haya, 1739, Vol. ii, pp. 12–13.

6 *S. M. T.*, act 1, scene ii (Hazlitt's *Dodsley*, Vol. x, p. 397). Compare Shelton's version of this passage in his *Don Quixote*, ed. A. W. Pollard, London, Macmillan, 1900, Vol. 1, p. 321: also Field's *Amends for Ladies*, Act 1, scene i (Hazlitt's *Dodsley*, Vol. xi, pp. 108–9).

The ponderous metaphor here used by Cervantes is thus reduced to proportions suitable to the action.

*The Second Maiden's Tragedy* has been attributed to Thomas Goughe (or Goff), Chapman, Massinger, Tourneur, and even Shakespeare. The names of the first two are written, in an old hand, on the back of the manuscript, and both have been scored through and that of "Will. Shakspear" substituted.[7] Thomas Goff was born in 1591 and consequently must have been nineteen or twenty years old at the time of licensing the tragedy. The three plays that are associated with his name were written when he was a resident of Oxford and acted there by the students of Christ Church. It is not probable, however, that *The Second Maiden's Tragedy* was a product of Goff's youthful pen. The rhyme and heroics that distinguish *The Raging Turk*, *The Courageous Turk* and *The Tragedie of Orestes* are almost absent from *The Second Maiden's Tragedy*. It was the tenderness, the pathos, maybe the "mighty lines" of the play that caused the former possessor of the manuscript to erase the names of Goff and Chapman and substitute Shakespeare's in their stead. The old critic blundered in the right direction. Although the tragedy cannot be attributed to the Master Dramatist, another name has been suggested—that of Cyril Tourneur—that in all probability solves the crux. Prof. Boyle in an article on Massinger states that, from internal evidence, "Massinger's hand is traceable in the first two acts, and Tourneur's in the last three."[8] This suggestion is valuable because both in its verse-structure and technique it resembles the work of the latter dramatist. It might be added in support of Prof. Boyle's contention, although not cited by him, that Massinger was acquainted with Cervantes' story, for in *The Fatal Dowry* one of the characters exclaims, "Away, thou curious impertinent!"[9] The structure of the verse, however, does not warrant the division that has been made. It is certainly dangerous to attribute certain acts of the play to different authors, because, after a careful examination, no great metrical deviation can be noticed. The blank verse is similar to that used by the author of *The Revenger's Tragedy*, and surely the conclusion of the play is in the manner of Tourneur. If Massinger had a share in its composition the evidence at hand does not convincingly indicate it.

Two other plays, similar in theme to the *Curious Impertinent*, were written before the appearance of Shelton's translation, *The Coxcomb* by Beaumont and Fletcher, and *Amends for Ladies* by Nathaniel Field. The plot of *The Coxcomb*, as Dr. Koeppel has observed, resembles *El Curioso Impertinente*.[10] The resemblance is so slight and the treatment of the story is so different from the Spanish that one is quite safe in asserting that the "renowned twins of poetry" made use of other material than Cervantes' novel. It was the invariable rule of Beaumont and Fletcher when adapting a play to adhere closely to its source, not only in the construction of the plot and in the minor details but even in the language used by the characters. In many cases whole speeches are boldly conveyed from one to the other. It is, therefore, extremely doubtful that the authors of *The Coxcomb* were indebted to Cervantes for the inspiration of their play, the only resemblance being in the husband Antonio requesting his friend Mercurio to make love to his wife. The motive for suggesting this trial is an entirely different one from the Quixotic version.[11] In the novel the test is made to discover whether the wife will remain virtuous despite the "promises, gifts, tears, and continual importunities of importunate lovers." In *The Coxcomb* the husband desires that his wife be

7 See the preface to Baldwin's edition of the play (1825); also Hazlitt's *Dodsley*, Vol. x. p. 384.

8 *Dict. Nat. Biography*, Vol. xxxvii, p. 11; also, *ibid.*, article *Tourneur*, by Thomas Seccombe; Fleay, *Chronicle*, Vol. ii, p. 331.

9 This expression was undoubtedly inserted by Nathaniel Field, who collaborated with Massinger in this play. Field's *Amends for Ladies* is founded, in part, upon Cervantes' story (see immediately below.)

10 *Quellenstudien zu den Dramen Ben Jonson's*, etc., Erlangen u. Leipzig, 1895, p. 54. According to Oldys acted at court in 1613; cited by Dyce, *Works of Beaumont and Fletcher*, Boston, 1854, Vol. i, p. 453. Dr. Koeppel gives the date of *The Coxcomb*, without stating his reasons, as early as 1610(?)

11 To what unworthy purposes this incident may be put compare Middleton's *A Chaste Maid in Cheapside* and his *Anything for a Quiet Life*. See Hazlitt's *Dodsley*, Vol. xi, p. 89.

given up to his friend in order to prove his unsurpassed friendship, or, to quote Antonio,

> "As ever Damon was and Pythias,
> Or Pylades and Orestes, or any two
> That ever were." . . . . .

The dramatists were not obliged to go to *Don Quixote* for material for this incident. *The City-Night-Cap: or, Crede quod habes et habes* (4to, 1661; licensed October 24, 1624), by Robert Davenport, is a case in point. Langbaine suggested, as early as 1691, that the plot of the comedy was lifted from *El Curioso Impertinente.* Mr. W. C. Hazlitt is also of the opinion that the intrigues of Lorenzo, Philipp and Alstemia were derived from this source.[12] Curiously enough Davenport himself has something to say upon the question at issue. That the author of *The City Night Cap* had frequently heard of the story from sources other than Cervantes can be gleaned from the following query.

*Phil.* "Try your fair wife?
You know 'tis an old point and wonderous frequent
In most of our Italian comedies."
Act 1, sc. i.

The plot of *The City Night Cap*, as Mr. Bullen has shown, was derived from Greene's *Philomela.*[13]

The minor plot of *Amends for Ladies* was certainly culled from *Don Quixote.* The play was not published until 1618, although it must have been written some time befor. In the dedication of *A Woman is a Weathercock* (4 to, 1612) Field speaks of his next play, yet to be printed, wherein shall be seen "what amends I may have made to her and all the sex." From this it is not certain whether the present play was already written, or only on the ways. As it was published six years after the statement in *A Woman is a Weathercock* it may have been a later production. A contemporary reference to it, however, seems to dispel all doubts upon this point;[14] the play must have been written sometime before 1611, or at least one year before the appearance of Shelton's *Don Quixote.* In *Amends for Ladies* the husband, Sir John Love-All, asks his companion Subtle to make a trial of his wife for exactly the same reason as that given by Anselmo in *El Curioso Impertinente.*

*Sub.* "Can there be an addition to a wife?
*Hus.* Yes, constancy; for 'tis not chastity
But there 'tis strong and pure, where all that woo
It doth resist, and turns them virtuous too."

The earlier scenes in the play resemble in a striking manner the Spanish original. The conclusion is quite different. It was the purpose of Field in this comedy to make amends for the damage done to the fair sex in his former effort. Here the wife carries to a triumph the extravagant suggestion made by her husband and passes the ordeal in safety. Field would have o'ershot his mark had he made Subtle meet with the same fortune as Lotario and Votarius, or even of Mercurio in *The Coxcomb.* In the "Lady Perfect, called Wife" Field has, in a most alluring and refreshing manner, created a strong and noble character that shines by contrast to the weakness of the others, and, to use the dramatist's own words, truly "made amends for ladies." The wife is not so realistic as Cervantes' heroine, but she is infinitely more pleasing. In *Amends for Ladies*, as in *The Second Maiden's Tragedy*, the author was indebted to *El Curioso Impertinente* not only for the incidents of the plot, but for portions of the dialogue as well. It is remarkable that both Field and Tourneur (if he indeed be the author) should have chanced upon the same metaphor that Cervantes used, that of comparing a virtuous woman to a diamond in the hands of a lapidary.[15]

In the use thus made of *Don Quixote* as a source-book and quarry for their plots, it is evident that the romance was widely known in England before Shelton's translation had been issued. As early as 1607, only two years after the appearance of the *editio princeps* at Madrid, Shelton was at work englishing the original, and two playwrights had made mention of the famous fight with the windmill. In

12 *Manual for the Collector of Old English Plays*, London, 1892, p. 42; cf. Halliwell-Phillipps, *Dictionary of Old English Plays*, London, 1860, p. 50.

13 *The Works of Robert Davenport*, edited by A. H. Bullen, London, 1890, p. 94, note.

14 Collier states that *Amends for Ladies* is alluded to by Anthony Stafford in his *Niobe dissolved into a Nilus*, 1611, as already in existence, *History of English Dramatic Poetry*, Vol. iii, p. xxvii; see *ibid.*, p. 69, note. The play is usually assigned to 1610 or 1611; see Ward, Vol. iii, p. 49; Fleay, *English Drama*, Vol. ii, p. 185.

15 Compare Act 1, scene i, of this play with the parallel passages before cited.

George Wilkins', *The Miseries of Inforst Mariage*, Act iii, one of the characters exclaims:

"Now am I armed to fight with a windmill and take the wall of an emperor."

Thomas Middleton in *Your Five Gallants* (1608) makes use of a similiar expression.[16] Ben Jonson, learned in contemporary as he was in the older literatures, was also acquainted with the Knight of the Rueful Countenance, even if he did put him in the same class with Amadis of Gaul! In 1610, two years before Shelton, we find in *Epicœne*, Act iv, scene i,

"You must leave to live in your chamber, then a month together upon *Amadis de Gaul*, or *Don Quixote*, as you were wont."

And in *The Alchemist*, Act iv, sc. iv:

"You are a pimp and a trig,
And an *Amadis de Gaul* or a *Don Quixote*."[17]

These quotations serve to illustrate the fact that the English dramatists had known of *Don Quixote* from hearsay, if not from an actual reading of it. It is certain that at least four of the playwrights were sufficiently acquainted with its treasures to borrow from it. The most noteworthy of all the dramas that were indebted to it was *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* by Beaumont and Fletcher,[18] which, although published in quarto in 1613 was, if we are to believe the statement of William Burre, its publisher, the elder of Shelton's translation "above a year." It is fairly redolent of *Don Quixote*. The plot, it is true, has not been borrowed, but the whole atmosphere, the very *motif* has been utilized by the English dramatists. They have caught in the happiest manner the spirit and gentle burlesque of the original.

16 See Fleay, *Chronicle*, Vol. ii, p. 94; p. 275; Dr. Emil Koeppel, *Archiv* (before cited), Vol. ci, p. 93. The ballad of *Dulcina* (*Stationers' Registers*, May 22, 1615), which Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelly, Introduction, p. 47, and Dr. Koeppel, *ibid.*, p. 94, cite as being taken from *Don Quixote*, has no relation to the heroine of that romance. A version of the ballad is given in Bishop Percy's *Folio MSS.*, ed. Furnivall and Hales, London, 1868, Vol. iv.

17 Dr. Koeppel, *ibid.*, pp. 73-94. *Epicœne* was entered in *The Stationers' Registers*, September 20, 1610; *The Alchemist*, October 3, 1610; see Arber's *Transcript*, Vol. iv.

18 See B. Leonhardt, *Ueber Beaumont und Fletcher's Knight of the Burning Pestle*, Annaberg, 1885, p. 31; Koeppel, *Quellenstudien*, p. 42; Dyce, Vol. i, p. 31; Ward, Vol. ii, p. 679.

One other must be added to the list of plays borrowed from Cervantes before Shelton, the non-extant play of *Cardenio*, which was entered upon the Stationers' Register in 1653 and which was known to have been produced at court on June 8, 1613. It was doubtless written a short time before and was probably based upon the Cardenio story in the first part of *Don Quixote*. With the exception of this play the three dramas influenced by *Don Quixote* before Shelton were all written within a period of one year, 1610–1611.

It is of curious interest that Wilkins, Middleton, Jonson, Beaumont and Fletcher, Field and one other, presumably Tourneur, should have known of the immortal Spanish romance before it appeared in any translation, for that by Thomas Shelton was the first in any language. *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* and the lost *Cardenio* were borrowed from *Don Quixote*; *The Second Maiden's Tragedy* and *Amends for Ladies* (*The Coxcomb* was derived from another source) were taken from the novel included in it. It appears, at a casual glance, as if the seven dramatists included in the list above must have had a reading knowledge of Spanish, and, judging from the immediate popularity of *El Curioso Impertinente*, they made use of their new mine of material as soon as they were able to put pen to paper. The two adaptators of the latter story could have found their inspiration in the little French version published anonymously in Paris in 1608, but the other playwrights, where did they secure their knowledge of *Don Quixote?* The scanty information we have concerning Shelton helps us but little. We know from the dedication that he translated

"some five or sixe yeares agoe, 'The Historie of Don Quixote,' out of the Spanish Tongue into the English in the space of forty daies: being therunto more than halfe enforced, through the importunitie of a very deere friend, that was desirous to understand the subject;"

that once having given him a view of it, it was cast into a corner and neglected; later, "at the intreatie of others my friends," he was content to have it

"come to light, conditionally, that some one or other would peruse and mend the errors escaped; my many affairs hindering mee from undergoing that labour."

Several queries are immediately suggested. Who was the very dear friend who desired to know more of the subject? Was he a dramatist, and, if so, what were his motives? Did the MS. of his strenuous, beautiful version of the *Caballero de la Triste Figura* circulate so widely that the many playwrights were enabled to make use of it? The questions here propounded seem destined to remain unanswered. Shelton, like "Master William Silence," wrote no verses in commedation of his friends' books,—a universal custom. He made no allusion in print to his companions or to his own surroundings. If not Shelton, did John Minsheu, Richard Perceval, Leonard Digges or James Mabbe, all well versed in the Spanish language and the translators of many books, share with the dramatists their knowledge of Castilian literature? This question also is likely to remain unanswered.

It is not strange that *The Curious Impertinent*, the wittiest (if perhaps the most daring) story in *Don Quixote*, should have exerted the influence it did upon the Jacobin drama. The writers for the stage in all countries were indebted to it. It is remarkable, however, that its influence in England began so early and before it had appeared in translation. The later Stuart drama was also to be influenced by it. *The Amorous Prince, or, The Curious Husband* (4to, 1671), by Mrs Behn, *The Disappointment, or, The Mother in Fashion* (1684), by Thomas Southerne,and *The Married Beau, or, The Curious Impertinent* (1694), by John Crowne, give ample evidence of the virility of this influence at a much later period of the English drama.

Abraham S. Wolf Rosenbach.
*Philadelphia, Pa.*

---

## *APROPOS OF A SEVENTEENTH CENTURY ARTICLE ON Jean Antoine de Baïf.*

In the National Library at Paris there is found an old folio volume of Latin essays containing certain notes on the poet Baïf of the existence of which none of his biographers seem to have been aware. The book is the *Questiones in Genesim* of Father Mersennus, published at Paris in 1623. According to the title-page the work is a commentary on the Book of Genesis, designed to confound atheists and deists, and to defend the Vulgate against the calumnies of heretics. But the reverend father was a man of wide interests, celebrated in his day as a philosopher, and an intimate friend of Descartes; so after commenting upon the first six chapters of Genesis he turns his attention to matters which lay nearer his heart, to music, ancient and modern, to theology, philosophy, medicine, law and mathematics.

Music was the subject which interested him most keenly, and Baïf had won his gratitude and admiration by founding the Academy, often designated by his name, the purpose of which was, in the words of the founder, to "remettre en usage la musique selon la perfection, qui est de representer la parole en chant accomply de son harmonie et melodie." M. E. Frémy has given a most interesting account of this Academy of Baïf in his *L'Académie des derniers Valois* (Paris). It was in a way the precursor of both the *Académie française* and of the *Conservatoire*.

Father Mersennus mentions Baïf frequently in his discussions of versification and music. In an article *De Versibus, et quantam vim musicæ tribunat* (cols. 1579–1586) he speaks at some length of Baïf's *vers mesurés*, of which he approves, and expresses his belief that quantitative verse is possible in French. He defends Baïf's verse, not because it is good, but because it is an imitation of antiquity, imitation through which alone perfection is possible, and also because it is an earnest endeavor to bring Greece into France. Baïf's *vers mesurés*, he admits, though not lacking a certain charm, are not especially pleasing to those who do not appreciate the difficulties to be overcome. Others, fired by the desire of perfecting French poetry, may vanquish these difficulties more successfully. Rhyme would, in his opinion, improve considerably this kind of verse, but it is a question whether or not rhyme can be successfully used with quantitative verse.

Baïf's translation of the Psalms merit, he thinks, the highest praise, and in columns 1581–1583 and 1604–1606 he gives some interesting details upon this versification. Columns 1633–1664 are of greater importance. They contain the music of nine of Baïf's hymns. Dr.

Groth, the editor of one of Baïf's translations of the Psalms (J. A. de Baïf's *Psaultier*, Heilbronn, 1888), evidently did not know of this music as he mentions only the music of one Psalm found in the manuscripts from which he made his edition. In the absence of the music of those poems of Baïf which were sung at the *séances* of the Academy, M. Frémy might have found here valuable material for a more detailed explanation of Baïf's idea concerning the union of music and poetry.

In column 1878, Father Mersennus speaks of a Latin paraphrase of all the Psalms by Baïf in addition to the three French versions which exist in a manuscript of the National Library. None of the biographers mention these Latin Psalms, which certainly existed as Mersennus quotes from a number of them and gives the eighty-third entire (1878). He adds (col. 1663) that both the Latin and French versions from which he has quoted have been set to music by Jacobus Moduitus, who will upon request show both words and music.

The account of the Academy of 1570 is interesting in that certain details are given concerning the purpose of the institution which are found nowhere else. They are not mentioned by Baïf's contemporaries, nor does any suggestion of the kind occur in Baïf's request for a charter. M. Frémy does not refer to this account, and the passage is sufficiently interesting to quote.

"Qui non aliud musicæ genus inducere volebant, nisi genus novum appelareris, quando aliquid in integrum restituitur, sed versibus gallicis nostræ musicæ diligenter excultæ junctis illos affectus restituere nitebantur, quos olim à Græcis exhibitos esse legimus: animum enim angustiâ pressum exhilarare, elatum ad modestiam reducere, et ad alia pathemata se suâ musicâ excitare posse sperabant; quorum experientiam non semel ante Regem et principes fecerant, ut ipse Rex Carolus 9 diplomate propria manu signato, et majori apposito sigillo anno Christi 1570, regni sui decimo testatur, seque ipsum protectorum, et primum auditorum Academicæ constituit et eius regulas, atque constitutiones libentissimè probat, atque confirmat.

Quæ omnia accuratè perlegi: ideoque ne tam honesti conatus oblivioni sepeliantur, paucis illos aperio. Cum Joannes Antonius à Baïfo, et Joachimus Theobaldus à Courvillo unanimes laborassent, ut barbariem è Gallia pellerent, nihil potius futurum existimarunt, ut juvenum mores ad omnen honestatem formarentur, quàm si musicæ antiquæ affectus revocarent, et certis legibus Græcorum instar omnes cantilenas complecterentur.

Quod ita peragere voluerunt, nihil ut in Academia deesset, quod ad virum perfectè tam quoad animum quàm corpus instituendum faceret. Idcirco viros in omni scientiarum naturalium genere versatissimos huic Academiæ destinarunt, et instituerunt præfectum illius, qui μεγαλοδιδαχαλος diceretur. Omitto reliquos scientarum, linguarum præsertim, musicæ, poetices geographiæ, cæterarumque Matheseos partium, et picturæ magistros, qui animi bona promoverent, et militiæ præfectos, qui ea docerent, quæ ad militiam, et omnia honesta corporis exercitia attinent. Erant etiam qui privatis officiis ut vestibus, horto, victui, pecuniæ et cæteris id genus præficerentur.

Quæ omnia tametsi authoritate regiâ confermarentur, ob aliquorum invidiam imperfecta reliquerunt (col. 1683).

Of this idea of a university in the broadest sense of the word, there is absolutely nothing in the plan submitted by Baïf to the King. The Academy was indeed intended to be a sort of conservatory, but it was to teach only music and poetry. It seems improbable that Baïf's plans were so far-reaching. At least, he confided no such ideas to his friend Scevole de Sainte-Marthe or to any other contemporary. Nor do his works, in which he refers so freely to what he considered his best claim to the memory of posterity, contain any reference to anything but poetry and music. Mersennus would seem to have confused the Academy with something else.

He was better informed regarding the date of Baïf's birth. M. Becq de Fouquières, confronted by a number of different dates given by previous writers, established from a statement made by Baïf, the date February, 1532. Father Mersennus confirms the year and month given by M. Becq de Fouquières, and adds the day of the month.

Apropos of a stray poem which he gives, he says:

"Hoc autem sapphicum Baïfus composuit, ut diem suum natalem, et viros Academicos celebraret, cum ad 39 ætatis annum pervenisset, die verò Februarii 19 anni 1571 (Col. 1686).

The poem written in Baïf's phonetic characters begins:

"Compagnons, fêtons ce jour où je naqui
Dans le sein des flots adriens."

It is of no value poetically, being simply one of the numerous poems in which he lauds his Academy and the composers Courville, Claudin, and Moduit.

MM. Comte and Laumonier recently published in the "Revue d'histoire littéraire" an interesting article upon the songs of Ronsard which were set to music, and the changes which Ronsard was compelled to make in his versification. Baïf's idea was to imitate more closely the Greek combination of music and poetry, and a study of his songs and their music could readily be made the subject of an article of no less interest than the one mentioned.

EDGAR S. INGRAHAM.
*Columbia University.*

---

## *NOTES ON CYNEWULF.*

THE manuscript of Cynewulf's *Christ*, l. 485, contains a corrupt reading which has hitherto escaped proper solution. The passage is that in which, after the resurrection, Christ bids the disciples go and teach all nations. The combination of this command with the promise to be with them always shows that the source is *Matth.* xxviii, 19–20. The text reads, in Prof. Cook's edition (ll. 481–488):

Farað nū geond ealne yrmenne grund,
geond wīdwegas; weoredum cȳðað,
bodiað ond brēmað, beorhtne gelēafan,
ond fulwiað folc under roderum,
hweorfað tō heofonum; hergas brēotaþ,
fyllað ond fēogað; fēondscype dwǣscað,
sibbe sāwað, on sefan manna,
þurh meahta spēd.

The difficulty lies in the expression, *hweorfað tō heofonum*. The natural meaning, "Go to heaven," does not make sense. It has consequently been assumed that the intransitive verb *hweorfan* must in this single passage be transitive. The object, by a further anomaly, is not expressed, but is to be supplied from the preceding lines. Grein, indeed, in his first edition, gave in a footnote the conjecture, *hweorfað hī*, with a query, but did not admit it into his text. This interpretation of *hweorfan* as transitive has been given by all the editors and translators, from Thorpe ("to heaven turn *them*"), and Grein (*wendet sie hin zum Himmelreiche*), to Gollancz ("turn them to heaven"), and Cook ("*hweorfan*, 3. trans. and intrans.," in his glossary). The Bosworth-Toller dictionary, similarly, at the end of the article *hweorfan*, declares, "in the following passage the verb is transitive," and quotes the words in question.

The difficulty is removed by reading, instead, *hweorfað to hǣðnum*," 'Go to the heathen.' A semicolon is to be placed at the end of the preceding line, and a comma used after *hǣðnum*. *Hweorfan* is now intransitive, as it should be. The word *hǣðnum*, further, makes the passage intelligible and consistent: "Go to the heathen; destroy their sanctuaries; overthrow and hate them." *Heofonum* and *hǣðnum* are sufficiently alike in sound for the one to have been substituted for the other in a manuscript copied from dictation.[1] The proposed reading is thus perfectly plausible, and restores sense and grammar.

The reading of the MS. of *Christ*, l. 592, *swā þæt lēohte lēoht*, has hitherto been accepted. The only comment upon it that I have seen is that in Prof. Cook's edition, comparing *Christ* 41, *þæt dēgol wæs Dryhtnes geryne*, and 118, *deorc dēaþes sceadu*. But these expressions are hardly of the same order as *þæt lēohte lēoht*. "The dark shadow" is not a surprising combination of words, "the light light" is certainly suspicious. The phrase occurs in a series of synonymous alternatives (591–596):

swā helle hīenþu swā heofones mǣrþu,
swā þæt lēohte lēoht swā ðā lāþan niht,
swā þrymmes þræce swā þȳstra wræce,
swā mid Dryhten drēam swā mid dēoflum hrēam,
swā wīte mid wrāþum swā wuldor mid ārum,
swā līf swā deað.

It will be observed that the first, third, fourth, and fifth lines contain each two pairs of contrasted words. I propose to read *lēofe* for *lēohte*, removing the anomaly, and restoring uniformity and sense. *Lēof* and *lāð* as an antithetical pair occur in *Beow.* 511, 1061, and 2911, also in *Christ* 846, *lēofum ge lāðum*.

Another line of Cynewulf that calls for emendation is *Elene* 581. Here, in place of the meaningless *apundrad* of the MS., the

[1] More probably the substitution is to be referred to the graphic resemblance between the long letters *ſ* and *thorn*.
J. W. B.

editors (except Grimm and Zupitza) have substituted *āwundrad*, being guided by the alliteration. The lines immediately involved (574–581) are those in which Helena threatens the Jews with the fires of purgatory, if they refuse to reveal the hiding-place of the cross.

Ic ēow tō sōðe secgan wille,
*ond* þæs in līfe līge ne wyrðeð,
gif gē þissum lēase leng gefylgað
mid fǣcne gefice, þe mē fore standaþ,
*þæt* ēow in beorge bǣl fornimeð,
hāttost heaðowelma, *ond* ēower hrā bryttað
lācende līg, þæt ēow sceal þæt lēas
āwundrad weorðan tō woruldgedāle.

Grein explains *āwundrian* (not recorded elsewhere) as *vertere quasi miraculi in modum*. Similarly, the Bosworth-Toller dictionary gives a verb *āwundrian*, 'To make a wonder of,' with this passage as the sole reference. So also Wülker. Grimm proposed to substitute *āwended*, which was accepted by Zupitza. The former conjecture gives a word not found elsewhere, and used in an improbable sense; the latter involves too great a change. The true reading is *āsundrad*. Compare *Andr.* 1243, *El.* 1308, *Gu.* 486, *Phœnix* 242, and *Gloria* 10, in all of which *āsundrad fram synnum* or *synnum āsundrad* occurs, with slight variants. This expression, 'freed from sins,' 'without sins,' is not, indeed, identical with that suggested for *El.* 581, 'falsehood shall be separated from you,' but it is closely similar. The objection of rhythmical defect in *āsundrad weorðan*, that the alliteration is borne by the word which should properly have the inferior stress, may be met by citing, for example, *Christ* 43,

þær wīsna fela wearð inlihted,

in which the same exceptional arrangement or "poetic license" is found.

W. Strunk, Jr.

*Cornell University.*

## *FRENCH ETYMOLOGY.*

*Mélanges d'Étymologie Française* par A. Thomas.—Vol. xiv of the Bibliothèque de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Paris, 1 volume, 8vo, 219 pp., Félix Alcan. Paris: 1902, 7 francs.

Following the example set by himself a few years since in his *Essais de Philologie Française* (Paris, Bouillon, 1898), Prof. Thomas has here gathered together in book-form a number of the many interesting and often brilliant etymological notes which have appeared over his name in volumes xxviii and xxix of the *Romania*. To these he has added one hundred and sixty-one new titles, so that the volume before us includes two hundred and fifty-nine etymological studies, both French and Provençal.

The plan of the book can only be praised. Etymological notes, when scattered through different volumes of a periodical, are often difficult to find and, therefore, neglected. Here they are arranged in alphabetic order in a single book, provided with indexes (general alphabetical, pp. 181–185; of authors cited, pp. 185–191; lexicographical, pp. 191–215; and grammatical, pp. 215–219), which greatly facilitate the use of the volume, and, therefore, materially enhance its value. It is unnecessary here to outline the method of Prof. Thomas, which has long since become familiar to all those who busy themselves with the study of French philology. It is to the point, however, in this connection to refer to a well-written page of the preface, where the relative importance of the two guides of etymological investigation, phonology and semasiology, is clearly defined. The former must lead the way, the latter should be cautiously held in reserve until the goal is in sight.

Before the wealth of information contained in a volume of this kind, the reviewer's task is a difficult one. In the present instance the method seems indicated by the nature of the book. We shall content ourselves with the brief citation of the new etymologies contained in this list, and refer for further information to the volume itself. It should be added, however, that the older studies are not mere reproductions of the notes which had already appeared in the *Romania*. They really form a second edition, *revue et corrigée*, and will be consulted with profit in connection with the earlier draft.

*Acheter* < *ACCAPITARE; *acousander* (Jaubert)=a modern formation upon an older *acousandre* < *EXCONSCINDERE; *agrassol* (Littré *agrassole*) < *ACRACIOLUS; *aimaillanter*

(Morvandeau)<*a*+*MACULENTARE with change of meaning under the influence of *maillet; aissade* (Littré)=Provençal *aissada*<*ASCIATA, from which stem also derives *aisson* (Littré); *ajoux* (Littré) is an erroneous orthography for *ajoues=la joue>l'ajoue* with agglutination of the *a* of the article. (The paragraph contains an interesting list of words showing the same phenomenon); *alandier* (Dict. Gén.) suggested derivation from Prov. *alanda*=to give room, and by extension to give room to the fire, that is, to make it burn; *aleron* (Diderot)=older form of *aleiron* (Lyonnais)<*ALARIONEM; *alèze* (Littré) <*LATIA>*laize* plus the feminine article; *allier* (Littré) < ALARIUM; *ambersac* (Jaubert)=Germ. HABERSACK; *amègue* (Joret) <DOMESTICUM; *amélanche* (Littré, *Suppl.*), a Provençal word of unknown origin; *anar* (Provençal) <ANNARE=to pass year after year, to progress, to walk. M. Thomas renounces the task of finding a common origin for French *aller*, Prov. *anar*, It. *andare; antille* (Wallon) <*ANITICULA, cp. Prov. *anadilha*, Fr. *anille, nille* for O.Fr. *aneïlle* < ANATICULA; *antoit* (Littré)=erroneous orthography for **entois*, verbal noun from *enteser; aranchier* (Joret) <*ARRENICARE; *argelas* (Mistral) <Arabic AL-DJAULAC; *armon* (Littré) does not derive from *ARMONEM formed upon ARMUS on account of the synonym *érémont*, older *aremon, airemon*, Prov. *aramoun* and *alamoun; arroumera* (Mistral) < *GLOMELLUM > *LOMELLUM > *ROMELLUM plus the prefix AD; *art* (Littré), sorte de filet dit ordinairement boulier =Prov. *art* (Mistral) <ARS, ARTEM, cf. *engins de pêche; assado* (Lyonnais) <AD+SITIM+ARE, cf. Prov. *assedar*, It. *assetare; assure* (Littré) =*laçure*, O.Fr. *laceure* derived from *lacer* with fall of initial *l* which was confused with the article. (The paragraph contains a list of words showing similar treatment of initial *l*); *at* (Raynouard) <APTUM; *auvele* (Godefroy), *ovelle* (Cotgrave), *avelle* (Littré) <ALBELLA, cf. Mod. Fr. *able* <*ALBULA; *auverèche* (Godefroy), ='ais à faire les *auves*' plus suffix *-erez* <-ARIS or -ARIUS+ICIUS; *auvernière* (Jaubert), =*auvennière* (Blaisois) formed upon *auvent*, whose *t* (<ANTEVANNUM) is adventitious; *avair* (Lyonnais)=old infinitive *aveir*<HABERE with the narrowed signification of 'possession of a swarm of bees.'

*Balzin* (Wallon)=O.Fr. *palesin, palasin* < PARALYSIN; *barbanoise* (Wallon)='*tarte bourbonoise;*' *bardin* (Bas-Maine), *berdine* (Haut-Maine) <*BERBICINUM and BERBICINA; *basteresse* (Godefroy from the book of Sidrac)= Prov. *aguio bastaresso* (Mistral), adjective formed upon *bast; bavéole* (Littré)=*blaveole* derivative of *bleu; bedoche* (Littré *bedochon*) =derivative of *besoche; bellicant* (Littré)= Prov. *belugon*, pres. part. of *beluga*=O.Fr. *belue*; *benevis* (*abeneviser* and *abenevis*, Godefroy)<BENEFICIUM; *bezougneto* (South of Department of Gers)=older **bouzoulheto*, **bezoulheto*, derivative of *bousoulh* and variants <VIDUBIUM; *boisseza* (Provençal) <*BUXIDA; *boucan* (wrongly interpreted by Littré and Godefroy, *Suppl.* s. v. boucaut)=*volcan* > *bolcan; broine* (Provençal) =ABROTONUM > *abroine; broufounié* (Mistral), *bruvenie* (Godefroy) <EPIPHANIA; *burgalèse* (Du Cange s. v. BURGOLAISIA)=Span. *burgales*, adjective to *Burgos; bus* (Mistral)=O.Prov. *bust*<BUSTUM.

*Cadarz* (Provençal)=Span. *cadarzo*, cf. Godefroy s. v. *cadarce*, etymology unknown; *cadola* (Lyonnais) < *CATABOLA = Greek καταβολή; *cagouillon* (Godefroy) < CUCULLIONEM; *carqueron* (Dict. Gén.) derivative of Picard *carquer=charger; cartayer* (Dict. Gén.) derivative of *quart; cascane* (Littré)=It. *cascana* from *cascare; cerce* (Dict. Gén.), variants *cerche, sarche, cherche* < CIRCITEM > *CIRTICEM; *chambrule* (Littré) = *CARBUSCULUS for CARBUNCULUS; *charolesse* (Lyonnais) = CARRARICIA understand VIA > **charoresse; chènevis* <*CANAPUTIUM, cf. It. *canapuccia* and at Isbergues near Saint-Pol *canebuche* <CANAPUCIA; *chevoistre* (Erec 3512) < *CAPISTRIUM; *chiauler* (Littré), *chiaule* <CATELLUS, cf. Prov. *cadel; chinquême* (Godefroy)<QUINQUAGESIMA the fiftieth day after Easter, that is, Pentecost; *climper* (Wallon)=MHG. SLIMP, whence Wall. **sclimper; cousîre* (Wallon) < CONGERIA; *copeau*, O.Fr. *coispel* from O.Fr. **coispe*<CUSPIA through confusion with *couper; courounda* (Provençal) older *coronda*=*CORONIDA from Greek κορωνίς? the meaning makes difficulty; *coulindrou* (Provençal) and variants=*raisin de Corinthe, razim de Coulindre*, cf. Engl. *currant; craventer* (Chans. de Rol. and elsewhere) < *CREPENTARE; *creule* (Bessin) < COROLLA; *curle* (Dict. Gén.) = It. *curlo* <

*CURRULUS; *cuschement*, argument in favor of Diez' derivation from OHG. CHÛSKI (= *keusch*).

*Dagagne* (Godefroy) from It. *degagna* < DECANIA; *despaisenter* (Godefroy s. v. *despaiseter*) <*DISPATIENTARE.

*Echife* (Lyonnais) from Germ. root SKIF, cf. Germ. *schiefer; écoucher* (Dict. Gén.) < *EXCUTICARE; *endeigner* (Bas-Maine) < *INDIGNARE; *enuble* (Godefroy) < INNUBILUS; *ereure* (Bessin) < ARATURA; *esclem* (Phil. de Thaon, *Comput* 383) = *oblique* from Germ. SLIMB with similar meaning, and from the same source Prov. *esclembo* (Mistral); *escofier* (Lyonnais) < Goth. SKOH + ARIUS; *esgloua* (Provençal) < *EXGLUBARE; *espaeler* (Godefroy) < EXPAGELLARE; *espanir* (Gascogne and Wallon) < Germ. *SPAÑJAN; *essaidier* (Godefroy) < EXAGITARE; *estober* (Limousin, cf. Du Cange s. v. *escober*) = O.Fr. *estovoir*, which disproves the derivation from EST OPUS, but does not favor STUPERE.

*Fanète* (Wallon)=diminutive of *faine*, *faisne* < FASCINA; *fargette—fargina* (Lyonnais) = Spanish *alforja*.

*Garmos* (*Guill. d'Angleterre*, 637) > Dutch *warmoes*, High German *warmmuos; girande* (Berry) also *gérante* = *gesante*, pres. part. of *gésir; gobeter* (Littré) doublet of *copter* and *copeler*, derivatives of *COLAPUM > *coube*, *cobe* — *cobeter; godemetin* (Provençal) = Span. *guadamaci* or *guadamacil*, or Port. *guadamecin; gource* (Godefroy) < *GORTIA; *graulo* (Provençal) < GRAGULUS, variant of GRACULUS; *gremissel* (Godefroy) < *GRUMISCELLUS.

*Harderic* (Dict. Gén.) = alteration of Arab. HADID = iron; *a holteux* (Rom. i, 91) = *à haute heure; hurebec* (Littré) identical with *hubert*, *urebec* = HILIBECCI and GUIRIBECCUS in Orderic Vital.

*Inmence* (Jaubert) derivation of *ADAESTIMARE; *ivière* (Wallon) < NIVARIA > *nivière* with loss of *n; jable* (Godefroy) < Germ. GABEL; *jade* (Dict. Gén.) < Span. *ijada* > *ejade* with aphæresis of *e*, *l'ejade* > *le jade; jagonce* (Godefroy) < *HYACINTHIA with tonic *o* under the influence of the proper noun ZACYNTHUS, Ζάκυνθος; *jazerène* (Wallon) = modern feminine formed upon *jazerenc*, preserved as *jaseran*, *jaseron; jè* (Bas-Maine) < GYPSUM.

*Lamberge* (Haut-Maine), variantof *ramberge* or *rimberge*, etymology unknown; *lioube* (Littré) <*GLUPA, Greek γλυφη > *lloube* (Saintonge); *list* (Godefroy) = masculine formed upon *liste* (Mod. Fr. *litre*) < LISTA; *luberne* (Godefroy) < *LUPERNA.

*Maguelet* (Rabelais ii, 34) doublet of *mahalet* < Arab. MAHLAB, cf. Languedoc *malaguet; maleviz* (*Voy. d. Charl.*, 438) < MALEFICIUM; *marcheïl* (Godefroy) < MERCATUM + ILE, cf. Prov. *mercadil; marrasson* (Monluc, *Commentaire*, ii, p. 363), derivative of *marras* < MARRA + ACIUS, Span. *marrazo; mespesol* (Provençal) derivative of **mespesar* < MINUSPENSARE + (I)OLUS; *mitoinché* (Morvandeau) derivative of O.Fr. *moitaenc*, based upon MEDIETATEM + suffix -ENC; *mois* (Old Provençal) < *MUSCEUS from MUSCA; *moleisse* (Provençal) < *MOLATICIA.

*Navegher* (Godefroy) = French rendering of the Flemish *navegeer; nollière* (Rom. i, 91) < *ANNUCULARIA; *nuitamment*, adverb formed in the fourteenth century upon *nuitantre*.

*Oing* (Littré), erroneous orthography for *oint* (and *oinst*) < UNCTUM; *pasi* (Mistral) < *PACIDUS, based upon PAX; *plie* (Littré) < *PLATICEM = O.Fr. *plaïz; prêcimis* (Rom. i, 91) = *ci pris ci mis* (Villon) written also *cipricimi* in the sixteenth century.

*Redoissier* (Godefroy) < *REDOSSIARE; *reneisèle* (Godefroy) diminutive of *raine* < RANA upon the model of *dameisele; repetnar* (Raynouard) = O. Fr. *repenner* < *REPEDINARE; *repous* (Littré, Godefroy), verbal noun from *repousser; revertier* (Littré) from *reverquier* < Dutch VERKEEREN, cf. *tabatière* for *tabaquière; revola* (Lyonnais) < ROBULLA; *riaule* (Littré) RUTABULUM; *riboue* (Jaubert) in the phrase *mener les chevaux à la riboue*, = older *a l'aribour* < *ARRIPATORIUM; *rivache* (Duchesne), doublet of *livêche* < LEVISTICUM; *roinse* (Jaubert) = *les oinces* (< UNCUS + IA) > *le roinse* with rhotacism of *s* > *r; rosser* = O.Fr. *roissier* (*Guill. d'Angleterre* 1495) < *RUSTIARE; *rouble* (Littré) < RUTABULUM; *rouvieux* (Littré) = Picard *rouviu* < *RUBEOLUS.

*Scion* (Dict. Gén.) < Germ. root KI in *keim*, cf. A.-S. *cidh*, O.S. *kidh; semouster* (Godefroy) < SUBMUSTARE; *serène* (Littré, *Suppl.*) < A.-S. *cyrine*, *cerene; sermontain* (Cotgrave) < Latin SILI variant of SESELI + MONTANUM; *servone*

(*Traité de la messe* of Jean Belet), derivative of O. Fr. *serf* + UDINEM; *sevau* (Jaubert) < SEPALIS; *sevil* (*Erec* 4976) < SEPILE; *soupeau* (Littré), variant of *cepeau*, diminutive of *cep*.

*Tallevane* (Littré) = the proper noun *Tallevende*; *tref* (Godefroy) with the meaning *voile* and *tente* < A.-S. TRAEF; *treisme* (*Z. f. R. Ph.* xviii, p. 220) < TREDECIMA = Epiphany; *trelliono* (Lyonnais), cognate of Prov. *trignouna*, *trilhouna* < TRINIONEM, variant of TERNIONEM; *trone* (Godefroy) meaning *poids* < TRUTINA; *tudieu* (Littré) = *vertu de Dieu*; *turcoin* (Littré), derivative of the proper noun *Tourcoing*, older *Turcoing*; *turgi* (Lyonnais) = Piedmont *turja*, Prov. *turga*, *turca*.

*Vaucle* (Jônain) < VINCULUM; *vareuse* (Dict. Gén.) = the shirt of the *varreur*, that is, the man who throws the *varre* to catch the turtle; *varre* (Littré) = Span. *vara* < VARA; *veillote* (Littré) = Bas-Maine *veille* for *veille* from VITICULA; *vericle* (Littré), variant of *bericle* < *BERICULUS; *vierg* (*Revue Critique*, 1900, p. 377) < VICARIUS; *virgouleuse* (Littré), variants *virgoulé*, *virgoulée*, older *virgoulese*, formed from the proper noun *Villegouleix*; *volgrener* (Godefroy), from the noun *volgrain* < *VOLUS + GRANUM; *vonger* (Bas-Maine) < VOMICARE; *voyer* (Littré), variant of *vider*; *were* (Wallon) < VARA.

The final pages of these studies (pp. 171–176) contain a most interesting explanation of the meaning of the O.Fr. term *le mois de deloir* = *décembre*. After a discussion of the earlier etymologies which have been proposed, Thomas shows clearly that the *mois de deloir* is the MENSIS DELERUS, the wild delirious month, the month of the saturnalia.

'Pendant ces fêtes les bases de la société étaient pour ainsi dire retournées: les maîtres s'amusaient à servir leurs esclaves; on ne se plaisait qu'aux extravagances; c'était une folie, un delire.'

A note adds examples from the *Corpus Glossariorum* of the occurrence of DELERUS.

JOHN E. MATZKE.

*Leland Stanford Jr. University.*

## GERMAN GRAMMAR.

*A German Method for Beginners*, by FRANZ J. LANGE. (With preface by PAUL V. BACON.) Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1901. 8vo, viii + 240 + 45 pp.

CONTRARY to what might perhaps be expected from the title, Lange's *Method* does not profess to offer a short cut to a perfect knowledge of German. It is, on the other hand, thoroughly sensible and conservative in plan, merely aiming to present in one small volume a sufficient amount of material for the whole of the first year's work. It contains grammar, composition and reader, devoting to each a separate part and making no attempt to combine them after the fashion of the general type of "methods."

The really distinctive feature of the book is the freshness and excellence of the matter contained in Part I, the reader. This consists mainly of *Märchen*, with a few short poems and a simplified version of Gerstäcker's *Germelshausen*. The *Märchen* are from various sources,—Grimm, Bechstein, Baumbach and others. They are something more than adaptations, however, for they contain much that is original in the way of ingenious additions and of combinations of several different *Märchen* into a single story. The tale of *Die Dummen*, for example,—perhaps the cleverest thing in the whole book—is a composite of three separate Grimm stories. The editor makes no claim to literary excellence for these tales, but says he has merely "sought to avoid the woodenness common to texts prepared expressly for pedagogical purposes." But Mr. Lange is too modest. His declared object could not be accomplished by one who did not possess a considerable degree of literary skill. These tales have suffered but little at the hands of their editor; on the contrary, some of the originals, notably *Germelshausen*, have distinctly gained. Mr. Lange's additions, emendations and combinations are singulary felicitous, and give ample evidence of the possession of a vivid imagination and a delicate feeling for niceties of style.

Annotation has been deemed unnecessary, as the process of simplification has eliminated nearly all special difficulties. Still, there remains now and then an idiom on which the beginner needs more help than he can get from the vocabulary and the very brief grammar.

Part II consists of composition exercises based on the texts in the reader. These exercises are very carefully graded, and their usefulness is increased by full reference to the paragraphs of the grammar which they are in-

tended to exemplify as well as to the passages in the reader on which they are based. They could not fail to be effective when used in connection with the other parts of the book, but, notwithstanding the suggestion of Mr. Bacon in his preface, they are not in the least adapted for use as an independent text-book. Torn asunder from their models, the sentences of these exercises would be extremely dull and "wooden," frequently absurd.

The reason for the choice of the name "Syntax" for Part III is not apparent. It is not a treatise on syntax; it is an outline of the essentials of grammar, with somewhat more stress upon syntax than upon accidence. An attempt is here made to give within the exceedingly compact space of forty-four pages all the grammar needed by the beginner, and with no small degree of success. The material is excellently arranged, the rules are stated simply and clearly, and are illustrated by brief but apt examples. Just what may safely be omitted in compiling such a concise treatise as this must of course remain largely a matter of opinion. In this respect there are not many points on which Mr. Lange's judgment is likely to be questioned. To give the uninflected form of the superlative, § 18, without warning the pupil not to use this form as adjective, is misleading. § 25 would be improved by an example of the possessive in uninflected form in the predicate. In the discussion of strong verbs, § 33, it seems a little too much of a sacrifice to conciseness to omit all mention of the changes of vowel in the present indicative and the imperative. The pupil can not be trusted to dig out this important point for himself from the forms as given in the list of strong verbs. Full paradigms of compound tenses also seem a desideratum, in the light of the experience of Prof. Thomas with his grammar, in the second edition of which one of the principal changes was the insertion of complete paradigms of all the compound tenses. This was apparently a slight change, but experience has demonstrated the wisdom and the importance of it.

The appearance of the book is unusually neat and attractive. The German text is printed in a very handsome, large clear type, and the whole work is remarkably free from typographical errors. Only the following have been noted: p. 38, l. 17, for *das* read *dasz;* p. 47, l. 3, for *schau* read *schau';* p. 58, l. 11, for *schönes* read *Schönes;* p. 61, l. 26, insert comma after *Sieh;* p. 88, l. 27 should have comma after *verging;* p. 129, l. 24, change ! to ? after *Tanze;* p. 133, l. 24 should not have comma after *Eiche;* p. 224, l. 5, the comma should be after "separable" instead of after "prefixes."

Wherever a concise introduction to the language is desired this *Method* ought to prove a satisfactory and reliable text-book. It certainly deserves to find a wide field of usefulness, for there are few books of its kind that are marked by such sound and accurate scholarship, combined with thorough knowledge of the practical side of language teaching.

FREDERICK BERNARD STURM.

*University of Iowa.*

## *CHAUCER STUDIES.*

*Chaucer: Prologue, Knightes Tale, Nonne Preestes Tale*, edited in critical text with Grammatical Introduction, Notes and Glossary, by MARK H. LIDDELL, recently Professor of English in the University of Texas, etc. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1901. cxxi + 221 pp.

THIS work contains an outline of Middle English Grammar as represented by Chaucer, with chapters on Sounds, Inflection, Syntax, and Versification, a Brief Sketch of Chaucer's Life, a summary discussion of the MSS. of the Canterbury Tales, and a critical text of the *Prologue*, *Knightes Tale*, and *Nonne Preestes Tale*, with Notes and Glossary.

The Grammatical Introduction would seem to be based mainly on Ten Brink's *Chaucer's Sprache und Verskunst;* and if it contains nothing new to one familiar with that work, it will yet throw light on Chaucer's English for the host of teachers and students who have had little or no training in English philology. The chapter on Sounds treats of the development of Middle English sounds from those of Old English; and for the benefit of the student who has no knowledge of Old English there is inserted a brief discussion of the relation of Modern English sounds to those of Middle

English. The chapters on Inflection, Syntax, etc., have been so written as not to presuppose any acquaintance with the corresponding subjects of Old English Grammar. A full index renders the Introduction convenient for purposes of reference.

It would be too much to expect that a work of this scope and character should be entirely free from errors and inconsistencies. Thus, an American editor ought to have been more accurate than to assign to ME. *ð*, p. xii, the sound of *ð* in *not*, *hot*, for in this country these words have the sound of a short *ă*, the true short *ð* being rarely heard outside of New England; and somewhat similarly, the statement on p. xvii that *w* rounds a following *ă* into *ð* cannot be accepted as true of American usage, seeing that such words as *swamp*, *wash*, and *wasp* show a pronunciation that varies from *ā* to *ǭ*.—P. xv, *g* has not the palatal sound in ME. *gai*.—P. xviii, note, the short open *ĕ* in *breath* is not due to the influence of the *r*, but is an example of shortening before *th;* cf. the length in *bream*, *dream*, and see Sweet, *HES.* § 824.—P. xx, *grant*, *dance* have usually *ā* in London, not *ǭ*.—P. xxiv, "In all cases of lengthening that resulted in *ō*, it was the long open vowel *ǭ* that was produced." This is not true of OE. *ð*, which appears as the long close *ǭ* in Middle English before the lengthening consonant groups *ld*, *rl*, *rn*, *rd;* hence *yǭlden*, pp. lv, 220, *unyǭlden*, p. 217, and *bǭrd*, p. 187, should not have been given the open *ǭ*.—P. xxvii, *bugan* should be *būgan*.—P. xxviii, ME. *queynte* has not arisen from OE. *cwencte* by the vocalization of *c* through an intervening consonant, but owes its form to the assimilation of *c* to *t*, with the development of a glide vowel before the palatal *n*.—P. xxxi, since Prof. Hempl's paper[1] on the development of Middle English final *-ich*, *-ig*, *-ȳ*, the view that ME. *-lȳ* and *-ȳ* are specially characteristic of unstressed syllables is no longer tenable.—P. xxxii, ME. *arwe* arises not from OE. *earh* by change of *h* to *w* (!), but from OE. *arwe*, which is itself adapted from Old Norse *ǫrvar*.—P. lxxi, *gę̄th* should be *gę̄th*.—P. lxxxii, the modern "thither" fails to indicate the relative character of ME. "ther as."—P. xcix, Chaucer's constant syncope of the *e* in *arn* points to the weak form with a short vowel, and not to *ārn*.—P. cv, *shę̆f* (OE. *scēaf*) should be *shę̄f*, and the by-form *shǫ̆f*, p. cvi, *shǭf*.—P. 139, the modern *course* springs from ME. *cours*, and not, as is here stated, from *cors*. ME. *cours* (ū) > early Mn. E. *course* (ū) > *course* (ǭ) and in London *course* (ǭ); cf. Vietor, *Elemente der Phonetik*, § 45, Anm. 7. This word has in America usually either *ǭᵉ* or *ǭᵉ*- less frequently *ǭ* or *ǭ̣*.—P. 186, OE. *bysig* should not be marked as an assumed form.—P. 187, *brę̄de* has the long open *ę̄*.—P. 190, *countrefę̄te* has the open *ę̄*.—P. 193, OE. *drūgaþ* has the long *ū*.—P. 194, as Chaucer has invariably syncope of the middle vowel in *everich*, as also in *everȳ*, the radical syllable is in his pronunciation certainly short.—P. 195, *floytinge*, *Prol.* 91, does not mean "playing on a flute," but "whistling;" see Flügel, *Jour. of Germ. Phil.* I. 2, 125 f.—P. 197, *Fynystę̄re* has the long open *ę̄*—P. 198, *grę̄ue* (OE. *grǣfa*) has the open *ę̆*.—P. 202, *lę̄uere* should be *lę̣uere*.—P. 204, *męmǭrie* should have the long open *ǭ*, as also *ǭpie*, *oratǭrie*, p. 207.—P. 208, *piled* in "piled berd," Prol. 627, means "thin," "scanty," rather than "bald."—P. 214, *stę̄pe* when used with "eye" as in *Prol.* 201 means "bright," and not "protruding."—P. 214, Me. *stīward* has a short vowel in the second syllable.—P. 215, the editor seems not to recognize the lengthening of *a* (*o*) before *nd* as in *strǭnd*, *hǭnd*, *lǭnd*.—P. 217, *upríste* has the short *ĭ*.

A beginner would be likely to find himself confused by the inconsistency with which the marks of quantity and quality have not infrequently been employed. For instance, ME. *dore*, *hope*, *mete*, and other words are left unmarked, but on the same page (xxxviii) one finds *nōse*—which should have been given the open *ǭ*—and *tȳme*.—P. xli, *clēne*, with no indication of the quality of the vowel, in the same paragraph with *drie* instead of *drīe*.—P. xlvi, *mǭst* correctly marked, but the by-form *mę̄st* without the sign of the open *ę̄*.—P. lxi, *wę̆pte* with *ĕ*, but no sign of the shortening in *slę̆pt*.—P. ciii, *knōwe*, which should have *ǭ*, but *growe* for *grǭ̣we*.—The Glossary has *tohę̄wen*, but ME. *ƿw*, *hę̄we*, *hę̄we*, *lǭwe*(*ly*), *trēwe* are not marked, *lüst* occurs by the side of *lustily*,

[1] See *Pub. of the Mod. Lang. Association*, vol. xvi, no. 4, p. xl.

*trāce* by the side of *Trace*, while *charge*, *large*, *targe* are marked with the long *ā*, but *farse*, *Tars* are left short. The fact that Chaucer uses the forms *list*, *lest* is not convincing proof of an invariable Southwestern *ĭ* in *lust*, which might just as well arise from OE. *lust* as from OE. *lyst*,[2] cf. Morsbach, *ME. Gram.* § 129, 2, p. 170; *Trāce* has the long *ā*; and although the orthoepists of the sixteenth century allow either the short or the long *ā* in *charge*, *large*, etc., yet it might have been better for the student if the editor had left them unmarked, since the modern pronunciation points invariably to a Middle English short *ă* in words of this class. An apparent exception is the word *scarce*(*ly*), which doubtless owes its pronunciation with *c̄e̊* to the influence of *sc*.

The text follows the orthography and readings of the Ellesmere MS., while essential variants given in each instance at the foot of the page furnish all the material necessary for a study of the relations of the MSS. Now and then the editor would seem to have rejected the reading of the Ellesmere MS. without sufficient grounds. Thus, *were*, *Prol.* 578, is substituted for *weren*, in which the *e* could be slurred as in v. 455; *it*, Prol. 1091, which is omitted in the El. MS., is scarcely necessary; 1573 reads: "A longę tyme, and afterward he upsterte," an extremely awkward line, instead of the simple "A longė tyme, and after he upsterte," of the El. MS. In the main, however, Prof. Liddell has displayed excellent judgment in his choice of variants, a notable instance being the insertion of the historical present *rit*, which the scribe of the El. MS. altered to the preterit *rood* with a view to avoiding the combination of the two tenses *took* . . . *rit*—a combination that is in no small degree characteristic of Chaucer's style: see A. 957, 966, 999, 1217, 1633, 1782.

One familiar with the pages of the Student's Chaucer will be struck at once by a number of rather important changes in the pointing of certain passages. For instance, a period stands after *strondes*, *Prol.* 13, "to ferne halwes," etc., being taken with "they wende," v. 16; *leet*, v. 175, is regarded as a transitive in the sense of "neglect," with v. 173 as its object, while the words "olde thynges pace" are put in the form of a parenthesis; a dash instead of the usual period ends A. 1138, so that vv. 1137, 1138 go with what follows, not with what precedes; a colon follows *foryeten*, A. 2021, and the force of the phrase "by the infortune of Marte" falls, therefore, on the following line.

In order to keep the edition within text-book limits, it was necessary to make the Notes somewhat brief, a defect that can be offset to some extent by a free use of the Glossary. Among the sins of omission may be counted the failure to explain the words *brouke*, B. 4490, *deye*, B. 4036, *veze*, A. 1985; and it is also a matter of regret that the Notes are not entirely free from the mistakes of former editors. Thus, Flügel has shown conclusively, in *Anglia*, xxiii, 2, 233 ff., that *rente*, *Prol.* 256, does not mean "income": "Der *frere*, will Ch. sagen, behielt noch von seinem erbettelten ein schönes sümmchen (wel bettre) übrig *über* seine pachtsumme." Again, the editor accepts Skeat's note on the *Prol.* 212, 213, apparently not being acquainted with the explanation that Flügel has given of this difficult passage: see the *Jour. of Germ. Phil.* i. 133 ff.

The following misprints may be noted: p. lvii, *ȩ̄re* should be *bȩ̄re;* p. lix, *liegan* should be *licgan*, and *fēren*, *fēran;* p. xcvi, fn., *containg* shonld be *containing;* *Prol.* 16, for *Caunturbury*, read *Caunterbury;* p. 216, *thȩ̄re* should be *thȩ̄re.*

The errors of detail that have been pointed out above detract little from the accuracy and completeness of the book, which, as a whole, can be heartily commended to all who desire to study Chaucer's language.

WILLIAM A. READ.

*University of Arkansas.*

---

## *SCANDINAVIAN PHILOLOGY.*

*Scandinavian Loan-Words in Middle English.* Part I, by ERIC BJÖRKMAN, Ph. D., Upsala: N. T. S Boktrykkeri-Aktiebolag, 1900. 191 pp.

THE author is already known to students of English Philology through his short but schol-

[2] *Lyst* is not given in either *Bosworth and Toller* or Sweet's *A.-S. Dict.*

arly treatise "Zur dialektischen Provenienz der nordischen Lehnwörter im Englischen," printed in *Språkvetenskapliga Sälskapets i Upsala Förhandlingar* (Transactions of the Philological Society of Upsala), 1898–1901, and also as a separate pamphlet, Upsala, 1900, in which are discussed the phonology and etymology of a list of Scandinavian loan-words in English, their provenience and geographical distribution. The author's thorough grasp of his subject and the method of handling the most difficult questions that the problem involves promised valuable results in the discussion of ME. loan-words that was to follow. Part I of the larger work now before us is characterized by the same scholarly thoroughness in treatment and perfect fairness in attitude and forms a most important contribution to the study of the relation of English to Scandinavian.

The author bases his researches largely on ME. material. OE. material is regarded as inadequate for a satisfactory treatment of the subject because of the comparative meagreness of Scandinavian elements, something that is accounted for partly by the fact that Northern English of the time is not sufficiently represented in literature, and partly by the fact that the main body of loan-words seems to have been introduced in the eleventh century, and does not appear in literature before the ME. period. Furthermore, the Scandinavian elements in OE. are of a different kind from those that appear in the eleventh century, the former being of a more learned character, largely legal and technical terms, while the loan-elements that appear in ME. are of the speech of the people,—the result of a very intimate blending of two languages. Nor does the author believe that the modern dialects can be made the chief basis for the study, because of the uncertainty that characterizes the phonology of the dialects. Many changes are of comparatively recent date, which makes the criteria of loan uncertain, and often quite unreliable. For this reason a knowledge of ME. conditions is regarded as neccessary to a reliable and satisfactory treatment of the material contained in the modern dialects. A difficulty attendant upon the general problem of Scandinavian influence on English is the limited knowledge that we possess of Old Northern English and the similarity in form and vocabulary as between Old Norse and Anglian. Scandinavian influence on English inflexions and derivations does not come within the scope of the author's treatise. By way of exemplification the frequency of the ME. and Mn. E. verbal suffixes *l* and *n* is pointed out as possibly due to Scandinavian influence. Attention is called to the fact that a great number of these verbs seem to be loan-words, and from these loan-words the suffix may have spread to word-stems of English origin. A partial list of verbs of this class, mostly from ME., is given on p. 15. In support of the author's conjecture it may be pointed out that in English dialects *l-* and *n-* suffix verbs are especially numerous in the dialects of northern and northwestern England, and in general where Scandinavian elements are most prominent. L-suffix verbs are especially numerous in these dialects. The present reviewer has collected over two hundred that occur in the dialects of Cumberland and Yorkshire. These formations are very characteristic of all the Scandinavian languages and Scandinavian influence seems highly probable in NE. dialects and in certain ME. texts. To the author's list of words illustrative of Scandinavian influence on inflection may be added M. Sco. *apert*, boldly, with neuter-adverbial *t* and *melder* and *leister* (Burns) with inflectional *r*, as also perhaps *caller* (Fergusson).

Under the various criteria of loan taken up in the order of vowels, diphthongs and consonants are discussed words of Scandinavian origin, their form, meaning and distribution in ME. texts: i, tests based on prehistoric differences between Scandinavian and West Teutonic; ii, tests based on differences between Scandinavian and English sound development. Section ii is subdivided into: A. Distinctively Scandinavian diphthongs and vowels in Scandinavian loan-words, pp. 36–118, where about two hundred and twenty-five words are discussed; B. tests chiefly depending on differences as to the development of consonants in English and Scandinavian, about two hundred and fifty words discussed. Under the latter head twenty pages are devoted to Scandinavian *sk* and words that fall under this

head. OE. *sc*, initially, medially, and finally seems to have become ME. š, except in some cases medially and finally where it has apparently developed out of OE. *cs*, *x*, ME. *ks*, *x* by metathesis. This sound is in ME. represented by *sh*, *sch*, or in southern texts by *s*, *ss*. Where *sk* (*sc*) appears, then, it must be due to foreign influence—Latin, Celtic or Romance if non-Teutonic, Scandinavian if Teutonic, except in the case of words of recent introduction where German influence has been shown to exist. The author regards ME. *sk* as in the main due to Scandinavian influence. Something over one hundred words in *sk* are discussed, in many of which, usually taken as Scandinavian, *sk* is rejected as a sign of Scandinavian influence. *Sk* is not, however, always a sign of Scan. loan, for there are in Mn. Eng. dialects, and standard speech native words in *sk*, and on the other hand, many undoubted Scand. words have the sound š. No attempt has been made to explain this difficulty. The author argues

"that both nationalities held, especially some time after the settlement of the Northeners, a very close intercourse with each other, and therefore each side must have had a fairly good knowledge of the language of the other. In adopting words from Scandinavian the English must, therefore, have been able to give the loan-words, which did not agree with the phonological conditions of their language, a thoroughly English form, and they must also, although unconsciously, have had a fairly good etymological knowledge of Scandinavian which enabled them to replace Scandinavian sounds by their English equivalents, and sometimes they coined words, esp. compounds, simply by translation from Scandinavian. . . . People who to some extent knew both languages saw, without any difficulty, the etymological identity of English š and Scandinavian *sk*, and this the more easily as there existed in both languages a considerable number of words which—but for the difference of *sk*, š—were absolutely identical as to form and meaning. Bilingual individuals, when speaking English, had to pronounce š in the same words which they pronounced with *sk*, when speaking Scandinavian. This may have led to confusion of several kinds. *Sk* has practically remained in many loan-words from Scandinavian, very often side by side with etymologically identical native words in š; this may have led to the introduction of *sk* even in words which did not exist in Scandinavian. Such a word is perhaps ME. scateren by the side of genuine English shateren. Words containing *sk* introduced from Scandinavian, may easily have been 'Anglicised' and pronounced with š." (pp. 9–10).

Scandinavian words are in ME. written with *sc* or *sk*, but in several ME. manuscripts OE. *sc* is kept for the sound š. There is then in such cases no test of loan. In manuscripts of this kind the author regards *sk* as a Scand. sign, as, for example, in the Cotton MS. of *Cursor Mundi*. While *sc* is used most frequently for š in the Cotton MS. of C. M. the writing with *sk* cannot be regarded as a safe criterion of loan from Scand. for while *sk* appears predominantly in words that were always pronounced with *sk*, not š, *sk* does appear in some cases where there can be little doubt that the sound was š. The word "shaking" is in C. M. Cotton MS. 26047, written *skaking* (Fairfax MS. has *shacand*). On the other hand *sch* does not always represent the š-sound, cp. *schillwisness* (first element <ON. *skil*), *schrews* "screws," *schured=scured*, "scoured," *schale* = *skail*, scatter, *schete* = *skete*, quick. To the author's discussion of ON. ð may be added that *d* (< ON. ð) is particularly frequent in M. Sco. as well as in the modern dialects of northwestern England and Scotland generally, especially in the final position, cp., for example, M. Sco. *heid*, brightness (Rolland), ON. *hæið*; *red*, to clear away (Ratis Raving), ON. *ryðja*; *styddy* (Douglas, Dunbar), ON. *steði*. The reviewer does not think that the spelling with *ē* in ME. *lesen* by the side of *laisen* (*Cursor Mundi*) proves a simple vowel. The diphthong is variously written *a*, *ai*, *ay*, *e*, *ei* and *ey* in the *Cursor Mundi*. *Lesen* and *laisen* are, then, only two different ways of writing the same word (cp. *dey*, *de*; *þai*, *þei*, *þe*; *þare*, *þere*, *þere*, *þair*; *wayk*, *waike*, *wek*). Nor is *ē* in OIr. *hēle* to be taken as a sign of East Scandinavian monophthongization, the simplification of the vowel in this word has probably taken place on Irish soil. Beside *sōm*, trace of a cart, p. 72, from ON. *saumr*, might also have been mentioned the more original form *soum* which occurs in Dunbar. I do not think that northern dialectal *glout* necessarily points to a *ū*-vowel in ME. (cp. Cumberland, Westmoreland *blowt*, *gowk*, *gowl*, *how*, *cowp*, etc.). The ON. source of NE. dial. *beace* is further

supported by the *i-* fracture, from ON. *bās* then as is suggested, p. 99. It does not seem quite satisfactory to derive *swaype* from OE. *swipe*, as is done on p. 59. It is noteworthy that the rhyme *swaype: raip* occurs in *Cursor Mundi*, 24023, which suggests a diphthong in *swaype* if the etymology of *raip* given on p. 49 be correct. *Raip* occurs in rhyme three times with the word *snaipe* (<ON. *snöypa*), which proves the author's etymology of *raip* to be the correct one, and at the same time strengthens the case against the English origin of *swaype*.

Dr. Björkman's work shows extensive research and is a model of scholarly exactness and thoroughness. It is by far the most important contribution to the study of the linguistic relations of English and Scandinavian that has yet appeared.

George T. Flom.

*University of Iowa.*

---

## *GERMAN LITERATURE.*

*Grundriss der neueren deutschen Litteraturgeschichte*, von Richard M. Meyer. Berlin: Bondi, 1902, 258 pp. M. 7.

Prof. Richard M. Meyer, to whom we owe the first satisfactory history of nineteenth-century literature in Germany, here gives us a by-product of his studies for this work, in the form of a voluminous bibliography. In thus filling the yawning gap between the latest fascicle of Goedeke and the present day, and at the same time booking in convenient form the best material furnished by the indispensable but time-consuming *Jahresberichte* and other helps of the kind, Prof. Meyer has done a great service to all students of "post-classical" German literature. The immense labor involved in such a work as this *Grundriss* can be appreciated only by one who has gone over somewhat similar ground himself. The writer of these lines, having attempted a more modest task of the same nature, and knowing what a vast amount of time and trouble this book would have saved him if it had appeared a year or so earlier, would be the last to underestimate its value; the criticisms and corrections that follow are not given in a carping spirit, but rather with the desire of contributing to the perfecting of a most important publication.

The arrangement of the *Grundriss* is naturally based upon that of the author's *Die deutsche Litteratur des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, and it is subject to the same objections and to the same defense. One advantage of the periodic system adopted is that it suggests interesting groups of documents on the general character of the successive decades; in these, as everywhere, the author's immensely wide reading in the literature of the century enables him to give innumerable valuable indications that are nowhere else to be found. In fact, the whole book is full of suggestive chips from the workshop of a first-class authority, perhaps the best of all authorities, on the period in question, and so it has a living value and interest that is lacking in any mere list of titles. Good suggestions are given here and there as to practical methods of study, useful lists of "principal works" are appended for too prolific authors, and helpful hints are added on the value of the critical and biographical works catalogued. These laconic criticisms might be extended with profit to many more titles, for too often the good and the comparatively worthless still stand side by side without a tag to mark their relative value.

Prof. Meyer, as his preface shows, recognizes theoretically the vital importance of a full index to a work of this nature. Unfortunately, he has failed to make a satisfactory practical application of this insight. As the whole book is a time-saving device, it is all the stranger that no account is taken of the time that might be saved the user by a complete index. And the index is not only far from complete, but lacking in system as well. It does not appear, for instance, why Nos. 210–12, 216, 231 should be indexed, and not Nos. 214, 215, 229, 230, taking just a few at random. The principle should be to index the name of every author and editor in the entire bibliography.

To the data given in the bibliography, either the price, or the number of pages, or both, should be added. It is often quite as important to know the approximate bulk of a book as its date, and the cost is pretty sure to be a matter of practical interest to users of the bibliography who are remote from great libra-

ries.—The author's suggestion in the preface regarding "Nachweise über handschriftlichen Nachlass" is decidedly important; it is highly desirable that all such information as is available should be registered.

The soul of a bibliography is not exhaustiveness—Prof. Meyer will deserve the gratitude of the world if he succeeds in demolishing the terrible fetish of "Vollständigkeit"—but accuracy. Here again there is room for criticism, and for improvement. The whole book bears marks of haste and of inefficient correction. It is inevitable that errors and misprints should creep into such a mass of data, but the author may at least be held responsible for inaccuracies that are easily avoidable. It would have been an easy matter for any cheap assistant, if the author had not time, to verify the cross-references and the index, and the many errors of this kind that occur are hardly excusable. Other mistakes are not so easy to avoid, but their very great frequency is to be deplored.

In order to help toward making future editions of this valuable work more reliable, I have compared its data with a bibliography made last year by the aid of the resources of the Royal Library at Berlin; where discrepancies appeared, I have verified my own data again by reference to the *Jahresberichte* and other available helps, and to the latest publishers' catalogues. Recognizing the fact that no two persons would agree as to the line to be drawn in the selection of titles for a bibliography, I shall suggest but very few additions to Prof. Meyer's list from my own. Both corrections and additions are given in the order of the consecutive numbers of the titles in the *Grundriss;* in the case of misprints, only the correct form is usually given. The large proportion of erroneous data found among those compared makes it appear probable that a host of other errors have escaped my observation. The whole book evidently demands thorough and careful revision.

15a) Library of the World's Best Literature, ed. by Charles Dudley Warner, N. Y. 96–8, Peale and Hill. 30 Bde. 16a) L. for Le; name should be in *Fraktur*, as all others in the book are. 20b) G. Pellissier, Le mouvement littéraire au xix. siècle, P. 95, Hachette. 24a) Geo. Saintsbury, A History of Nineteenth Century Literature, L. 96, Macmillan. 33a) Barrett Wendell, A Literary History of America, N. Y., 1901, Scribners. 34) should go under g). 98) L. 92. 220) Literature. 231), under II., after Scherer N. 227, after Marggraff N. 214. 236) Geo. Saintsbury; *dele* period after criticism; I. 00. Comma after Dodd. 239) s. o. N. 98. 243a) Spingarn. 248) Iowa. 258a) Hugo P. Thieme, *La littérature française du dix-neuvième siècle* Bibliographie. P. 97, H. Welter. 292) L. 88. 330a) Dictionary of National Biography, ed. by Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee, 63 Bde., L. 85–00 (weitere Supplementbände). 471) L. 95. 476) 96 f. 546a) R. Eucken, Die Grundbegriffe der Gegenwart, L. ² 93, Veit. 572) vergriffen. 597) for 577). 608) Weimar 93. 615) II. 1902. 617) 6. Aufl. 99. 619) 2 Bde. illustriert, 2. Aufl. 99. 640) B., Weidmann, vergriffen. 650) die Kunst, 1799. 652) 28 Bde., incl. Novellen, 52–4. 663) Meiszner. 670) à Saïs. 762) (Biographie des Prinzen). 777) Eloesser. 798) J. Dohmke. 804) Cotta? 832) 84. 832a) Hertz. 834) and 836) do not appear in Dümmler's catalogue. 840) Breslau, Schottländer. 843) 4. Aufl. 90. 872) Ch. Rabany; Lublinski. 887) Gesammelte Schriften, 2. Ausg. 36 Tle. 888) 17 Tle. 889) *dele* Eine; 7. Aufl. 77. 922) 6 Bde.? 939) C. C. T. Litzmann. 941) 2. Aufl. 96. 946) Hamburg 94. 1012a) W. Müller, s. u. N. 1201. 1044) Stuttg. 63. 1061) is not in Decker's catalogue. 1176) *dele* L.; Beck, München. 1194a) period after Public. 1196) Z. Teil vergriffen. 1197) L. 68. 1217) X, wrong font. 1327) vergriffen; neue Ausg. 24 Bde. 61. 1328) 7, 188. 1425) 20 Tle., 8 Bde. 1451a) Münchhausen. 1465) 4 Bde. 87. 1469) 2. Aufl. 00. 1471) 2. Aufl. 90. 1498) 2 Bde. 1539) 8 Bde. 90–93. 1643a) Works ed. by E. C. Stedman and G. E. Woodberry, Chicago 00, Stone. 10 Bde. (Beste und vollständigste Ausgabe). 1643b) G. E. Woodberry, Life of Poe, Boston 99, Houghton. 1684) vergriffen. 1786) in R. M. Werners Nachlese. 1842) L., Göschen. 1855) J. Klaiber; L., Unflad. 1864) E. Gosse; s. o. N. 23. 1892) 2. Aufl. 1909) 75–82. 1923) 13 Bde. 1924) 2. Ausg. Jena 79. 1934) B., Janke. 1936) Janke. 2133) Volksausgabe, 10 Bde. 2157a) Neue Ausgabe 15 Bde. 86–90, Volksausgabe 7 Bde. 2162) 2. Aufl. 98. 2173) Kiel 92. 2214) for 2213) Why should the date of Pichler's death be given and that of no

other author in the book? It would be well to give the dates of birth and death throughout. 2267) 85–87. 2289) 3 Bde. 2299) Schiller. 2301) Prag 92. 2312) Lahr 82. 2313) Bruns, Minden. 2336) B. 77, Paetel. 2364) 12. Aufl. L., Göschen. 2367) jetzt Stuttg., Dietz. 2369) 2. Aufl. oo. 2430) Kladderadatsch; quotation marks wrong. 2459) L., Wigand. 2488) 10 Bde., 97–99. 2532) 36. Aufl. Mainz 86, Kirchheim. 2634a) 2 Bde. 88, s. o. N. 292. 2687) Nothing in Schmidt. 2719) 3 Bde. 52–4. 2720) 2 Bde., I. 12. Aufl. 84, II. 7. Aufl. 85. 2732) 5. Aufl. oo. 2734) 50. Aufl. oo. 2756) Fkft., Rütten u. Loening. 2756a) Geschichten und Novellen, Stuttg., Cotta, 7 Bde. 2774a) Schriften, L., Haessel, 9 Bde. 2789) Cotta. 2790) H. Trog. 2799) Schenck. 2802) 158. Aufl. oo. 2817) Correspondance. 2822) *dele* The. 2827) George Eliot. 2840a) I., 92. B., Wilhelmi? 2869) B. 99. 2877) s. u. 2899) 249. Aufl. oo. 2901) 177. Aufl. oo. 2903) 63. Aufl. oo. 2917) A. Ruhemann. 2946a) jetzt Cotta. 2950) 32 Bde., 93–97. 3000) 74. Aufl. oo. 3091a) Werke, Auswahl in 4 Bden. Hamb., Richter. 3163) Auswahl, L. 95. Fock; 10 Bde. 3165) Heinrich, L., Fock. 3. Aufl. 3302) last line, parenthesis. 3360a) Romane, L. 95–00, Staackmann. 22 Bde. 3385) B. 01. 14 Bde. 3409) 29 Bde. 3478) spirit. 3560a) s. o. N. 2876. 3564) 86, 9. Aufl. 94. 3692) und L., Staackmann, 30 Bde. 3756) jetzt Grote; folgende. 3807) 12 Bde. 3815a) last line, parenthesis. 3819a) U. v. Wilamowitz. 3856) B., Steinitz. 3907) 98 f. 3908) 2. Aufl. 98. 3956) 3. Aufl. Jena, Costenoble. 4048) *dele* comma. 4051) L., Göschen. 4096) 4. Aufl. Dresden 98, Pierson. 4098) 2. Aufl. Dresden 95, Pierson. 4103) 2. Aufl. 99. 4119a) G. Irrgang, *Nord und Süd*, N. 287. 4142) oo, beides Stuttg. 4211) 2. Aufl. oo. 4319) jetzt B., Schuster u. Loeffler. 4432a) Goldner. 4605) jetzt Cotta. 4605a) Neue Gedichte. Stuttg., Cotta. 4608) jetzt Cotta.

JOHN SCHOLTE NOLLEN.
*Iowa College.*

---

## *OLD SAXON GRAMMAR.*

*Wortlehre des Adjectivs im Altsächsischen*, von Dr. EDWIN CARL ROEDDER. Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin, No. 50. Madison, Wisconsin: August, 1901.

THE aim of the investigation may be stated in the author's words:

"Die vorliegende Arbeit ist der erste Teil eines Versuchs, das Adjectiv auf dem Gesamtgebiete des Altsächsischen—also nicht allein im Heliand—in all seinen Erscheinungsformen darzustellen."

It therefore supplements the second part of Wilmanns' *Deutsche Grammatik* and Kluge's *Nominale Stammbildungslehre*, to which constant reference is made.

After a brief introduction, the work falls naturally into two main divisions: *Formenlehre*, paragraphs 5–50, and *Bedeutungslehre*, 51–86. Quite properly the discussion of inflection is omitted, reference being made to W. Schlüter in Dieter's *Laut- und Formenlehre der altgerm. Dialekte* and to Holthausen's *Altsächs. Elementarbuch.*

Under *Bildungslehre* are treated, 6–14, *Adjectiva ohne Ableitungssilben;* 15–33, *Adjectiva mit ableitenden Suffixen;* 34–50, *Zusammensetzung.* This division, like all such divisions, is necessarily mechanical. For in many cases it is impossible to decide whether a particular form should be regarded as primitive or derived. In fact, these terms are movable. A form which, at one period of the language, is clearly derived, may at a later period appear as a primitive stem. Consequently many adjectives are given under both heads.

It is also entirely mechanical to separate adjectives connected with strong verbs from those related to weak verbs, or from so-called isolated adjectives.

"Unter isolierten Adjectiven sind solche zu verstehen, die kein im Germanischen lebendiges Ableitungssuffix zeigen und auch nicht fühlbar mit Nominal- und Verbalstämmen in Beziehung stehen."

According to this definition given, § 12, many of the adjectives classed as isolated should come under a different head. So in the following, where the connection must have been felt until a late period.

13, 2. *sinu-wel* 'ganz rund': OHG. *wella, wallan, wallōn*, etc.—13, 6. *blind:* ON. *blunda* 'die augen schliessen'; *lut* 'wenig': OE. *lūtan* 'bow, bend,' *lūtian* 'lurk, skulk'; *(un-)spōd* '(nicht) frommend': OE. *spēd* 'success,' *spōwan* 'succeed'; *wrēdh* 'kummervoll, feindlich,' OE. *wrāþ* 'angry, fierce, hostile': *wrīþan*

'twist, writhe,' *wriþa* 'bridle; ring; torture.' This list might be increased.

In giving etymologies the author seems not to have an independent judgment. At any rate some improbable and even impossible combinations are suggested. Examples are:

9. *skarþ* 'scharf,' zu ahd. *scrëvōn* und *scarbōn:* better OE. *sceorpan, screpan* 'scrape, irritate,' Lith. *skrebĕti* 'rascheln', Gk. σκέρβολος 'scolding.'—13, 2. *sinu-wel* 'ganz rund' is compared with OE. *hwēol* 'wheel' (written here *hweol*) and at the same time referred to the root *wel* in Lat. *volvere*, an utterly impossible combination.—13, 7. *blak* 'schwarz' is better separated from Gk. φλέγω 'burn'. Compare rather Gk. ἀμολγός 'darkness.'—15. *falu* 'fahl' is better compared with Lith. *palvas*, with which it exactly corresponds.—16, 2. *edili* 'edel' has nothing to do with OE. *ĕad*, which represents Goth. *auda-(hafts)*.—27, c. "Mit eingeschobenem Vocal" is hardly a scientific expression.—31, e. On *wōrig* 'müde', which is said to be 'dunkeln Ursprungs,' see Prellwitz, *Et. Wb.* s. v. ἄωρος.—33, 1. "mit ahd. *forskōn* ist as. *horsk* urverwandt." How did the author arrive at such a conclusion? A strange comparison is also *malsk* 'stolz': Gk. μέλειν. On the other hand, *twisk* 'zwiefach' is undoubtedly from the Germ. stem *twis-*.

The development of meaning is not well explained in a few cases. For example, 22. *lēhni* 'vergänglich' goes back to the meaning 'leave, depart, go away' as seen in Lat. *linquō*, Gk. λείπω, and did not come from 'leihbar', which is itself a secondary meaning.

However, in spite of inaccuracies of this kind, the author has made a serviceable and valuable little book.

FRANCIS A. WOOD.

*Cornell College.*

---

## *SHAKESPEARE.*

*A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare.* Edited by HORACE HOWARD FURNESS. Vol. xiii. *Twelfe Night, or, What You Will.* Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. 1901.

EVERY student of Shakespeare is so familiar with Dr. Furness's admirable work, and is so ready to acknowledge his debt to that accomplished and genial scholar, that any words of eulogy by the present writer would be superfluous, not to say presumptuous.

The editor has had an easier task with *Twelfth Night* than with any of the previous plays. The text, as we have it in the Folio, is exceptionally correct; and it may perhaps be an advantage that there is no quarto to hint a doubt or darken counsel where all seems plain. The only unsolved enigma is the mysterious "Lady of the Strachy;" and, so far as we can see, if we had the word in Shakespeare's own handwriting, we should be none the wiser. We should be glad to know whether she ever repented the *mésalliance;* but that is left untold.

Clear though the text is, for the most part, the ingenuity of commentators has given birth to a mass of conjectural emendations, sometimes plausible, and sometimes grotesquely absurd; and of elucidations, sometimes really luminous, and sometimes tenebrific to no small degree. From all these the editor has selected those most likely to help, to unsettle, or to amuse us, adding in most cases his own sane and rational opinion. From a few of his judgments I incline (with due deference) to dissent, and these shall be noted.

P. 9, *sweet sound.* Dr. Furness adheres to the Folio, rejecting Pope's emendation "South." "South" may not be right; but the present reviewer will go to the block before he will admit that Shakespeare could find no simile for a sweet sound but a sweet sound. That would speak him as bankrupt in comparisons as the amorous Sir Sampson Legend:—"Give me your hand—'tis as soft and warm as—what? Odd, as t'other hand."

P. 52, *dam'd coloured stocke.* Rowe's emendation of "flame-coloured" has this in its favor that it makes excellent sense, and the word is a familiar one, twice used by Shakespeare; whereas "dam'd coloured" has no assignable meaning, and was never used by any mortal. If "dam'd" be for "damned," we are little better off. Shakespeare, it is true, uses "damned" with considerable frequency, but always in the sense of "condemned,"

"condemned to perdition," or to express strong abhorrence, as "his damn'd fingers;" whereas Sir Andrew is speaking with approbation of the color of his stocking.

P. 81, *what is yours to bestow, is not yours to reserve.* Surely Viola is neither speaking nor thinking of "the lordship of the house," but of Olivia's person, graces, and affections which are not given her to be sequestered in a cloister, but lent, to be one day accounted for. It is the theme of the fourth sonnet.

P. 119, *My Lady's a Cataian . . . Malvolio's a Peg-a-ramsie.* "Why Sir Toby called Malvolio a Peg-a-ramsey . . . no one, I suppose, but Sir Toby can tell," says Dr. Furness. I fancy he meant to call Malvolio a Cataian, and Olivia a Peg-a-Ramsey, but the admirable fooling into which he had drunk himself superinduced a "derangement of epitaphs."

P. 151, *and yet I know not.* The duke has asked Viola if her (supposed) sister *died of love.* If Viola means that possibly her brother may be alive, she does not answer the Duke's question at all. As I understand it, her answer to the Duke is: "my sister is dead; but whether she died of her love or not, I do not know;" but to herself her answer means that she (who is the supposed sister) does not *yet* know what the issue of her untold love will be.

P. 182, *words are very rascals since bonds disgraced them.* This is surely not "a dark passage." When men grew so false that their words ceased to bind them, and bonds had to be invented, then words were disgraced, and are ever since of small account and credit.

P. 229, *o' th' windie side of the law.* Wright explains, "so that the law cannot scent you . . . . as a hound does the game," and Dr. Furness calls this "unquestionably the right definition." Does not the scent blow from the windward to the leeward? Shakespeare (if all tales be true), knew more about deer-stalking than his commentators. It rather refers to manœuvres at sea, where the windward side, or "weather-gage," is the position of safety or advantage.

P. 289, *Strangle thy propriety.* Halliwell's explanation: "destroy or suppress thy individuality," is right, of course; but one wonders to find no reference to Sonnet 89: "I will acquaintance strangle."

W. Hand Browne.
*Johns Hopkins University.*

## CORRESPONDENCE.

*WICHERT'S Als Verlobte empfehlen sich—*

To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes,

Sirs:—In an edition of the above comedy by George T. Flom (Heath & Co., 1902), a curious error is made that would seem to demand a correction.

The situation is the following: a young girl called Malwine is being urged by her cousin Franz, who is in love with her, to go out into the garden for a walk. She is, however, busy writing an essay, and from this essay we are, on page 3, given the following extracts: "Der unglückliche Kaiser—muszte sich beugen—" "Der unversöhnliche Papst—" Then follows, page 4, line 25, the statement: "Die ganze Kirchenbusze fehlt noch," which the editor annotates as follows: "*a thorough church-penance is all that is lacking now*, i. e., I'll be made to atone for it." The editor thus entirely fails to understand the situation which is, of course, that Malwine is writing an essay on the investiture conflict between Henry IV and Pope Gregory VII. The last sentence is accordingly to be rendered: "There is'nt a single line written as yet about the church-penance," referring doubtless to the well-known incidents at Canossa.

It may not be out of place to point out one or two other errors in the Notes. "Ist so schon in guter Stimmung," page 4, line 9, means "in bad enough humor as it is," not "in such thoroughly good humor." "Und dürfte sich . . . . gut machen," page 23, line 27, means "It (i. e., such an announcement of engagement) would look very well indeed," not "and might even very easily happen."

B. J. Vos.
*Johns Hopkins University.*

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

**Baltimore, November, 1902.**

## *OFFA AND LABHRAIDH MAEN.*

Among the stories of backward princes who eventually are roused from their inactivity or recover from youthful disabilities, not the least interesting are those which concern Haveloc the Dane and Amlethus, the prototype of Shakespeare's Hamlet. The parallel between the two sagas and the likeness which they present to the tale of the Roman Servius Tullius has been examined by Ward in his *Catalogue of Romances* (i, 428, 429, 435, 860).

A parallelism in some respects even more striking is that between the stories of the Anglian King Offa I. and Labhraidh Maen, an early Irish hero. As far as I know, this similarity has not hitherto been pointed out, though each story has separately been compared (Müllenhoff, *Beowulf-Untersuchungen*, p. 79; Nutt, "The Aryan Expulsion and Return Formula," *Folk-Lore Record*, vol. iv, p. 33, note) to the well-known tale of the son of Crœsus related by Herodotus. The parallel is not only interesting of itself, but may perhaps also throw some light on the relation between Germanic and Celtic tradition.

In the first place let us look at the Classical story. Herodotus (book I, 85) says that Crœsus, King of Lydia, had a son who was dumb, though in other respects quite normal. When Crœsus sent to Delphi in regard to this misfortune, the oracle replied that the youth should first speak on a day of disaster. So it proved. When the Persians under Cyrus had overcome Lydia, and one of the enemy was approaching to kill Crœsus, the boy cried out: "Man, do not kill Crœsus."

The story of Offa is variously told; but all versions agree in the essential point that he was dumb in his youth and recovered the use of his voice under stress of threatening misfortune. Offa was king of the Angles (*Widsið*, 35) and son of Garmund (*Beowulf*, 1963). He married the beautiful but somewhat intractable Ðryðo (*Beowulf*, 1950) and had a son named Eomær (*Beowulf*, 1961). He is, of course, to be distinguished from the Mercian king commonly known as Offa II, who lived in the eighth century, though the story with which we are concerned has been transferred in modified form to the latter, as we shall see.

The English tradition in regard to Offa's youth is preserved in the *Vitæ Offarum* written at St. Albans toward the end of the twelfth century (Müllenhoff, p. 77), and afterward used in the compilation of Matthew Paris' *Chronica Majora* (Suchier, "Sage von Offa und Ðryðo," Paul und Braune's *Beiträge*, iv, 507). The *Vitæ* are printed in Wats' edition of Matthew Paris, but not by Luard in the Master of Rolls' series. Offa I, son of Garmund, is said to have been both blind and dumb from birth. The former affliction continued to his seventeenth year, the latter to his thirtieth. Though a man of great strength he was considered unfit for the royal succession because of his disabilities. At length when the king was old the nobles demanded that he abdicate, and on his refusal collected a great army of malcontents. At a council which had been called by the king to consider the situation, Offa suddenly spoke and offered to oppose the rebel force. When the old king had girded him with his sword and placed him at the head of the army, he put the rebels to flight and killed the two sons of their leader with his own hand. Offa II similarly is said to have been lame, dumb, and blind in his youth, but he recovered the use of his legs, tongue, and eyes simultaneously when the usurper Beornred began to oppress the land (Müllenhoff, p. 77). It is, of course, evident that the latter story is simply a modified version of the former and is due to a confusion between the two Offas.

The Danish tradition concerning Uffo (Uffi) differs very little from the English except in the matter of the battle which followed the hero's recovery. According to the account of Sven Ågesen, Uffi, son of Wermund, was dumb to his thirtieth year. In the *Annales Ryenses* he is represented as dumb from his seventeenth to his thirtieth year (Müllenhoff, p. 77). As will be seen, the resemblance between these versions and that of the *Vita Offæ* is strong. The differences appear to be purely fortuitous, though, as Müllenhoff remarks, it is

not necessary to argue any immediate and bookish connection between the two versions.

Indeed, that the Danish accounts like the English sprang from popular tradition seems the more probable since Saxo Grammaticus (lib. iv, §§ 32–35, ed. Holder, p. 106 ff.) agrees with the other Danish versions in the account of Uffo's battle, but gives no details as to the hero's age when he came to himself. Saxo says that Uffo, son of Wermund, was thought dull of wit in his youth and never spoke, though he surpassed all his companions in stature. When Wermund was old and was losing his sight, the King of Saxony sent envoys to demand that he give up the kingdom or let their sons fight in single combat for the realm. In the midst of the consternation which ensued Uffo, who chanced to be present at the reception of the envoys, sought permission to speak, "subitoque velut ex muto vocalis evasit." He offered to fight not only the king's son, but at the same time any other warrior who might be chosen from the enemy. Accordingly he fought the two champions on an island in the Eider and vanquished them, while his father watched the battle from a bridge. So he won his kingdom. This is the tale popularized by Uhland in his ballad *Der blinde König*.

We have thus a well-established Germanic tradition told with apparent independence by two branches of the race. It is unlikely, to say the least, that it was borrowed from the Classical story. Let us look at the Irish tale.

O'Curry (*Lectures on the Manuscript Materials of Ancient Irish History*, p. 252 ff.) summarizes this, but unfortunately he makes no clear statement as to the source from which he took it. From the reference to the *Book of Leinster* on p. 251, however, and from the fact that in an appendix (p. 587) he gives the same title—"The Navigation of Labhraidh"—in his list of "historic tales" contained in that MS., it is probable that he has summarized the account there related. In a note (p. 587, note 156) he indicates that the story is also found in the *Yellow Book of Lecain*, a MS. written toward the end of the fourteenth century. The *Book of Leinster* dates from the first half of the twelfth century.

According to O'Curry's summary Labhraidh Maen or Labhraidh Loingseach (L. the Voyager) was the grandson of Laeghairé Lorc, who ruled over all Erinn in the sixth century B. C. Laeghairé Lorc was killed two years after his accession by his brother Cobhthach Cael Breagh, who usurped the throne of Erinn. The kingdom of Leinster, however, came into the possession of Ailill Ainé, eldest son of Laeghairé Lorc. Soon afterwards he in turn was slain by Cobhthach and left an infant son named Maen Ollamh. This child was spared by the usurper because he was dumb and, therefore, ineligible to the kingship. He was placed in the care of two officers of the court of Tara, Ferceirtné the poet and philosopher, and Craftiné the harper.

Maen in the course of years grew into manhood

> "singularly distinguished by beauty of feature, symmetry of person, and cultivation of mind. One day, however, it happened that while enjoying his usual sports in the play-ground of his father's mansion he received some offense from one of his companions. The insult was promptly resented by a blow; and, in the attempt to suit words to the action, the spell of his dumbness was broken, and the young man spoke. The quarrel was lost in an exclamation of joy raised by his companions, when they all cried out 'Labhraidh Maen! Labhraidh Maen!' ('Maen speaks! Maen speaks!'); and his tutor coming up at the same time, and hearing what had happened, said that henceforth the prince should bear the name of *Labhraidh Maen*, in commemoration of the wonderful event."

When the news came to Cobhthach at Tara the prince and his tutors were promptly banished. After various adventures Labhraidh slew Cobhthach and took possession of the kingdom.

Curiously enough in the *Yellow Book of Lecain* the Midas story of the horse's ears is told of *Labraid Lorc* (cf. *Rev. Celt.* ii, 197). This name appears to indicate some confusion between the grandfather and grandson of our tale, though there is little doubt that the Midas story belongs to Labhraidh Maen, since it is elsewhere told of Labhraidh Loingseach (cf. *Rev. Celt.* ii, 507) which as we have already seen is but another name for our hero. The parallel versions of this story told of March ab Meirchion, the Lord of Castellmarch, etc., need be mentioned only in passing. It is sufficient for our purpose to notice that Welsh and Breton equivalents are in existence. For

further treatment, see Rhŷs, *Celtic Folklore*, p. 231, and Grimm, *Kleinere Schriften*, iv, p. 216.

Though Mr. Alfred Nutt, in commenting upon the likeness of the two stories told about Labhraidh Maen to those of Croesus' son and Midas, expresses his fear that Labhraidh was simply a "convenient person to whom classical legends might safely be attributed" ("The Aryan Expulsion and Return Formula," *Folk-Lore Record*, vol. iv, p. 33, note), it seems scarcely probable that the tale of his recovery of speech can be regarded as borrowed from the Classics. Indeed, it bears less resemblance to the Greek tale than does the story of Offa. In the first place Labhraidh was an orphan; and Offa, like the Lydian prince, had a father of advanced age. Moreover, as in Herodotus, it was to save his father that the hero of the Germanic tale spoke. In the Irish story it was anger in a quarrel that loosed Labhraidh's tongue. Yet the two stories, Celtic and Germanic, have the characteristic in common that the hero wins a kingdom more or less indirectly through the recovery of his voice. In this they differ from the tale of Croesus' son. If, then, as seems probable, the story concerning Offa is a genuine Germanic tradition is it not likely that the Irish tale was borrowed by the Celtic from that source?

The somewhat scanty evidence that such was the case may be formulated thus. 1. Both the Germanic and the Irish stories, as I have just pointed out, differ from their Classical prototype and agree with each other in one essential point. 2. This agreement shows that the two could not be independent borrowings. Now the fact that the *Book of Leinster* dates from the first half of the twelfth century, and is therefore older than the English and Danish accounts which are preserved, shows that the Offa story could not have been a Classical turn due to the learning of clerics who wrote late in the century. The opposite view, that the widespread Germanic story came from Ireland, need not, I think, be seriously considered. 3. The Germanic influence on Irish saga has been shown to be considerable even in the case of the earlier cycles. Even if one does not accept all the theories of Prof. Zimmer (cf. *Gött. gel. Anzeigen*, 1890, p. 785 ff.; *Zts. für deutsches Alterthum*, 1891, p. 1 ff.), it cannot be doubted that even the Cuchulinn saga was to some extent modified by the Scandinavian invasion. 4. The story of Labhraidh Maen's youth is not found, to my knowledge, in any Irish collection earlier than the *Book of Leinster*, that is, earlier than the twelfth century. At that period the Scandinavian influence, whatever it was, had had more than two hundred years in which to alter Celtic saga—time enough certainly for an attractive story to attach itself with some change to a king of reputed valor and convenient remoteness. 5. Unlike the Midas story, which is also told of Labhraidh Maen, this tale of his youth is not told of any other Celtic hero either in Wales or in Brittany so far as I know. 6. Even if it be denied that Scandinavians from the Continent carried the story to Ireland, might it not have come from England, which had its legend of Offa's youth? We know the intimate relations between Ireland and the north of England which existed in the time of Olaf Godfreyson and his cousin Olaf Sytrygson during the tenth century. The identity of Offa and Uffi precludes the possibility that the tale was brought to England from Ireland after it had been transplanted there by the Northmen. The converse might, however, be true. I hold no brief for any particular Germanic family as transmitter of the story.

In conclusion I wish to say that I offer this suggestion as to the relations between the stories of Offa and Labhraidh Maen with all humility. Someone with a wider knowledge of Germanic and Celtic literature may be able to offer a better solution to the problem of the relationship. The evidence here adduced scarcely proves, though I think it renders probable, my conjecture that the Irish tale came from the Germanic tradition.

GORDON H. GEROULD.
*Bryn Mawr College.*

---

## *THE LEODILLA EPISODE IN BOJARDO'S ORLANDO INNAMORATO.*

(*I, xx-xxii.*) II.

THIS immediately attracts the attention to the *Miles Gloriosus* of Plautus, the plot of which is similar in many respects to this story, especially in the first two acts. Pleusicles is in love

with Philocomasium, a courtesan of Athens, who returns his affection. But during the absence of her lover, a captain of Ephesus, Pyrgopolinices by name, comes and having won the favor of the mother carries off Philocomasium much against her will. The servant of Pleusicles, Palestrio, learning of this goes in search of her. His ship is captured by pirates and he is given as a servant to the captain Pyrgopolinices. He talks with Philocomasium, who informs him that she hates her master cordially, and that she would gladly return to Athens. Palestrio writes to his master who comes forthwith and lodges in the house of Periplecomenus, which adjoins that of the braggart captain. The servant then makes a passage through the house-wall so that the two lovers can meet each other. Sceledrus, another servant of the Captain's who is entrusted with the watching of Philocomasium, is chasing a monkey along the roof and looking through the skylight sees Philocomasium in the room of Pleusicles. The case is critical. It is Palestrio's business to extricate them from their difficulty. He brings this about in practically the same way that Leodilla and Ordauro deceive Folderico. He invents the story of the twin sister who has come to look for her twin. Act ii, v. 237.

PALESTRIO. Nunc sic rationem incipissam, hanc instituam astutiam:
Ad Philocomasium huc sororem geminam germanam alteram
Dicam Athenis aduenisse cum amatore aliquo suo,
Tam similem quam lacte lactist: aput te eos hic deuortier
PERIPLECOMENUS. Dicam hospito. Euge, euge, lepide: laudo commentum tuum.
PALESTRIO. Vt, si illanc concriminatus sit aduorsum militem
Meus conseruos, (se) eam uidisse hic cum alicuo auscularier,
Arguam (hanc) uidisse aput te contra conseruom meum
Cum suo amatore amplexantem atquo auscultantem.

Sceledrus is extremely incredulous, but after having seen Philocomasium in both houses wearing different dresses and after she has appeared to him coming from both houses in a manner quite incomprehensible to him (since he knows nothing of the passage), he comes to the conclusion that he did not see what he did see, as Palestrio puts it. The resemblance in these points is striking and there are some other similarities which suggest that Bojardo was influenced by the Latin comedy in the composition of his narrative. In both cases the lady is tricked and carried off against her will by a ridiculous person whom she despises so that there is good reason for the watchfulness of the husband in the one case, and that of the slave in the other. In both cases, too, the lover follows his mistress from a distance, and both find a similar means of approaching her. Both agree in omitting the episode of the ring, or the clothes of the Latin version, as a preparatory step to the deceit which is to follow. The idea of the banquet seems without any doubt to have been taken from the *Sette Savi*, although Sceledrus too goes into the house of Periplecomenus, where he sees the two lovers together, v. 519 sq., whereupon he hastens back to his master's house where he sees her, she having returned to her room by the passage through the wall.

The incredulity of Sceledrus resembles much more closely the obstinacy of Folderico in believing the verdict of his senses than the mild behavior of the husband in the *Libro dei Sette Savi*. Thus Sceledrus, v. 345 sq.

Agedum ergo face. uolo scire, utrum egone id. quod uidi uiderim
An illic faciat quod facturum dicit, ut ea sit domi.
Nam ego quidem meos oculos habeo nec rogo utendos foris.
Set hic illi supparasitatur semper: hic eae proxumust:
Primus ad cibum uocatur, primo (ei) pulmentum datur.
Nam illic noster est fortasse circiter triennium:
Nec quoiquam (alii) quam illi in nostra meliust famulo familia.
Set ego hoc quod ago, id me agere oportet: hoc opseruare ostium.
Si hic opsistam, hac quidem pol certo uerba mihi numquam dabunt.

It is not till he has seen Philocomasium appear in and coming from both houses several times that he will admit that she whom he has seen is really the twin sister. So Folderico:

37. . . . . .
Diceva il vecchio: non mi vender foglie,
Chè io vedo pur di certo e non son cieco,
Che questa è veramente la mia moglie;
Ma pur, per non parer pazzo ostinato,
Vado a la torre e mo sarò tornato.

Finally according to Leodilla he is convinced;

44. Cosl più volte in diversa maniera
Al modo sopradetto fui mostrata,
E sl fuor di sospetto il geloso era,
Che spesso mi appellava per cognata.

As Sceledrus bursts from the house where he

has been to see the supposed twin to Philocomasium he exclaims, v. 529 sq.:

Pro di immortales, similiorem mulierem
Magisque eandem, (tam) quæ non sit eadem, non reor
Deos facere posse.

This recalls the exclamation of Folderico as he enters his wife's chamber on returning from the banquet of Ordauro's in the last verses of the thirty-ninth stanza and the first of the fortieth.

Come fu dentro ed ebbemi veduta,
Maravigliossi e disse: Iddio mi aiuta.
40. Chi avria creduto mai tal maraviglia,
Nè che tanto potesse la natura,
Ch'nna germana sl l'altra simiglia
Di viso, di fazion e di statura?

Palestrio had thus outlined Philocomasium's course of conduct, v. 186:

Vt eum qui se hic uidit uerbis uincat ne is se uiderit.
Qui arguat se, eum contra uincat iure iurando suo.
Si quidem centiens hic uisa sit, tamen infitias eat.

This is just what Leodilla does when Folderico accuses her of leaving the castle:

42. Ora non dimandar com'io giurava
Il ciel e i suoi pianeti tutti quanti;
Quel si fa per ben, Dio non aggrava,
Anzi ride al spergiuro degli amanti,
Cosl ti dico, ch'io non dubitava
Giurare e l'alcorano e i libri santi,
Che da poi ch'era entrata in quel girone,
Non era uscita per nulla stagione.

The *Miles Gloriosus* must have been at least as familiar to Bojardo as the *Libro dei Sette Savi*. According to Reinhardtstoettner (*Plautus*, pp. 18–19) the manuscript containing the *Miles Gloriosus* was discovered in 1428 or 1429 by Nicolaus of Trier. In the year 1472 the Editio Princeps appeared, or about ten years before the first two books of the *Orlando Innamorato* were completed. Among the princes who promoted the studies leading to the Renaissance none were more zealous than Ercole I., Prince of Ferrara, who took especial delight in having the plays of Plautus represented in his theatre. In 1486 he had the *Menæchmi* given, and there is a tradition that he translated it himself. The *Amphitrio* was given in 1487 and 1491 in the version of Collenuccio. Gregorovius says of him in his *Lucrezia Borgia* i, 227:

"Er war einer der leidenschaftlichsten Begründer des Renaissancetheaters. Er hatte schon viele Jahre zuvor von Dichtern an seinem Hofe Stücke des Plautus und Terenz in terza rime übersetzen and dann aufführen lassen. Guarino, Berrardo, Collenuccio, selbst Bojardo, haben für ihn zu diesem Zwecke gearbeitet."

For Bojardo's activity in this line of work see also D'Ancona, *Origini del Teatro Italiani*, ii, 135 sq. While we do not know of any special comedy of Plautus which Bojardo translated or popularized in this way, it is certain that he did work of this kind, for there is a play or representation of which he is the author, and on its title-page it bears this inscription:

"Commedia del Magnifico Conte Matteo Maria Bojardo, conte di Scandiano, tradotta da un Dialogo di Luciano, a compiacenza dello Illustrissimo Principe signor Ercole Estense Duca di Ferrara."

There is then every reason for believing that Bojardo was well acquainted with the *Miles Gloriosus*. Hence, instead of believing with D'Ancona (cf. edition, p. 120) that Bojardo has made of the *Moglie Involata* of the *Libro dei Sette Savi* the episode of Folderico and Ordauro ("Il Bojardo ne ha fatto l'episodio del vecchio Folderico e di Ordauro"), we should rather hold that this episode is a welding together of the two elements, the Classical and the popular; the poet adding much of his own native material in the characterization of the personages. Such a fusion is quite in harmony with the spirit of the Bojardesque narrative.

However, Leodilla's troubles were not over even after she had succeded so well in getting away from her detestable husband. For the second day as they were riding joyfully along their way they perceive a page who is fleeing at full speed before a villain who is evidently trying to kill him with his lance. The page is in great distress calling for aid. Ordauro is moved to pity and starts out to save the boy. But the chase is long and takes him away from his mistress. No sooner has he disappeared than Folderico appears with a large force of armed men and Leodilla again becomes his prey. This treacherous device is sometimes met with in the old Romances of Adventures; so, for example, in the *Lancelot* which I have to quote from the *Romans de la Table Ronde mis en nouveau langage par Paulin Paris*, vol. 4, p. 60:

"Nos quatre chevaliers demeurent en aguet, et bientôt Lancelot entend la pucelle crier: 'A l'aide! à l'aide!' Il s'élance dans le courtil et voit à peu de distance vingt fer-armés qui attaquent deux chevaliers couverts des armes du roi Artus et de Galeriet. Il broche vers eux; mais ceux qu'il venait défendre le saisissent et le font tomber de cheval .... Le même piège

attendait Hector et messire Gauvain. Désarmés à leur tour, ils sont liés et conduits dans une grande geôle où ils eurent tout le temps de maudire la messagère de la perfide magicienne.

As Folderico is carrying her away by a long detour through a dark valley to escape Ordauro, the three giants appear, kill the husband, and in this state she is rescued by the knights Orlando and Brandimarte in the manner already seen.

The three cantos containing the Leodilla episode represent in miniature the whole work. A romantic episode is introduced, then interrupted to give place to a description of the battle between Rinaldo and the champions of the traitor Truffaldino—quite in the style of those battles which the vassals of Charlemagne were in the habit of fighting. The story is then resumed, blended together out of Classical and popular elements, and ends with the introduction of new adventures—Brandimarte's pursuit of the stag. He disappears and the canto comes to an end.

COLBERT SEARLES.

*Leland Stanford Jr. University.*

## *GOLDSMITH AND THE NOTIONS Grille AND Wandrer IN WERTHERS LEIDEN.* II.

IT may still further be shown that actual thoughts and feelings of the sentimental young author in regard to Lotte Buff found an echo both in his own and in Goldsmith's poem. After Charlotte's wedding, he wrote in May, 1773, to Kestner that a poem of his would appear in the (Göttinger) *Musenalmanach*, which no one should better understand than Kestner and his young wife; that it bore the title, *Der Wandrer*, and began: "Gott segne dich iunge Frau." On Sept. 15th of the same year, he mentioned in another letter to Kestner the page of the almanac where the latter would find the poem, adding: "er binde es Lotten ans Herz." He then remarks: "Du wirst unter der Allegorie Lotten und mich, und was ich so hunderttausendmal bey ihr gefühlt erkennen." The *Wandrer* of the allegory is, accordingly, Goethe himself, and Lotte Kestner the young wife upon whom he invokes a blessing. Before becoming enamored of Lotte, he had, moreover, sent a copy of the poem to Herder's sweetheart, Caroline Flachsland, who was greatly delighted with it. It may be safely assumed that the sight of these happy young couples kindled in his heart a desire to follow their example. This was at that time the wish of his parents. That he was himself disposed to wed is proved by his engagement to Lili in 1775, the year after the publication of *Werther*.

Let us now compare the two poems, and we shall easily recognize the thoughts and feelings that animated the young poet at that time. The sight of a young peasant wife and her cottage built amid the ruins of an ancient Roman temple of Venus, awakens in the heart of Goethe's wandering stranger the longing that he, on his return home, might also be welcomed in his cottage by such a wife:—

> Und kehr' ich dann am Abend heim
> Zur Hütte, vergnüldet
> Vom letzten Sonnenstral,
> Lass mich empfangen solch ein Weib
> Den Knaben auf dem Arm!

In his wanderings in foreign parts, Goldsmith's Traveller finds very similar scenes of simple, domestic happiness. In Italy, his attention is arrested by a peasant's cot amid the ruins of the palaces of the Roman emperors:—

> As in those domes, where Cæsars once bore sway,
> Defaced by time and tottering in decay,
> There in the ruin heedless of the dead,
> The shelter-seeking peasant builds his shed:
> And, wondering man could want the larger pile,
> Exults, and owns his cottage with a smile.

In Switzerland, his heart is gladdened on beholding its contented peasant life:—

> At night returning, every labour sped,
> He sits him down the monarch of a shed;
> Smiles by his cheerful fire, and round surveys
> His children's looks, that brighten at the blaze;
> While his loved partner, boastful of her hoard,
> Displays her cleanly platter on the board;
> And haply too some pilgrim, thither led,
> With many a tale repays the nightly bed.

Like Goethe's *Wandrer*, the Traveller returns home with the conviction that in every land man's true happiness does not depend upon laws and rulers, but is to be found in the quiet joys of family life:—

> Vain, very vain, my weary search to find
> That bliss which only centres in the mind:[5]
> Why have I strayed from pleasure and repose,
> To seek a good each government bestows?
> . . . . . .
> Still to ourselves in every place consigned,

5 "Ach so gewiss ist's, dass unser Herz allein sein Glück macht," Werther exclaims (WA., p. 62).

Our own felicity we make or find:
With secret course, which no loud storms annoy,
Glides the smooth current of domestic joy.

To show how exactly the young Goethe's social and political standpoint coincided with that of Goldsmith, I will add the following quotation from a review written by him in 1772 (DjG., vol. 2, p. 429):—

"Wenn wir einen Platz in der Welt finden, da mit unsern Besitztümern zu ruhen, ein Feld uns zu nähren, ein Haus uns zu decken, haben wir da nicht Vaterland? Und haben das nicht tausend und tausende in jedem Staat? und leben sie nicht in dieser Beschränkung glücklich?"

The frequent use of contrast is perhaps the most striking characteristic of Goldsmith's technique. The rhetorical device is employed again and again in all three of his chief productions: in the *Traveller*, the *Deserted Village* and the *Vicar of Wakefield*. In all three, the contrast between the restless, discontented life of the wanderer and the contentment and domestic felicity of the cottager, plays an important part.

Let us now turn again to *Werther*. In the first book (Am 21. Junius), we read the following meditation upon the two contrasting tendencies in human life:—

"Lieber Wilhelm, ich habe allerlei nachgedacht über die Begier im Menschen sich auszubreiten, neue Entdeckungen zu machen, *herumzuschweifen;* und dann wieder über den innern Trieb, sich der Einschränkung willig zu ergeben, in dem Gleise der Gewohnheit so hinzufahren, und sich weder um Rechts noch um Links zu bekümmern" (WA., p. 38).

But his reflection is not based on the observation of others alone; it is the result of his own experience. He is himself a *Wandrer:*—

"Wie oft habe ich das Jagdhaus, das nun alle meine Wünsche einschliesst, *auf meinen weiten Wanderungen*, bald vom Berge, bald von der Ebene über den Fluss gesehen" (WA., p. 38).

Again, in the second book (Am 9. Mai), looking back upon his life, the returning wanderer tells us:—

"Damals sehnte ich mich in glücklicher Unwissenheit hinaus in die unbekannte Welt, wo ich für mein Herz so viele Nahrung, so vielen Genuss hoffte, meinen strebenden, sehnenden Busen auszufüllen und zu befriedigen" (WA., p. 108).

Like Goldsmith's Traveller and Goethe's *Wandrer*, like Burchell in the *Vicar of Wakefield* and the youthful Goethe himself in Sesenheim, Werther's heart is touched on beholding the simple, domestic joys of the humble cottager, whom he discovers on his *Wanderungen*. Of the schoolmaster's daughter in his favorite village, the rambling hero writes:—

"Ich sage dir, mein Schatz, wenn meine Sinne gar nicht mehr halten wollen, so lindert all den Tumult der Anblick eines solchen Geschöpfs, das in glücklicher Gelassenheit den engen Kreis seines Daseins hingeht, von einem Tage zum andern sich durchhilft, die Blätter abfallen sieht, und nichts dabei denkt, als dass der Winter kommt" (WA., p. 20).

Why so? For the reason that he himself sometimes feels the desire to relinquish his roving life and "sich der Einschränkung willig zu ergehen." The proof of this is found in a letter of the second book (Am 20. Januar). Werther leaves the town, the "traurige Nest," and renews once more his wanderings. He takes refuge from a heavy storm in a "geringe Bauernherberge"; and here he writes to Lotte:—

"und jetzt in dieser Hütte, in dieser Einsamkeit, in dieser Einschränkung, da Schnee und Schlossen wider mein Fensterchen wüthen, hier waren Sie mein erster Gedanke. Wie ich hereintrat, überfiel mich Ihre Gestalt, Ihr Andenken, Lotte! so heilig, so warm! Guter Gott! Der erste glückliche Augenblick wieder" (WA., p. 96).

Why do *Hütte* and *Einschränkung* remind him at once of Lotte? Because of his longing to call Lotte his own and to share a cot with her.

Yet Werther's soul, like that of Goldsmith's Traveller, is darkened by pessimistic thoughts of the vanity of all things earthly. Compare the following three quotations. With regard to the literature of England as the external occasion of the "Lebensüberdruss" prevalent among the young men of Germany in the Werther period, Goethe writes in DW. (WA., I., vol. 28, p. 213):—

"und wohin kann der Ernst weiter führen, als zur Betrachtung der Vergänglichkeit und des Unwerths aller irdischen Dinge."

Of the melancholy works in question Goethe mentions especially Goldsmith's *Traveller*, in in which stand these lines:—

But me, not destined such delights to share,
My prime of life in wandering spent and care;
Impelled, with steps unceasing, to pursue
*Some fleeting good, that mocks me with the view:*
*That, like the circle bounding earth and skies,*
*Allures from far, yet, as I follow, flies:*
My fortune leads to traverse realms alone,
And find no spot of all the world my own.

In a letter (Am 21. Junius) already cited, which contains several other reminiscences of the *Traveller*, we read:—

"O es ist mit der Ferne wie mit der Zukunft! Ein grosses dämmerndes Ganzes ruht vor unserer Seele, unsere Empfindung verschwimmt darin wie unser Auge, und wir sehnen uns, ach! unser ganzes Wesen hinzugeben, uns mit aller Wonne eines einzigen, grossen, herrlichen Gefühls ausfüllen zu lassen.—Und ach! wenn wir hinzueilen, wenn das Dort nun Hier wird, ist alles vor wie nach, und wir stehen in unserer Armuth, in unserer Eingeschränktheit und unsere Seele lechzt nach entschlüpftem Labsale" (WA., p. 39).

Traveller, wanderer, pilgrim, vagabond are Goldsmith's terms for the same general conception, whose prototype was himself. His wanderer George in the *Vicar* (Chap. 20) entitles the narrative of his travels: "The History of a Philosophic Vagabond, pursuing Novelty, but losing Contentment."[6] Werther's terms are *Wandrer*, *Umherschweifender*, *Herumlaufender*, *in der Irre Herumziehender*, *Waller*, *Pilger*, *Pilgrim*, *Vagabund*. The letter of June 21 contains the following meditation—clearly a reminiscence of the *Traveller*—upon the wanderer returning to his cot:—

"So sehnt sich der unruhigste Vagabund zuletzt wieder nach seinem Vaterlande, und findet in seiner Hütte, an der Brust seiner Gattin, in dem Kreise seiner Kinder, in den Geschäften zu ihrer Erhaltung die Wonne, die er in der weiten Welt vergebens suchte" (WA., p. 39).

And Werther himself is a returning wanderer. Like the dejected wayfarer of the *Traveller*, above all of the *Deserted Village*, he revisits as a lone and melancholy pilgrim the scenes of his boyhood. He writes (cf. above, p. 11):—

"Ich habe die Wallfahrt nach meiner Heimat mit aller Andacht eines Pilgrims vollendet, . . . . . Damals sehnte ich mich hinaus in die unbekannte Welt, . . . . . *Jetzt komme ich zurück aus der weiten Welt*" (WA., p. 108).

The letter just quoted (Am 9. Mai) is, as I have said above, replete with reminiscences of Goldsmith, especially of the *Deserted Village*. Another passage in Goethe's own account of the part played by English literature in producing the gloomy spirit of those times of which Werther is an embodiment, runs:—

"und selbst der heitere Goldsmith verliert sich in elegische Empfindungen, wenn uns sein *Deserted Village* ein verlorenes Paradies, das sein *Traveller* auf der ganzen Erde wiedersucht, so lieblich als traurig darstellt."

According to this, elegiac thoughts and feelings that are to be referred to Goldsmith's pathetic poem, should be sought in our novel; and, in fact, several such are found in the letter of May 9.

In the first place, the general conception is in both cases the same—that of the wanderer returning from the wide word, sorrowful and dejected, to his birthplace. This is proved by the opening lines of the letter as just quoted.

Secondly, the wanderer returns in both cases, not to the domestic joys of which he dreamed, but with many disappointed hopes: "O mein Freund! *mit wie viel fehlgeschlagenen Hoffnungen, mit wie viel zerstörten Planen!*" In the *Deserted Village* we read:—

> In all my wanderings round this world of care,
> In all my griefs—and God has given my share—
> *I still had hopes* my latest hours to crown,
> Amidst these humble bowers to lay me down;
> . . . . . .
> And, as a hare, whom hounds and horns pursue,
> Pants to the place from whence at first he flew,
> *I still had hopes*, my long vexations past,
> Here to return—and die at home at last.

Thirdly, the reawakened remembrance of the past kindles in the hearts of both an emotion of tender melancholy:—

"An der grossen Linde, die eine Viertelstunde vor der Stadt nach L . . . zu steht, liess ich halten, stieg aus und hiess den Postillon fortfahren, *um zu Fusse jede Erinnerung ganz und lebhaft, nach meinem Herzen zu kosten.*"

Compare this with the following lines:—

> Here, as I take my solitary rounds,
> Amidst thy tangling walks and ruined grounds,
> And, many a year elapsed, return to view
> Where once the cottage stood, the hawthorn grew,
> *Remembrance wakes with all her busy train,*
> *Swells at my breast, and turns the past to pain.*

Fourthly, characteristic objects singled out by Werther in fond remembrance are the same as such found in the *Deserted Village*. These are:—

*The Tree.* For *Werther*, see the passage quoted above. So the *Deserted Village*:—

> How often have I blessed the coming day,
> When toil remitting lent its turn to play,
> And all the village train, from labour free,
> Led up their sports *beneath the spreading tree*,
> . . . . . .

*The School.* *Werther*:—

6 A lack of contentment was also a fault of the wanderer Werther, who in the first letter of the second book exclaims: "Guter Gott, der du mir das alles schenktest, warum hieltest du nicht die Hälfte zurück, und gabst mir Selbstvertrauen und Genügsamkeit."

"Im Hingehen bemerkte ich, dass *die Schulstube*, wo ein ehrliches altes Weib unsere Kindheit zusammengepfercht hatte, in einen Kramladen verwandelt war. Ich erinnerte mich der Unruhe, der Thränen, der Dumpfheit des Sinnes, der Herzensangst, die ich in dem Loche ausgestanden hatte."

*Deserted Village*:—

Beside yon straggling fence that skirts the way,
With blossomed furze unprofitably gay,
There, in his noisy mansion, skilled to rule,
*The village master taught his little school:*
A man severe he was, and stern to view,
I knew him well, and every truant knew;
Well had the boding tremblers learned to trace
The day's disasters in his morning face;
. . . . . .

*The Cottage*. The article is here used in the generic sense. The cottage is, as well as the tree and the school, a typical feature of the two birthplaces, both which are scenes of rural simplicity. Werther:

"Ich kam der Stadt näher; *alle die alten Gartenhäuschen wurden von mir gegrüsst*, die neuen waren mir zuwider, so auch alle Veränderungen, die man sonst vorgenommen hatte."

Goldsmith's returning wanderer refers in general to "the sheltered cot," and describes in particular that of the village preacher:—

Near yonder copse, *where once the garden smiled*,
And still where many a garden flower grows wild;
There, where a few torn shrubs the place disclose,
*The village preacher's modest mansion rose.*

Fifthly, Werther's narrative of his visit to the home of his early years closes with an earnest remark concerning the *Vergänglichkeit* and the *Unwerth des Lebens*, which is in part a verbal rendering of two oft-quoted lines of Goldsmith. The hero's words are: "Der Mensch braucht nur wenige Erdschollen, um drauf zu geniessen, weniger, um drunter zu ruhen." Compare herewith:—

Then, pilgrim, turn, thy cares forego;
All earth-born cares are wrong:
*Man wants but little here below,*
*Nor wants that little long.*

The stanza is from the ballad now known as the *Hermit*, formerly styled *Edwin and Angelina*, upon which Goethe based his *Erwin und Elmire*, published in 1775 in Jacobi's *Iris* —a proof that the ballad must at that time have been familiar to him. In the translation of the *Deserted Village*, he vied with his friend Gotter in Wetzlar in 1772, but was dissatisfied with his effort because of the difficulty, if not the impossibility, of preserving the *zarte Bedeutsamkeit* of the original. Werther's letter of May 9, even unsupported by the testimony of DW., is in itself sufficient proof that Herder's young pupil was touched by the sweet melancholy of Goldsmith. In this letter Werther describes himself as a *Waller* to his earthly *Heimat*. In the next (Am 25. Mai), he tells of his *Grille* of going, like Goldsmith's wanderer George, into the army. In the one following this (Am 11. Julius), he writes of his intention "wieder in der Irre herumzuziehen." Then comes that of July 16, in which he exclaims: "Ja wohl bin ich ein Wandrer, ein Waller auf der Erde!" Here is no *Abgerissenheit*, but a perfectly logical sequence. The hero regards himself not only as a pilgrim to his heavenly home, but also as such when returning to his home on earth; and, in the latter case, the tender pathos of his story is due not a little to the influence of the kind-hearted, though unfortunate and impecunious, Irish poet, Oliver Goldsmith.

ROBERT FERGUSON.
*New York.*

## *OLD ENGLISH NOTES.*

### 1. *Beowulf* 1408 ff.

THE passage in *Beowulf* descriptive of the abode of Grendel's mother, though much more elaborated, suggests a couple of lines in Seneca (*Herc. Fur.* 762–3):

Ferale tardis imminet saxum vadis,
Stupent ubi undæ, segne torpescit fretum,

which has thus been translated by Dr. Ella I. Harris:

A savage cliff o'erhangs
The stagnant shallows, where the waves move not,
And where the lazy waters ever sleep.

Virgil's description of his infernal river (*Æn.* 6. 296–7):

Turbidus hic cæno vastaque voragine gurges,
Æstuat atque omnem Cocyto eructat harenam.

suggests the 'gedrēfed' of *Beow.* 1417. With these Virgil lines Harper and Miller, *Æneid*, compare Shelley, *Sensitive Plant* 3. 70–73:

Spawn, weeds, and filth, a leprous scum,
Made the running rivulet thick and dumb,
And at its outlet flags huge as stakes
Dammed it up with roots knotted like water-snakes.

There can, of course, be no connection; but Shelley's 'water-snakes' suggest the 'wyrmcynnes fela' and 'sellice sǣdracan' of *Beow.* 1425–6. The whole context in Shelley should be compared; here, however, there is no overhanging cliff, as in *Beowulf* and Seneca. In the *Odyssey* (10. 515) 'there is a rock, and the

meeting of the two roaring waters;' and, as we have the 'fyrgenbēamas' the 'wynlēasne wudu' of *Beowulf* (1413, 1416), so there are in the *Odyssey* (10. 509–510) 'the groves of Persephone, even tall poplar trees and willows that shed their fruit before the season,' even as the *Æneid* has its 'forest gloom' (6. 238), and its 'elm, shadowy, vast, spreading out its boughs and aged arms (6. 282-3).' Dante (*Inf.* 3) helps us but little; his scene is quite different. Plato is not so wholly dissimilar (*Phædo* 112, 113), with his 'lake . . . boiling with water and mud,' and his 'wild and savage region' near the Styx. We might also, in a general way, compare Catullus (17. 10–11):

> Verum totius ut lacus putidæque paludis
> Lividissima maximeque est profunda vorago.

---

## 2. *A CORRUPT WORD IN KING ALFRED'S Soliloquies.*

In King Alfred's translation of the *Soliloquies* of Augustine (*Englische Studien* 18. 341[1]) occur these words:

'Swā-swā scypes ho feut, þonne þæt scyp ungetǣslicost on ancre rīt and sēo sǣ hrēohost byð, ðonne wōt hē gewiss smelte wedere tōwærd.'

In this *ho feut*, of course, makes no sense. Cockayne (*Shrine*, p.205) says: 'Hofding, *chief, captain*, occurs in Chron. 1076, MS. Tiber. B. iv, and is probably meant here.' Hulme (*Die Sprache der Altenglischen Barubeitung der Soliloquien Augustins*, p. 58) proposes to read *hāsǣta*, since *ō* occurs elsewhere in this text for OE. regular *ā*, and *f* and *s* are occasionally interchanged. Hulme remarks that there is nothing to correspond in the Latin, that Thomson translates by 'the ship's master,' and that Bosworth-Toller falsely render *hāsǣta* by 'rower.' On this it is to be noted that Earle and Plummer translate by 'rower,' Hall by 'oarsman, rower,' and Sweet by 'rower in warship.'

I propose to read *hlāford*, basing the emendation upon the *scipes hlaford, sciphlaford*, of the Wright-Wülcker *Vocabularies*, 166. 6 and 181. 21, both translating *nauclerus*.

Albert S. Cook.

*Yale University.*

1 Since the above was written, Hargrove has silently adopted my emendation, which I suggested to him privately, in his edition (29. 20).

## *ETYMOLOGIES.*

### *Cheap, cope, coup, kaupatjan, caupo, κάπηλος, etc.* I.

In volume iii (p. 1379) of his dictionary Grimm suggested that *kaufen* was related to Gothic *kaupatjan* 'strike' and that the formal striking or shaking of the hands in sign of sealing a bargain was at the bottom of the change of the meaning from 'strike' to 'barter.' This position was assumed also by Weigand, Vigfusson, and others. It is interesting to read the treatment of the word in the various editions of Kluge's dictionary and to observe how from being at first an ardent advocate of the native origin of the word he has yielded step by step until he has removed from the sixth edition every trace of the fact that there are serious objections to the theory of the Latin origin. Skeat follows the earlier editions of Kluge and (see his *Concise Etymological Dictionary*, new edition, 1901) has not observed that he has abandoned his earlier position. Murray maintains a cautious attitude. In volume v. of the Grimm dictionary, Hildebrand associated the word with dialectic German *kauten* 'trade,' but added: "die sinnige ableitung J. Grimms von goth. *kaupatjan* könnte vielleicht daneben bestehen."

Those who abandon the association of Gothic *kaupōn* and *kaupatjan* have felt it incumbent upon them to explain *kaupatjan* and have been compelled to call various foreign languages to their aid. Kluge (first edition) derived it from Latin *colaphus* (see below), Bugge from Armenian *kop'em* 'dar delle busse' (see below and Uhlenbeck from a

"nominalstamm *kaupat-* = *haubiþ*, der von einem nicht-germ. volke mit vorgerm. consonantismus zu den Goten oder deren vorfahren gekommen war"!

It is my desire to bring forward evidence in favor of the theory so briefly set forth by Grimm, and to explain the ultimate origin of the words.

In speaking of such correspondences as LG. *piwit, tiwit, kiwit*, Hildebrand (vol. v, pp. 5–6) says:—

"Diese erscheinung nun, eine uralte bewegung in den consonanten, welche die der lautverschiebung kreuzend durchschneidet, und während jene einem schritt vorwärts gleicht, einem sprung zur seite zu vergleichen ist, zeigt sich

im gebiet der deutschen sprachen besonders entwickelt im auslaut der stämme und wurzeln, sie ist geradezu ein wichtiger behelf bei der aus- und weiterbildung der wurzeln."

I need not refer to earlier expressions of this idea, or to the recent exploitations of it. I desire only to urge that words that are attempts at linguistic imitation of sounds must be taken and dealt with by themselves, and cannot be used to strengthen any theory as to other words. Thus in *clap clapper*, *clack clacker*, *clat clatter*, it will not do to say that we have a common root *cla-* with the various determinatives *p*, *k*, and *t*; we simply have three slightly different attempts to imitate by means of a group of speech-sounds the complex sound heard when two bodies strike each other, —just as we have others in *knack*, *knock*, *clock*, OHG. *klockōn*, Du. *kloppen* (Ger. *klopfen*), Greek κολάπτω, κολάζω, κόλαφος, Latin *colaphus*, etc. So, too, *slick* and *slip; flip*, *flick*, *flutter*, and *flirt; tattle*, *cackle*, *prattle*, *chatter chat*, *blatter blat*, *blab*, and a thousand others.

A large and important class of these words consists of attempts to imitate the sound of a blow or of the impact of one body upon another. These words fall into groups according to the character of the impacting bodies and resultant sounds. Thus *flap*, *hnæppan*, *slap*, *spat*, *spank* belong together; as do also *thud*, *thump*, *bump*, *bunt;* and *swat*, *swap*, *whap*, *swack*, *whack*, *thwack*, etc. Another group contains words consisting of a back vowel preceded by *k* or *ch* and followed by some voiceless consonant, usually a stop. Thus, without looking beyond English dialects, we have: *chap* or *chop* 'strike,' 'chop,' *cut* 'strike,' 'cut,' *cuff* 'strike,' *coot* 'a beating,' *cop*[1] 'strike,' *cope* 'strike,' *coup* 'knock over;' not to mention *coop*, *cook*, *cuck*, *chuck*, all meaning to throw with force.

When, then, we find words like dialectic German *kauten* to 'swap' and *kaupen* to 'barter, or 'buy,' if we can make it reasonably sure that they are derived from imitative words meaning, for example, to 'strike,' we are justified in associating them,—not as variant derivatives from a common root, as Hildebrand would have us do,—but as similar formations only.

It is not difficult to show that there are various words that have the two meanings 'strike' and 'barter.' First of all, we have Gothic *kaupōn* 'barter' and *kaup-at-jan* 'strike,' 'cuff.' Corresponding to *kaupōn* we have ON. *kaupa* 'buy,' 'barter,' but its preterit tense corresponds in form to the preterit of Gothic *kaupatjan*, not to that of *kaupōn* (cf. Vigfusson). Moreover, *kaupatjan* passed into Finnish as *kaupata*, and there has the meaning 'offer for sale.' A closer identification of two words could hardly be asked for.—English *chap* and *chop* mean (1) 'strike,' 'cut with a blow,' (2) 'buy,' 'barter.' It might be said that *chap* was abstracted from *chapman*, a normal development of OE. *čēapman*; but this explanation cannot be resorted to in order to explain *chop* and is, therefore, probably not correct for *chap* either.—English *swap*, *swat*, *swack* mean to 'strike,' 'cut,' 'fall heavily,' and *swap* also means to 'barter,' 'exchange.'—German *kauzen* signifies to 'strike,' 'hack,' and MG. and LG. *kauten* has the meaning 'swap,' 'barter.'—English *rap* means to 'strike' and to 'exchange' or 'barter.'—Of English *cope*, *coup*, 'strike,' 'knock over,' 'barter,' I shall speak later.

It might be suggested that the idea 'strike' arose out of that of 'exchanging blows,' 'dealing out blows,' etc., and is, thus, secondary. We shall, however, see that several of the words for striking are imitative of the sound made by striking and, therefore, must have had the meaning 'strike' before they got that of 'barter,' 'buy,' etc. The idea of striking could develop into that of bartering in more than one way. First of all, one might imagine that ancient hucksters had a clapper (like that of the clapman, or public crier), as the modern huckster at times rings a bell. Then there is the hammer of the auctioneer. Grimm, as we have seen, suggested (Dictionary iii, p. 1379; cf. also *Deutsche Rechtsaltertümer*, ii, index) the striking of hands in sealing a bargain; and my colleague Prof. Drake has called my attention to the Roman custom of striking a slave or other property with a spear, later a wand, in sign of ownership.[2] It would not be strange if more than one of these possibilities had been effective. For Grimm's theory there is, however, so much evidence that we must recognize it as explaining practically all the Germanic words involved in the present discussion.

1 Cf Armenian *kop'em*, which Bugge suggested as a source of Gothic *kaupatjan* (see above). Such imitative words occur in all languages, but they have no more derivative relation to one another than have the *oh's* and *ah's* of different languages.

2 As Prof. Drake expects to investigate this matter farther, I forbear to deal with it.

Grimm (iii, p. 1379) referred to Ger. *kaufslagen* and ON. *slā kaupi*. We have also ON. *kaupslaga*, Du. *koopslagen*, Eng. *strike a bargain*, etc. It might be said that these terms all point to some connection between striking and bargaining, but that they do not prove that it was the striking together or shaking of hands that was referred to. Modern German and Modern English expressions, however, place this beyond all doubt. Compare the following German expressions taken from Sanders' dictionary.

*Einschlagen*='in die Hand schlagen,' namentlich in die dargereichte eines andern, besonders als Bekräftigung beim Abschluss eines Handels, Vertrags, einer Wette, etc.: "Er schlug ein: es gilt!" "Schlag ein! topp!" So too: "Die Hand einschlagen" and "Mit der Hand einschlagen," z. B. in die dargebotene des andern. In the light of this, compare: "Der Kauf ward eingeschlagen"=durch Einschlagen der Hand abgeschlossen. — *Anschlagen*='etwas mit Handschlag, etc., abschliessen,' z. B. "Eine Wette anschlagen," "Einen Kauf mit jemand anschlagen;" auch= 'verkaufen.'—Compare also *Schlag* 'price.' But *losschlagen* ("Etwas um einen bestimmten Preis losschlagen," etc.) probably arose at auctions, as *zuschlagen* and English *knock off* certainly did. Other similar uses of *schlagen* and its compounds are of uncertain origin.

In English it was formerly customary, and locally is still customary, to say *to strike hands*, both in the sense of 'to shake hands' and in that of 'to conclude an agreement or bargain.' Similarly there is the archaic expression "*Strike me luck*," said by one of the parties to a bargain as he extended his hand to the other. Balancing accounts was formerly spoken of as *striking*.—But even our present expression *to shake hands* has undergone the same development. Thus we say "*to shake hands on it*"='to shake hands in sign of binding an agreement.' To some extent *to shake* was, and in slang is still, used without the word *hands*, cf. "First, Marcus Brutus, will I shake with you," *Julius Cæsar*, iii, 1. 185; and so in slang: "Will you shake on that?" In southern England *shake* has actually got the meaning 'bargain,' for example, "*That's a fair shake*"='That's a fair bargain.' We may, then, regard the development of the idea 'bargain,' 'barter,' etc., out of that of 'strike' as settled beyond all question and we have no reason to doubt that, at least in the great majority of cases, the development arose out of the custom of shaking hands in sign of binding a bargain.

In a subsequent paper I shall consider in detail the words involved.

George Hempl.

*University of Michigan.*

---

## *NOTES ON THE CÆDMONIAN EXODUS.*

Since the publication of the second half of the second volume of the Grein-Wülker *Bibliothek*, in 1894, the difficult text of the *Exodus* has received attention at the hands chiefly of Holthausen (*Anglia*, *Beiblatt* v, 231), Graz (*Die Metrik der sog. Cædmonschen Dictungen mit Berücksichtigung der Verfasserfrage*, Weimar, 1894; and "Beiträge zur Textkritik der sogenannten Cædmonschen Dichtungen," *Englische Studien* xxi, 1 f.), Cosijn (*Beiträge* xix, 457 f.), and Mürkens "Untersuchungen über das altenglische Exoduslied" (*Bonner Beiträge zur Anglistik*, Heft ii, Bonn, 1899, p. 62 f.).

22-34. Mürkens (p. 69) refers to the historic event recorded in *Ex.* iii, 11-25; the poet's specific expression in ll. 27-29 appears, however, to stand in closer relation with *Ex.* vi, 3: 'but by my name Jehovah I was not known to them.'

47. The tradition to which Holthausen refers has scriptural basis in *Numbers* xxxiii, 4: 'upon their gods also the Lord executed judgments.'

62. Mürkens (p. 88) adopts the reading *meorringa* (for MS. *meoringa*), and would see in it the Anglian equivalent (*eo* for *ea*, and absence of umlaut) of **mearringa*. This is correct. The verb *mirran*, *mierran* is represented in the Goth. *marzjan* (see also Mod. Lang. Notes xvi, 153), and the noun in *-ing* should agree in vocalism with the denominative verb (Kluge, *Nominale Stammbildungslehre*, §159). The metre is now restored (see *Beiträge* x, 505). In construction, contrary to the interpretation given by Grein and Toller, *meorringa* as gen. pl. limits *fela*, which is an acc. governed by *ofer*. The *þā* of line 61 is adverbial: 'Moses then led the host over many obstacles.'

70-92. Mürkens has overlooked *Ps.* 105, 39: 'He spread a cloud for a covering; and fire to give light in the night.' Compare also *Isaiah* 4, 5.

108 *Heofonbēacen āstāh*
*æfenna gehwām, ōðer wundor,*
*syllic, æfter sunne setlrāde behēold,*
*ofer lēodwerum līge scīnan,*
*byrnende bēam.*

Cosijn reasons ineffectually against the expression so admirably paralleled in *Ps.* 103. 18, *Sunne hire setlgang healdeþ: sol cognovit occasum suum*, and Kluge violently destroys both grammar and style by putting *setlrāde behēold* beyond the reach of its subject. After correcting *sunnan* of the MS. (occasioned by *æfter*) to *sunne*, the entire passage, as now punctuated, appears to be altogether satisfactory. It will be observed that March (*Anglo-Saxon Reader*, p. 87) has done his utmost to construe the imperfect text.

115. *hār hæðstapa.* This reading, suggested by Rieger (*Verskunst* p. 46; cf. *Beowulf* 103, *mære mearcstapa*), is indirectly confirmed by that connection of thought and phrase which led Groth (*Composition und Alter der . . . Exodus*, Berlin, 1883, p. 31) to recall *Beowulf* 103 while commenting on line 61. Cosijn cites only the conjectured *hāres hæðes* (Sievers), and then offers *hār hæðbroga*, an uncalled for substitute for *hæðstapa*. It may be presumed that a recollection of Rieger's emendation would have both restrained Cosijn from offering another, and proved an advantage to Graz (see *Beiträge* xx, 553). Holthausen, with his usual attention to completness, has not overlooked Rieger.

145. Read *ymbe ānwig.*

147. Read *wære brǽcon* (MS. *frǽton*).

148–153. 'Floods of rage filled the heart (of the Egyptians), and mighty passions of men; in violation of compacts ((*mānum trēowum*) and maliciously (*fācne*) they would requite that life-value, so that he (Moses) would have bought for his people that day's deed with blood, had the mighty God granted them (the Egyptians) success in that hostile expedition.'

162. Read *hilde grædige* [*hræfn ūppe gol*]. This is in accordance with *Elene* 52–53, *hrefen ūppe gōl, wan and wælfel*, which also gives the desired confirmation of the singular *wonn wælcēasege.*

186. Read *on þæs ēades riht* (cf. 338–339 and 353–354).

203. *tō þām mægenheapum.* Cancel *to*, and construe the resulting dat. instr. as referring to the Egyptians.

283. Read *wæter in wealfæsten* (cf. 296: *in randgebeorh*).

305. Read [*him ȳða weall*].

334. Read *fēða mōdgode* (cf. 312: *Jūdisc fēða*).

349. Read *mægenprymma mǽst* (cf. 550).

350. Read *folc æfter folce.*

487. *helpendra pað*, read *hwelpendra þæð*, 'the path of the sea-dogs, or sea- monsters'= 'the sea.' Compare *hwelp* and the Germanic **hwelpa* (Uhlenbeck, *Beiträge* xxvi, 311) and *Seefahrer* 21, *huilpa* (Hönncher, *Anglia* ix, 446). The participial noun of agency **hwelpend*, here assumed as a generic name for sea-monsters, requires the construction of the verb **hwelpan* 'to toss, to plunge.'

491. *Witrod*, read *Wīgrād* (cf. *Gen.* 2084, *wīgrōde* for *wīgrāde*, Cosijn, *Beiträge* viii, 570). This reading is suggested by Toller s. v. *wigtrod*, but see also Dietrich *H. Z.* x, 353.

498. MS. *on bogum*, Edd. *onbugon*, read *onbrugdon* (or *onbrūdon*; cf. 222), and construe transitively with *brūne yppinge* as subject, and *hīe* as object: 'after the brown floods struck them.' Metrically the line is exceptional with *onbugon* (*Beiträge* x, 454).

504–506. *gescēadan* is the reduplicating verb recorded in Sievers3 § 395 *Anm.* 4, 'to separate, discern, decide, decree, deal out,' but Grein's translation of *wolde . . . hilde gescēadan*, 'den Heerkampf wolte scheiden' is incorrect. The true meaning (as in *Maldon* 33, *hilde dǣlon*) is 'he wished to deal out warfare.' In the following sentence the past participle of the same verb occurs in the weak form, *wearð . . . . gescēod.* This form is supported by the weak preterite *gescēode* in *Daniel* 620. Moreover, we may now accept the conjectured weak pret. *scēode* for *Exodus* 586, with the additional advantage of retaining the pronominal subject *hēo*, which the editors have wrongly changed into *heom.* The verb in *Genesis* 1103, and *Daniel* 266, cited in the B.-T. Dictionary, s. v. *scēon*, does not belong here.

A parellel group of forms may be noticed in the case of the verb *sceððan* (Sievers3 § 392 *Anm.* 6): *Exodus* 488, pret. *gescēod* (cf. *Phoenix* 400, *gescōd*); *Andreas* 18, weak pret. *gescēode.*

The verb *scēon* (*ge-scēon*), first suggested by Dietrich (*H. Z.* x, 320) and since then kept alive in the dictionaries, may therefore, I believe, be confidently cancelled.

JAMES W. BRIGHT.

## *ARTHURIAN LITERATURE.*

*King Arthur in Cornwall*, by W. H. DICKINSON. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1900.

So much has been written within recent years on the origin and development of the Arthurian legend that there is scarce a recess of the subject which remains unexplored. The writer who attempts to treat any phase of it to-day is thus sore beset by the bulk of his materials. Perhaps his most difficult task is to do justice to these materials, to sift the grain from the chaff and to take proper account of the results which his predecessors have secured. The value of the present investigation could undoubtedly have been increased, if the author had kept this fact in mind. One cannot help regretting that Mr. Dickinson has no knowledge of the French localization of the Arthurian legend[1] (however untrustworthy he may have considered evidence drawn from this source), and Zimmer's *Nennius Vindicatus*,[2] with which he is apparently unacquainted, is surely too important a work to be overlooked in any discussion of the personality of Arthur. Apart from these limitations, however, the present inquiry is an exceedingly clear and dignified piece of work, which gains in importance when viewed in the light which modern research has thrown on the history of other Celtic heroes, notably Tristan.[3]

In general, the work may be described as an independent attempt to lay bare the roots which underlie the main branch of Arthurian literature. To attain this end the author purposely leaves aside everything "obviously fictitious," and gives his sole attention to geographical and historical records. By way of introduction he humorously remarks that "only the Devil is more often mentioned in local association than Arthur." But while the British hero's name is thus widely known in this respect, no written record of him has been handed down from his own time or place.

Considering first the topographical side of his subject, Mr. Dickinson distinguishes four groups of Arthurian "localities": 1. North Cornwall, from Boscastle to Wadebridge, embracing such well-known sites as Tintagel, Damelioc, Kelly-Rounds (Kelliwic); 2. Brittany, which he mentions only by name; 3. South Wales, with Cærleon-upon-Usk, the City of Legions (so-named after the Second Augustan) as a center; 4. the "borderland" between England and Scotland, extending from Carlisle as far north as Edinburgh. Names alluding to Arthur, directly or indirectly, are plentiful throughout all these districts, but in the last-named region, in the north of Great Britain, they are most numerous. The last fact is the basis of the hypothesis that Scotland is the "historical birthplace of Arthurian tradition."[4] Though Mr. Dickinson cannot be called an advocate of this view, he nevertheless believes—as will presently appear—that the North was the scene of several of Arthur's exploits and probably of his death. On the other hand, he frankly admits that compared to the other districts there are but few legendary details connecting Scotland with Arthur, which, moreover, are by no means reliable.

As regards the earliest written records we have of Arthur, he points out that these are practically limited to the literature of Wales. The *Triads*, which are held to contain materials dating from the sixth century, frequently refer to Arthur. One of these compositions[5] states that he was "chief lord at Kelliwic in Cornwall." Other Welsh records connect him with the same locality. In a poem on Geraint,[6] he is mentioned as fighting also at Llongborth, which Mr. Dickinson interprets as Portsmouth, where an engagement between Cerdric and Arthur probably occurred. Taliessin, the most famous of Welsh bards, gives Arthur the title of *Gudelig*; that is, ruler, and constantly alludes to him in terms of great admiration. Further references might be cited, but these are sufficient to show the author's reasons for believing that these traditions have reference to a genuine local hero. Whatever doubts there may be as to the precise date of the *Triads*, to the Welsh bards Arthur was a soldier of great activity, who was engaged in a number of fights, one of which was at Kelliwic, a stronghold of historic record. Thus we have ample reason to believe that the West, including a part of Wales and certainly Cornwall, had a chieftain called Arthur who had won fame as a warrior:—this fact must be given due weight as against the negative evidence of other sources.

1 Cf. p. 5. 2 Berlin, 1893; cf. below.
3 Cf. Golther, *Zeitschrift fur französische Sprache und Litteratur*, 1900, pp. 1–3.

4 The view of Stuart Glennie.
5 Triads of Arthur and His Warriors; cf. Skene, *Four Ancient Books of Wales*, vol. ii, p. 457.
6 Black Book of Cærmarthen.

The period from the sixth to the ninth century is a blank with respect to records of the king. The histories of Gildas and Bede do not once mention his name, though they describe battles in which later ages have given him a place. The omission is particularly striking on the part of Gildas, who lived in Glastonbury, a place rich in Arthur lore, and who was twenty-two years of age at the time assigned by tradition to Arthur's death. The Saxon Chronicle also—though of somewhat later date—has not a word on Arthur. The supposition is, therefore, inadmissable that Arthur was in any sense as important a figure in British history as either Vortigern or Ambrosius, for if he had been like the latter, commander-in-chief of the British forces, or like the former, King of Britain, the fact would surely have been mentioned by the historians of the period. As was said above, Arthur probably held sway over a limited territory in the West, but his concern with the East, the so-called "Saxon Shore," must have been slight, if such a connection is to be granted at all.

Thus far it is possible to accept Mr. Dickinson's conclusions in full. The above views have, since their appearance, been independently borne out by the best of authorities,[7] on the testimony of additional written documents. The remainder of the book, however, gives evidence of the writer's deficiency in reading to which we alluded above, and here his estimates are accordingly less secure. By the time of Nennius (ninth century) the "legend" of Arthur had taken tangible shape. Of the twelve battles in which this writer claims Arthur was engaged, one alone, that of Badon Hill, stands out as an indubitable historic fact. The date of this battle is 520, and Badon Hill is generally located in the South, as Cerdric is supposed to have opposed Arthur on this occasion, and we have no evidence that Cerdric ever went North. But the "last weird battle," that of Camlan, in which Romance lets Arthur meet his death, is not among the engagements enumerated by Nennius. It has, however, been given such prominence by Geoffrey of Monmouth and the romancers who follow in his train, that the question of its possible occurrence and location is full of interest.

If we admit the reality of Camlan, there are two localities to either of which it may be assigned. We may simply accept the statement of Geoffrey that it took place on the Camel, near Camelford (Cornwall), where it is certain another battle having no connection with Arthur occurred in 832; or we may suppose that it was waged in Scotland, as Skene[8] and Stuart Glennie[9] maintain, in the valley of the Firth of Forth, and that this Scotch battle later became confused with the ninth century combat in the South. Mr. Dickinson presents the following reasons in favor of accepting the latter view.

Scotch tradition, which is in part supported by the "Chronicle of the Scots," represents Arthur opposed on the Firth of Forth by Modred, King of Scotland; in this engagement Arthur is defeated and slain. Even Geoffrey of Monmouth,[10] who places the battle on the banks of the Camel, states that Modred's force consisted of Picts and Scots. Now, says Mr. Dickinson, "it is improbable that Arthur could have been confronted in Cornwall by a great army of northern savages." But Geoffrey goes on to say that immediately after the defeat Arthur was conveyed to Glastonbury, where it is supposed he died and was buried. As the question of Arthur's last battle has thus been linked with that of his final resting place, the Glastonbury story demands consideration. For it is evident, since Glastonbury is in the South, that if Arthur concluded his career in Scotland we cannot assume that he was buried in Glastonbury. Inversely, the author argues, if the Glastonbury story can be maintained, we may agree with Geoffrey that Camlan was fought in Cornwall. Considerable space[11] is now devoted to an examination of the last question. Mr. Dickinson adduces excellent reasons, into which we cannot enter here, to show that the testimony which some writers have accepted in favor of Glastonbury as the place of Arthur's burial is entirely *ex post facto*, being devised years after Arthur's death to meet the demands of a well-established legend.

However true the above statements may be, they do not, as Mr. Dickinson seems to believe, prove that Camlan took place in Scotland; they do not even disprove the contrary, that the battle occurred in the South. In reality

7 Cf. *Romania*, xxx, p. 1 ff. (F. Lot).

8 Skene, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 60.

9 Glennie, *Arthurian Scotland*, Merlin. Early English Text Society, part iii, p. lxi.

10 *Historia regum Britanniae*: cf. J. A. Giles, *Six Old English Chronicles*, Bohn ed.

11 Pp. 34-48.

they show only that the Glastonbury legend may in the future be dissociated from the accounts of Arthur's last battle. As to the supposed location of the latter we have better grounds, perhaps, in spite of the above arguments, to place it in Cornwall than in the far North. The name of Gorlois and Modred have for some time been recognized to be of Cornish origin.[12] Furthermore, Prof. Zimmer[13] has shown beyond reasonable doubt that when the Irish founded the Kingdom of Scotland in the third and fourth centuries they also landed in South Wales and established Demetia, which included Cornwall. When in the fifth century the Saxons attacked the British in Wales the latter turned on their Irish neighbors, then called "Scots," and subjugated them. This contest probably occurred long before Arthur's date, but it is quite possible that a memory of it has survived in the romantic accounts of his life, especially those which have made Camlan so famous.

Mr. Dickinson's inquiry concludes with an attempt to determine more precisely than has yet been done the location of several Cornish strongholds which legend connects with Arthur's career. His discussion of Tintagel and Kelliwic is very interesting and instructive. Caradigan, however, which together with Mr. Phillimore he identifies with Cardinham, is rather Cardigan, as M. Lot has recently pointed out.[14]

WM. A. NITZE.

*Columbia University.*

## *ENGLISH PROSODY.*

*An Introduction to the Scientific Study of Poetry;* being Prolegomena to a Science of English Prosody, by MARK H. LIDDELL. Doubleday, Page, & Co. New York: 1902. Pp. xvi+312. $1.25.

THE science of English prosody is confessedly in so unsatisfactory a condition that any serious attempt to establish its theories or explain its facts deserves respectful attention. Prof. Liddell begins his attempt by criticising various inadequate notions of poetry. We are told, he says (p. 5), that

"poetry is a thing of God;" that it is "the finer spirit of knowledge;" that it is "something divine;" that it is the "opposition of science;" that it is "the completest expression of humanity;" that it is the "language of ideality;" that it is the "expression of the inner motions of the soul."

These notions are lamentably current, we must admit; but for the most part they are men of straw, ideas not set forth in textbooks on poetics, and certainly more illogical in their phrasing than in the ideas they stand for. Here, however, is what Prof. Liddell offers as a substitute:

"Poetry is literature, usually of a high degree of Human Interest, which, in addition to its Human Interest, has in it an added Æsthetic Interest due to the arrangement of some easily recognizable and constantly present concomitant of thought-formulation into a form of æsthetic appeal for which an appreciative Æsthetic Sentiment has been gradually developed in the minds of those who habitually think by means of the language in which the poetry is written."

As the sub-title shows, a science of English prosody, rather than poetics, is the aim of the book. Here, too, Prof. Liddell begins by ridiculing our use of the classic names. To him, an English "iambic pentameter" is distressing, a "monometer" monstrous (p. 168). It must be admitted, I suppose, that to one who knows only (and only a little) of classic prosody, these terms would be misleading; but I do not know of a single writer on prosody (since Shakspere's day) who does not at once explain that, though the names are the same, the things meant are different. Lamentable as the original adoption of the terms may be, they are ineradicably present in the literature of English prosody for the past three hundred years, and if, as Prof. Liddell insists (pp. 21, 310, *et al.*), our study of prosody must be historical, the student cannot evade them. Moreover, in these three hundred years, these terms have acquired English citizenship and have fairly taken their place along with a multitude of others, equally illogical but now in established good usage. We have substituted a little, for we often call the ballad measure "four-beat," say "pause" instead of cæsura, and "unstressed foot" instead of pyrrhic. But it seems quite unlikely, at least, that "iambic pentameter" will soon be replaced by Prof. Liddell's "five-wave rising rhythm."

The classic notation of ⏑ -, is, to be sure, absurd, and perhaps inevitably misleading. But it is not the only notation current; Schipper and Gummere mark stressed syllables with an accent-mark, Ellis and Mayor use *0*, *1*, *2*, ac-

12 Cf. Rhys, *Arthurian Legend*, Oxford, 1891, p. 392; Loth, *Études corniques*, in *Revue celtique*, 1898, p. 404, note 3.

13 *Op. cit.*, pp. 84-93; also Kuno Meyer, *Early relations between Gael and Brython*, in *Transactions of the Society of of Cymmrodorian*, 1895-1896, pp. 55-86.

14 *Romania*, xxx, p. 19.

cording to the relative emphasis of the syllables, Lanier uses the musical notation, and Corson marks unstressed syllables with an *x* and stressed ones with an *a*. The current authorities seem, therefore, not to be misled by the classic prosody, and have given us our choice of at least four notations which, however wrong they may be in what they represent, are not misleading. To none of these does Prof. Liddell pay any attention.

The preface (p. ix) declares that "the treatment of the subject has been made as simple and as practical as possible." The definition of poetry we have already quoted. As nearly as the reviewer can make out, the argument is this:

Our ideas tend to express themselves not only in words but in word groups, which have fixed modulations of emphasis or stress. For example, the phrase "the power of God" is not merely a word group expressing a definite idea; its order is fixed, for "the of God power" is by no means the same thing to us. We cannot alter the stresses; for to read "*the* power *of* God" is to change it into something else. These units are called "thought moments."

The tendency of such thought moments, in material which possesses Human Interest, is to arrange themselves in some sort of rhythmic order, in which the rhythms may be "punctuated" by alliteration, rime, or accent. Our English verse punctuation system is based upon stress (which is discriminated in some obscure esoteric way from accent). The stress, which he calls "attention-stress," is of three kinds, word-stress, sentence-stress, and emotion-stress. The first two kinds seem fairly intelligible; by emotion-stress he means

"a stress of attention due to the peculiar emotional interest which a notion may have in virtue of its relation to a recalled personal experience" (p. 197).

These stresses admit of various arrangements, so that we have the following summary of the principles of English verse form:

"English rhythms run either in rising or falling series of successive rhythm waves. In rising rhythms the even impulse is differentiated from the preceding odd impulse by receiving a greater amount of attention stress.

In rising rhythm a thought-moment may begin with a falling wave-group; or, in other words, a series in rising rhythm may be reversed for two impulses at the beginning of a new thought-moment.

. . . . . .

Corollary: Full stressed impulses do not occur in the odd numbered places of rising rhythm, except in the case of 'reversal', nor in the even numbered places of falling rhythm.

Secondarily stressed impulses may occur in any position in the verse."

In the above principles, he allows for a trochee only in the first foot of iambic measures; although we have them most frequently in the first foot, they may and do occur anywhere. The Corollary does not allow for either spondees or hovering accents, that is, for two equally stressed syllables together forming a "wave" or foot. It does not allow for a "wave" in which neither syllable has a logical stress, that is, an unstressed or pyrrhic foot.[1] In short, in many rather important instances, the book is wrong as to the facts of English verse, and in most cases, as the quotations show, is not simple and clear in its statements, but woefully obscure and well nigh unintelligible.

EDWARD P. MORTON.
*Indiana University.*

## *GOETHE.*

*Goethe über seine Dichtungen*, Versuch einer Sammlung aller Aeusserungen des Dichters über seine poetischen Werke. Von Dr. HANS GERHARD GRAEF. Erster Theil: Die Epischen Dichtungen. Zweiter Band. Frankfurt a/M.: Literarische Anstalt, Rütten & Loening, 1902. 8vo, iv+697 pp.

GRAEF'S monumental work on Goethe, the first part of which has now been completed by the appearance of the second volume, is easily the most helpful aid in the field towards a thorough study and an intelligent appreciation of the poet. It does not merely give us in their chronological order Goethe's own utterances concerning each of his works, but it supplements these by the most important remarks of his friends and critics and adds a more or less elaborate comment wherever it has seemed necessary to do so. We thus are made to assist, as it were, at the very genesis of the poet's works and are taught how to look upon them correctly by being informed how the poet himself viewed them and how he wished or did not wish them to be viewed by others. To be sure, some Goethe specialists may think much space might have been saved by merely citing instead of giving in full the many pages taken

[1] The reviewer's positive statements concerning substitution of feet and his failure to distinguish rhythmic stress from logical stress will not be universally accepted as satisfactory. J. W. B.

from such easily accessible books as *Dichtung und Wahrheit*, or the Correspondence between Goethe and Schiller, and, on the other hand, some Goethe enthusiasts whose private libraries are not all they desire, may sometimes wish for a quotation in full when they find but a reference, or for a detailed comment where they are offered only a short one or none at all. Nevertheless, all things duly considered, the author seems to have solved the difficult task of satisfying both the specialist and the enthusiast at the same time with remarkable tact and good judgment.

Volume Two contains pages 493–1189 of Part One and completes the treatment of the epic works. While Volume One, which together with the general plan of Gräf's work was briefly noticed in these columns, Vol. xvi, p. 182 f., apart from introductory matters comprises no less than twenty-three works, Volume Two, though considerably larger in number of pages, brings besides a few minor items additions and corrections and two indexes, only *Werther* and *Wilhelm Meister*. The four hundred pages devoted to *Wilhelm Meister* show especially the influence which Schiller and his friends by their appreciative remarks and reflections exercised upon the artistic and philosophic development of the *Lehrjahre;* the two hundred pages which deal with *Werther* remind us above all that the poet of *Faust* for almost a generation was preëminently the poet of *Werther* and that in a certain manner *Werther* remained his lifelong companion. We see the genesis of *Werther*, the impression it created among the poet's friends and in the world in general, the changes introduced in the edition of 1787, admirably summed up on pp. 554–556, the interesting, ludicrous or even provoking meetings between the author and foreigners in Italy and Germany, and in addition to this the enthusiastic letter from the writer of another *Werther* on an island on the Southern hemisphere, the famous interview with Napoleon at Erfurt in 1808, and, finally, the connection of *Werther* with Goethe's last graet affection and the Marienbad elegy. Among all these things the subject of the meeting with Napoleon is made the basis of special study, the problem it offers to the literary critic is duly set forth, and an attempt is made to reconcile the various conflicting accounts and utterances by assuming that Napoleon censured both the introduction of the motive of wounded ambition and the circumstance that *Werther* does not make any attempt to win Lotte while she is not yet married to Albert.

The additions and corrections (pp. 1085-1107) are mainly derived from material published since Volume One went to press. The first part of the two indexes is an index of the epic works. Each of the twenty-five works is taken up separately, and all matters pertaining to it are grouped under the nine headings of sources, places, letters, diaries, conversations, genesis, prints, influence, and details. The second index (pp. 1164–1189) is an index of persons and places. Not only the time and position of the persons is given, but also the nature of their relations to Goethe and the beginning of their acquaintance with him are indicated. The apparent intricacy of the first index is obviated by the detailed explanations and instructions which precede it; both indexes very materially enhance the value of the two volumes as books of reference. The typography shows great care and misprints appear to be very few and of no consequence. The comments of the author on utterances of Goethe and others are scarcely ever open to doubt, and when they are, the reader is always placed in the position to judge for himself.

We can, therefore, but repeat and still more emphasize the assurances of grateful obligation to the author which we expressed when noticing Volume One and we earnestly hope that, after he has so successfully completed his guide to a proper study and enjoyment of the epic works of Goethe, he may at no very distant date find strength and leisure to perform the same signal service with regard to the dramatic and lyric works.

A. Gerber.

*Earlham College.*

## *GERMAN LITERATURE.*

### I.

*Der Talisman.* Dramatisches Märchen in vier Aufzügen, von Ludwig Fulda. Edited with Introduction and Notes by C. William Prettyman, Ph.D., Professor of German in Dickinson College. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co, 1902.

An edition of Ludwig Fulda's *Der Talisman* without one word as to its keen political satire, its embodiment of one of the oldest Germanic

tales, and its great literary significance! Verily this is as good as the proverbial performance of *Hamlet* with the title rôle omitted for sake of brevity. Did the editor think that Fulda had no reason for changing the lazy old monarch lolling about at his ease, the Roi d'Yvetot of Andersen's fairy story, into a fiery young king raging around like a madman and claiming himself a god? Who else than Kaiser Wilhelm II can be intended (rightly or wrongly) by this tyrannical young despot, who says that he is the light and his people the dark, he the day and they the night; who deems the Almighty alone his peer? And the noble old Chancellor who has just been dismissed because he frankly said he could not see the bright halo which sycophant courtiers have persuaded the king ever burns about his head,—who else can be meant but Bismarck? If this was not apparent to the editor at first sight, he might have gained some very valuable suggestions from Spielhagen's excellent essay on "Ludwig Fulda's *Talisman*" in the *Magazin für Litteratur*, 62, p. 85 (1893), afterwards reprinted in Spielhagen's important *Epik und Dramatik*, xii (p. 263). Some valuable information might also have been obtained from the following articles, which the editor evidently did not consult: *Magazin für Litteratur*, 64, p. 1418: Velhagen and Klasing's *Monatshefte*, xiii, p. 9; *Deutsche Dichtung*, xv, p. 249: *Universum*, xiii, p. 276; *Hamburger Correspondent*, 1897, (Beilage 5-6); *Illustricrte Zeitung*, cii, p. 87; *Westminster Review*, cxli, p. 589. Other minor articles given in the *Jahresberichte für Litteraturgeschichte* might also have been consulted to advantage. A review such as this is not the place to elucidate all the political satire in the drama under discussion. One or two examples must suffice: to those who know the German hatred of the French the following is intelligible enough. Omar says of his father, the banished chancellor,—

> "Und Gandolin, der nie geschont sein Blut,
> Der in dem Kampfe mit den Heiden einst
> Unüberwindlich war geblieben."—239.

and this man ("ein wackrer Mann und kühner Streiter.—Sein tapfres Herz war ohne Falsch und List") is dismissed for the reason already given. Can there be any doubt as to the satire? In the great procession scene on the anniversary of the coronation the whole populace is divided as to the color of the king's suit into two political parties, *Rechts und Links*, conservatives (*Die rechte Gruppe*) and liberals (*Die linke Gruppe*). When the cry goes up finally from the liberals, could the satire be clearer?

BENEDICT [Leader of the Liberals-*links*]
Der König hat nichts an.
VIELE (noch gedämpft).
Der König hat nichts an!
(Wachsende Anfregung im Volk, von Benedict und Balduin geschürt.)
ANSELM [Leader of the Conservatives—*rechts*]
Hört nur die Frechen!
GUIDO (halblaut zu Anselm).
Sie haben diesmal guten Grund.
ANSELM.
Ganz einerlei; wir müssen widersprechen. (1710 ff.)

There was a very general smile over the audience at the first Leipzig performance in 1893 at the line which plays upon the popularly accredited vanity of the Emperor: Rita after her naïve remark—"auch in Unterhosen"—says to the king,—

> An dich zu Glauben ist Gesetz und Pflicht:
> Ich glaube, dass du Kleider hast in Massen,—(1800ff).

and when the king feels he is losing control he calls upon those around him to help;—

> Mich wieder Herr, mich wieder Gott zu fuehlen. (2149)

Whether this satire be true or false is of no importance, but it is safe to say that not since the days in which Aristophanes so mercilessly and so fearlessly lashed the demagogue Cleon and his political tyranny in *The Knights* and *The Wasps* has a dramatic author dared to present such keen political satire to the public as Fulda has done in *Der Talisman*.

The editor naïvely prints Andersen's charming fairytale, *Des Kaisers neue Kleider* as the old fable referred to by Fulda in the words "mit teilweiser Benutzung eines alten Fabelstoffes." Andersen died in 1875! Of course Fulda used Andersen's tale, but the story itself is almost world-old, coming probably from some such collection as the Pantschatantra or the Hitopadesa. As Spielhagen says (*Neue Beiträge zur Theorie und Technik der Epik und Dramatik*, p. 226):

"Seines alten, uralten Märchenthemas. Ich will hier nicht mit fremder Gelehrsamkeit prunken und den Leser mit der geschichte der Metamorphosen behelligen, welche das Thema durchgemacht hat, bis es von seiner indischen Heimat in Ludwig Fuldas Hände gelangte. Es ist ihm ergangen, wie jenem weltberühmten von den drei Ringen, auch insofern, als es das Glück hatte, auf seiner langen Wanderschaft endlich zu einem zu kommen, der den Wert des Kleinods voll zu schätzen wusste und die meisterliche Kunst besass, ihm eine seines Wertes würdige Fassung zu geben. Dieser Ruhm wird Ludwig Fulda bleiben, und er ist wahrlich kein geringer."

So, just as Lessing gave to the old story of the three rings its final artistic setting, has Fulda given final form to an indigenous Germanic fable. The original Hindu, or perhaps Oriental, source has not as yet been found. The story first appears in German literature about 1239 in *Der Pfaffe Âmîs*. At the time when the *Volksepos* and the *Kunstepik* were on the decline, the *Novelle* became popular: it degenerated later into the *Schwank*. The crusaders brought back many such stories which were transmitted orally at first, no doubt. Large collections were afterwards made, such as the *Disciplina Clericalis*, *Gesta Romanorum*, *Liber Facetiarum*, *Dialogus Miraculorum*, etc. Many were incorporated in the French *Fabliaux*.

*Der Pfaffe Âmîs* by *Der Stricker* is oriental in form and content. The third tale is called *Das unsichtbare Gemälde*. (*Erzählungen und Schwänke*, ed. by Lambel, Leipzig, 1872= *Deutsche Classiker des Mittelalters*, xii, p. 36). At Paris the Pfaffe Âmîs pretends to paint for the king a picture which only legitimately born people can see,—

> die sehent ez unt niemen mê.
> die niht sint komen von der ê
> die sehent es einen stich niht.

The king gives him a large hall to paint and much money for materials. No one is to enter until all is done in six weeks. At the end of that time Âmîs takes the king in first to explain all to him. He sees nothing, but is terrified and claims to see all clearly. The knights come and all swear they see it. Âmîs departs richly paid. The queen comes with her ladies: all profess to see it. Then the Knechte come likewise, but,—

> Sus sprach ein tumber dî bî:
> "ich'n weiz, was kindes ich sî:
> ob ich joch vater nie gewan,
> hie ist niht gemâlet an."

Then the common people, knights and finally the king agree with him.

In *Till Eulenspiegel*, "Die xxvii histori sagt wie Ulenspiegel dem landgroffen von Hessen malet, und in weisz macht, wer unelich wer der künt es nit sehen." (*Till Eulenspiegel*. Abdruck der Ausgabe vom Jahre 1515. *Neudrucke deutscher Litteraturwerke des xvi und xvii Jahrhunderts*, No. 55 u. 56; p. 38.) It is practically the same story localized on the Landgraf von Hessen at Marburg. Here it is one of the queen's maidens, a *toerin*, who can not see the painting. Then all cry out that there is no painting there: Till has, of course, decamped in the meanwhile. The story, no doubt, is to be found in other Schwankbücher.

The form, however, in which Fulda used his tale is neither that of the *Pfaffe Âmîs* nor of *Till Eulenspiegel*, but is first found on European soil in *El Conde Lucanor* (*Libro de Patronio*) of the Infanta Don Juan Manuel; Enxemplo xxxii; "De lo que contesció á un rey con los burladores que ficieron el paño." (*Biblioteca de Autores Españoles: Escritores en Prosa Anteriores Al Siglo xv.*, Madrid, 1884, p. 402). Three rogues tell a king they can make cloth which only the legitimately born can see. He gives them a room to work in and much gold, silver, and silk. They pretend to weave. The king sends a courtier to inspect the cloth, who sees nothing, for there is nothing there, but dare not say so. Others come and claim to see the cloth clearly. So too the king, whom his courtiers pursuade to have a suit made of the cloth and to wear it at the coming festival. This he does; all acclaim the beautiful suit except a negro groom, who naïvely says,—"por ende digovos que só cierto que vos desnudo ides." Then all cry out the king has nothing on: the rogues in the meantime have escaped. Manuel probably got his story by oral tradition from the Moors. Nevertheless the form of the *Conde Lucanor* is like that of the *Pantschatantra*. Indeed, the moral of this tale,—

> Quien te conseja encobrir de tus amigos
> Quiere te engañar mas que tus enemigos.

resembles very closely one in the *Hitopadesa*,—"He who doth not hearken to the voice of a friend and well wisher in adversity, is the delight of his enemies." (*Hitopadesa*, Translated by Charles Wilkins, London, 1885, p. 55.)

The connection of the *Conde Lucanor* with Oriental literature was shown by Wolf in the *Wiener Jahrbücher*, 1857, p. 193, and later in his *Studien zur Geschichte der Spanischen und Portugiesischen Nationalliteratur*, Berlin, 1859, where he says (p. 94),

"Es bildet daher recht eigentlich das Mittelglied zwischen den morgen- und abendländischen, und nimmt schon deshalb eine bedeutende Stelle in der Geschichte der Literatur überhaupt in Anspruch."

For further information as to the source the editor is referred to Roscoe: *The Spanish Novelists* (London, 1832). Liebrecht: von der Hagen's *Germania*, 1848, viii, p. 197. [Liebrecht's remarks are repeated almost verb-

ally in his translation of Dunlop. Cf. Dunlop: *Geschichte der Prosadichtungen*, übs. v. Liebrecht (Berlin 1851, p. 501.)]. Lemcke: *Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung*, 1857, No. 16. Benfey: *Göttinger Gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1858, No. 32, p. 318, (Reprinted in Benfey: *Kleine Schriften*, iii, p. 63).

The *Conde Lucanor* was translated by Eichendorff into German in 1840 (Werke, 2. Ausgabe, vi, 424) and into French by Puibusque in 1854. The latter has a dissertation on the sources, and finds the original form of the Talisman story in a tale of Hindu folk-lore to be found in *Die vierzig Veziere*, übs. v. Behrnauer (Leipzig, 1851, p. 155). [Cf. also Dunlop: *Geschichte der Prosadichtungen*, übs. v. Liebrecht (Berlin, 1851), p. 524, note 485]. This book *Die vierzig Veziere* (cf. Belletête, *Les Quarante Vizirs*, Paris, 1812), translated into German by Behrnauer from the Turkish manuscript in the Dresden royal library, is one of the oldest of all oriental collections of tales. The stories in it arose long before the Christian era in India, from whence they found their way through Arabia into Turkey. (Cf. Loiseleur Deslongchamps, *Essai sur les fables indiennes et sur leur introduction en Europe*, Paris, 1838, p. 130: also H. Keller, *Li Romans des Sept Sages*, Tübingen, 1836, Introduction, p. vii.) According to Behrnauer, Prof. Brockhaus has shown the connection of these tales with the popular Hindu Volksbuch, *Das Papageienbuch* (Sanskrit *Çuka Saptati*; Persian *Tutiname*, in the *Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung*) Nr. 242, 243, and in his privately printed *Die sieben weisen Meister oder Veziere von Siyaïeddin Nakhschebi*, Leipzig, 1845. The stories of the *Vierzig Veziere* found their way into almost all the popular collections of Oriental lore; many of them were localized upon Sinbad the Sailor. They came into the Occident with the Moors and were also brought back by the Crusaders.

The plan of the book itself is entirely Oriental; the main thread is similar to the Bible story of Joseph and Potiphar's wife. A young queen, who has tried in vain to gain the affection of her step-son, accuses him of treason to his father the Sultan. The preceptor of the young prince forseeing by the horoscope forty days of great danger forbids him to speak a word during that time. Each night the queen relates a story to her husband the Sultan, and persuades him to have his son beheaded; each day one of the forty Vizirs saves the Prince by admonishing the Sultan with a counter-tale. (Most of these stories became very widely known and are contained in many of the popular *Volksbücher*, for example:

"Die nützliche Unterweisung der sieben weisen Meister, wie Pontianus der König zu Rom, seinen Sohn Diocletianum den sieben weisen meistern befiehlt und wie derselbe hernach durch Untreue seiner Mutter sieben Mal zum Galgen geführt, aber alle Zeit durch schöne Gleichnisse der sieben Meister vom Tod gerettet und ein gewaltiger Meister zu Rom ward. Sehr lustig und nützlich wider der falschen Weiber Untreue zu lesen. Ganz von neuem aufgelegt." Nürnberg?).

On the thirteenth night the queen relates:— A young man once came to a king and said,— "I will weave you a turban which shall be visible only to a legitimate son and invisible to all illegitimately born." The king gave him much money and fine material, and the man shut himself up in a shop. After several days he appeared before the king with a carefully folded package and said,—"Here is your turban." The king opened the package in the presence of all his Vizirs and nobles, and saw nothing within. He was almost overwhelmed to learn himself a bastard, but saved himself by pretending to see a beautiful turban and by praising the weaver greatly, who in turn pretended to bind the turban around the king's high hat. When the king put the hat on, all the nobles claimed to see the fine turban and were loud in their praise of the weaver. But there was nothing there. Then the king took his Vizirs aside and told them that he really saw nothing; then they too confessed that they saw nothing at all. They all agreed the young weaver had played them a sly trick for gain.— This is probably the original form of one of the first tales conceived and told by man.

Andersen did not get his story from the original source, but from Don Juan Manuel through Eichendorff. He changed the test from illegitimacy to wickedness or inaptitude, and replaced the negro groom by a simple little child. Such then was the form of the old, old tale, which Fulda found and in which he saw all the possibilities of the keen political

satire we have already noted. It had been used already dramatically by Calderon in his *El Conde Lucanor*, (cf. Münch-Bellinghausen: *Ueber die älteren Sammlungen spanischer Dramen*, Wien, 1852, p. 82.), and by Goldoni in his *Il Talismano*; but these now forgotten dramas were probably not known to Fulda. His fine insight into the significance of the old tale made him incorporate into it the very gist of the *Vierzig Veziere* itself, which he probably never heard of. In Behrnauer (p. 149) we find the Oriental saying, "Die Unwahrheit, welche Heil stiftet, ist besser, als die Wahrheit, welche Unheil stiftet." In Sadi's *Gulistan* we find,—"Die Weisen haben gesagt: Eine Lüge welche gutes bezweckt, ist besser als eine Wahrheit, welche Unheil versteckt,' (Graf's Übersetzung, p. 17). And Fulda gave the story again its old Oriental setting. Such is the insight of a true poet.

The editor has nothing to say as to the form into which the *Talisman* is cast. Surely a word or two on the Märchendrama might well have been given for its great literary significance. The Märchendrama arose and flourished in Austria: it was the natural expression of the naïve, poetical Viennese temperament. Its most ardent exponent was Raimund, whose *Der Verschwender* contains much the same thought as Grillparzer's remarkable *Der Traum, ein Leben*, which the former recognized as the ideal he had so often striven to attain (Kuh: *Zwei Dichter Oesterreichs*, p. 94). Under Nestroy the Märchendrama degenerated into farce: this desecration practically led Raimund to take his own life. The apotheosis of the Märchendrama was reached in Grillparzer's *Der Traum, ein Leben*. Fulda had studied this wonderful drama, and saw in it a form of dramatic art which, used discretely, and not too often (Grillparzer himself noted this: cf. *Grillparzer-Jahrbuch*, iii, p. 147; the views of the two poets Grillparzer and Bauernfeld, and the two dramaturgists Schreyvogel and Deinhardstein are most instructive), could express more real truth than all the realistic formlessness of modern stage-plays. Let any one compare Fulda's Rita with Grillparzer's Mirza, and he will see at once how much the *Talisman* is indebted to *Der Traum, ein Leben*. Fulda restored again to their old supremacy the fine fancy and rich imagination of the German poet. He realized one of the fundamental facts of art, that for each folk there is an indigenous form in which alone its genius can be fully expressed. *Faust* itself is really a Märchendrama on a colossal scale. Fulda's lead with *Der Talisman* (1893) was soon followed by Hauptmann with *Die versunkene Glocke* (1896), and by Sudermann with *Die drei Reiherfedern* (1898). Wildenbruch made the first ineffectual attempt at the fantastic-satirical drama in his *Das heilige Lachen*, but to Fulda's genius alone is due the revival of the Märchendrama.

(To be continued.)

EDWARD STOCKTON MEYER.
*Western Reserve University.*

## *SPANISH PUBLICATIONS.*

### IV.[1]

8. *Don Gil de las calzas verdes, comedia en tres actos y en verso, por Fray Gabriel Téllez (el Maestro Tirso de Molina).* Edited with an introduction, notes and vocabulary by BENJAMIN PARSONS BOURLAND, Ph. D., Assistant Professor in the University of Michigan. New York: Henry Holt & Company, 1901. 8vo, pp. xxvii+198.

DR. BOURLAND, in the Introduction to his edition of *Don Gil*, sets forth, in eleven well-written pages, all that needs to be said about the author and his works, due credit being given to Cotarelo; seven pages deal, concisely but to the point, with the Metre of the play; while a careful Bibliographical Note gives the titles of thirty-one works whose study, in addition to that of the well-known handbooks on the Spanish drama, is all-important for a proper appreciation of the wittiest and least conventional, if not the greatest, of Spanish dramatists.

The play itself (about two thousand five hundred verses) is followed by twenty-four pages of Notes, in which the editor has, with refreshing good sense, omitted translations and what he rightly calls "the commonplaces of history and mythology," and by a Vocabulary that refrains from making "definitions broader or deeper than the text requires." The volume has in front a good reproduction of the author's

1 Cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES for January, 1898 (vol. xiii, col. 39).

portrait—a new and highly commendable feature in our textbooks.

The Introduction could not be expected to furnish new facts about Tirso's life or proclaim new discoveries in the bibliography of his works. Since the publication of Cotarelo's excellent little monograph (1893) no one but Doña Blanca de los Ríos had undertaken a task so arduous, and no part of her investigations has, to my knowledge, been printed except the curious, though unconvincing, articles in *La España Moderna*, in which she attempted to identify Tirso with the elusive Avellaneda, the auther of the spurious second part of *Don Quijote*. Our editor has wisely kept aloof from this contention that has called forth no small amount of literature. He also leaves untouched Salvá's claim (*Catálogo*, 1441; 1443) that the first edition of the *Cigarrales* is of 1621, a claim that appears to have been overthrown by Morf.[2] He has summed up all that is essential in Cotarelo, not, however, without carefully testing the latter's conclusions, and arriving occasionally at different and well-argued results. Particularly pleasant to note is Dr. Bourland's unaffected enthusiasm and appreciative reverence for Tirso—of which more anon, when we consider the Notes.

Perhaps, in his note to p. xiv, he might also have spoken of Tirso's plays as reworked by Dionisio Solís, in the first quarter of the nineteenth century. Solís had in his day a well-earned reputation as an adapter of classic plays, and a goodly part of Tirso's vogue in those years was undoubtedly due to the intelligent way in which his almost forgotten works were brought before the public.

The various metres found in *Don Gil* are first discussed, and then tabulated by acts and scenes, in pp. xvi–xxiii of the Introduction. The editor's considerations are most acceptable, being clearly worded and, therefore, easily understood. Possibly it might be better to substitute some other word for "regularly" in: "Hiatus between words regularly results in synizesis" (p. xvii), inasmuch as the second example there given admits of no such contraction between the words *No hay*, which in numerous other cases, for instance, in the verses quoted on p. xxi, becomes imperative. But as Dr. Bourland expresses his hope of publishing a more extended study of hiatus in Tirso, we can well afford to look forward toward seeing this vexatious question competently disposed of for at least one of the foremost dramatic poets.

The editor has preferred the name *cuartetos* for the more current one of *redondillas*, and his remarks on pp. xviii, xxi and xxii might perhaps at first sight be somewhat puzzling to a beginner. Namely, the *redondilla* is not alone the usual, but the only form of the *cuarteto* as such (that is to say, if we consider the *décima* as a unit) in this play, and there is no difference between *Act i, scene 1*, versés 1–60, tabulated as *cuartetos* (*redondillas*) and those named only *cuartetos* in the other scenes. We might advocate the usual and convenient name *romance* for the

"combination of *versos libres*, or blank verses, of eight syllables, with alternating *octosílabos* that rime [read: assonance] with one another, in long series."

This form, true to its history, is indicated where a personage relates his life, as in our play *Act i, scene 1*, and *Act ii, scene 5*, and it is comparatively rare to find it used for dialogue, as in *Act i, scenes 9–10*. The *terza rima* has in Spanish the name *tercetos*, and a word about its conclusion might perchance be of value. Be it also noted here that the verse-form of *Act i, scene 7*, can hardly be called *quintillas*, in spite of its strophe of five lines; while the *décima* of *Act i, scene 6*, is not a model of its kind.

Inadvertencies so slight do not keep this presentation of the metre from being a good and instructive basis for the student's work in the promising field of Spanish versification. The editor deserves our sincere thanks for having begun by brushing aside the mistake of using the term "feet" in connection with Spanish verse. One becomes more and more strengthened in the conviction that the superstition about "feet" is a serious handicap for the understanding of Spanish verse, the conditions being such that it would go hard to find a poem in which, even when the author pretends to write in "feet," the spirit of the language has not made it impossible to be consistent in their use.

2 Cf. *Bulletin Hispanique*, iv, No. 1 (Janvier-Mars 1902), p. 40.

In the preparation of the text of the play, the editor has been favored by the circumstance that the *princeps* edition showed none of the distressing imperfections so common in the seventeenth century volumes of dramatic works. Not a verse had dropped out, and hardly a misprint could be detected. Where, moreover, so careful a critic as Hartzenbusch has twice edited this play, it might be presumed that the present text would be excellent. And, in fact, only a few corrections are needed to make it as perfect as a text can be when its final form, in the author's own handwriting, is not available.

On p. 60, after l. 46, we must insert:

*Doña Juana.* Muestra. (*Ap.* ¡ Ay cielos !)

a passage that has dropped out in printing, as proven by the verse-numbers.

It might be well to give, at the beginning of the play, the list of *Personas*, preferably with a footnote setting forth their relation to each other.

P. 7, l. 203 calls for a conjectural emendation that will, I trust, do away with all difficulty. Namely, if we read:

Mas la sospecha . . .
Adivinó mis desgracias,
Sabiéndolas descubrir
El oro *en que* dos diamantes
Bastantes son para abrir
Secretos de cal y canto.

the meaning becomes: 'the gold [ornament], two diamonds [set] in which.' A change so slight is legitimate, and the syntax should satisfy even so watchful an editor. That Hartzenbusch could overlook so obvious a correction is indeed surprising.

P. 9, l. 21:

¿ *Que* tantos habéis tenido?

means in its connection: [do you mean to say] that you have had so many? ¿ *Qué* tantos . . .?, how many . . .? would better befit the wail that elicits the question.

P. 11, l. 80, rather than

*Ojeaba* dos autores,

I should read:

*Hojeaba* dos autores,

for examples abound of *hojear un libro*, *un autor*, while it would take long to find *ojear* with a meaning appropriate to this passage.

The substitution of *Don Andrés* for *Don Martín* on p. 18, l. 38, seems felicitous, especially in view of l. 40, where only Don Andrés can be meant. Were it not for this latter line, the meaning: 'a child (or: children) of Don Martín and my child' would be logical enough.

P. 25, l. 6, the verse surely demands *Bene venuto;* for the same reason, p. 28, l. 74, lacking one syllable, is improved by Hartzenbusch's *cuando* for *que;* and again, l. 80 is not mangled overmuch by reading with Hartzenbusch:

Cosa que no *os* esté bien.

P. 31, l. 157, should of course be contracted into *apartesé* (compare p. 81, l. 68: *sueltelé*, and p. 89, l. 42: *Hablamé*).

P. 37, l. 31, the *busquen* is inadmissible; Hartzenbusch reads *buscan*, the only possible form.

P. 56, l. 23, and p. 70, l. 22, it would seem better to transfer to the Notes the passages between [ ], since it is customary thus to mark inserted words, not the eliminated passages. P. 63, l. 6, should, inversely, have [es]; p. 73, l. 24, [señor]; and p. 108, l. 10, [ya].

The editor rejected Hartzenbusch's emendation of *su* for *tu* on p. 27, l. 32, saying in the Notes that it is "happy . . . but . . . unnecessary." I venture to submit that, since Caramanchel is not aware of Doña Juana's being a woman, the remark would be uncalled for, and *su*, as applied to *dinero*, surely impresses me as the only appropriate reading.

A curious and subtle point of Spanish syntax and, incidentally, also of versification, comes up in connection with a passage on p. 63. The text has:

¿ Porqué mintiendo, Inés, me desvaneces?
Don Andrés ¿ no me ha escrito por este hombre?
¿ No dice que es Don Gil el que aborreces?

to which the editor remarks:

"The reading of the first edition is: *No dize que Don Gil el que aborreces?* a misprint, in which the predicate *es*, supplied in the text, is omitted before *Don Gil;* Hartzenbusch reads *no dices*, a peculiarly inept emendation."

At first sight we might incline to assent, for we may translate:

'Inés, why do you mislead me with lies? Has not Don Andrés written to me in favor of this man? *Does he not say that the one you detest is Don Gil?*'

which looks plausibly simple; while it would appear as if Hartzenbusch had meant, either: 'Has not Don Andrés written to me in favor of this man? *Do you not say that the one you de-*

*test is Don Gil?*,' or else: '*Do you not say that Don Gil is the one you detest?*'

Either construction would fully warrant the editor's indignant comment. But there remains one other possible meaning that well deserves our attention.

Hartzenbusch's line would have looked less intricate if he had printed:

¿ *No, dices, es Don Gil el que aborreces?*

but he rightly retained the *que*, in the first place because the original edition had *que*, and secondly, because the word is the constant complement of verbs that mean 'to say,' 'to ask,' and so forth. Sentences like: '¿ Quién es este señor?' 'Dices *que* ¿ quién es? Pero ¡ hombre! ¡ si es mi padre!' explain themselves.

In Spanish dramatic literature the negative word *no* has a somewhat exasperating way of appearing at the beginning of a phrase when, from the un-Spanish point of view, we might wish it to stand immediately before the very words it is meant to negative. The matter has not, to my knowledge, been dealt with in treatises on Spanish syntax, and would well repay a special investigation; but I am not prepared to doubt that Hartzenbusch, the hair-splitting and wonderfully well-read commentator of *Don Quijote*, was quite familiar with it.

The basic principle is that in Spanish a word, when transferred to a place other than its usual one, thereby becomes more conspicuous, and consequently more emphatic. In the verse as emendated by Hartzenbusch, the *no* can belong not only to *dices*, but also to *es*, which makes the passage say:

'Has not Don Andrés written to me in favor of this man? [Then how in the world can] you say that the one you detest is not Don Gil?'

My impression is that this version is most befitting the speaker's dignified anger, and surely more forcible than the simple repetition, in different words, of his first question. If Dr. Bourland, who is well familiar with spoken Spanish, reads the verse aloud, in a tone of wondering inquiry and with strong emphasis on *no*, this interpretation may yet find favor with him, while a search through a few dozen plays, especially Alarcón's, will not fail to furnish examples in justification of Hartzenbusch.

However, my defense of Hartzenbusch in no wise takes away from the merit of our editor's own emendation, which for purposes of a school text is satisfactory enough. Still, I cannot refrain from pointing once more to the endless watchfulness we should exercise over our opinions in the matter of Spanish, the most difficult, and for that very reason the most fascinating, of our modern languages.

Now, if with Hartzenbusch we read *dices*, it may be asked: Does not the sentence become more grammatical when we transpose the *no* to its logical place, as follows:

¿ Dices que *no* es Don Gil el que aborreces?

Strictly speaking, so it would; but the *no* then would stand in hiatus, and lose thereby part of its emphasis, so that the sentence would hardly mean more than: 'Did I understand you right?' This same consideration of emphasis should, I think, be taken into account in any careful study of the treatment of hiatus; perhaps it may furnish a clue to many apparent irregularities of such treatment, or, at least, the results of such a study could scarcely be deemed conclusive if the possibilities of emphasis were overlooked.

On pp. 76, ll. 73–78; 90, l. 67; 108, ll. 24–27, it might be well to place ( ) around the *aparte* speech, in order to simplify the student's task.

On pp. 81–82, in the passage:

¿ Manjar soy que satisfago
Antes que me pruebe el gusto?

we must interpret: 'Am I a relish that satiates before the palate tastes me?' I prefer to read:

¿ Manjar soy que satisfago,
Antes que me pruebe, el gusto?

which would mean: 'Am I a relish that satiates his desire before he has a taste of me?'

P. 101, ll. 5–10, our text has:

El temor
De que en penas anda, muda
Mi valor en cobardía.
En no meterme me fundo
*En* cosas del otro mundo,
Que es bárbara valentía.

We may translate this: 'I am scared! The reason is that I don't *poke my nose into* things of the other world, which is foolhardiness.' Hartzenbusch reads:

En no meterme me fundo
*Con* cosas del otro mundo;
Que es bárbara valentía.

This seems to be far preferable, for it means: 'I am scared! The reason is that I don't *beard* spooks, for that is foolhardiness.'

This is all that I find to observe here about the form of the text, and we can pass on to the

Notes. They are differentiated advantageously from the "Notes" so frequent in our Spanish textbooks, in that they contain much valuable information, in place of startlingly novel misinterpretations that would move a cynic to tears of joy. Especially may we be thankful for the pretty note on p. 141, even though the *seguidilla* has since been printed elsewhere (*Revue Hispanique*, viii, 321, no. 166).[3] I had hoped to repay the editor in kind, but the expressions *cazolero* (p. 131) and *macho de Vamba* (p. 142) have, as yet, eluded the most determined search.[4] For lack of better, the following remarks may perhaps be acceptable.

The last note of p. 123 puzzles me greatly. I heartily share the editor's frank and healthy admiration for Tirso, and with him deplore whatever blemishes bedim the lustre of the great poet's worth; but I fail to see what is wrong in the syntax of i, 8, 14, and ii, 5, 79, to which he takes exception; while ii, 10, 23 and ii, 18, 21–22 may well be set down to the printer of the *princeps*.

P. 126, 89, *le ha dado garrotillo*, is not impersonal, for *garrotillo* is the subject. Literal translation: 'croup has stricken him.'

P. 127, 223. It would seem that there is nothing obscure about the passage, for the editor's first interpretation is most lucid. Perhaps, if we render *moscatel* by 'dude' (p. 17, l. 286, it is adjective) the version might be even more plausible. Covarrubias says: "Moscatel, lo que tiene sabor de musco, vulgarmente dicho almizcle"—from which the transition to an effeminate person is natural.

P. 136, 24: ¡Bonita es ella!, translated: "That's a good one!" is perhaps somewhat misleading. I might suggest: 'That would be just like her!' of course to be taken ironically.

P. 139, 118. If the old punctuation were retained, *transformó* would have for a subject the *riqueza* of l. 119. We may be glad the editor overlooked this possibility, for his emendation is singularly felicitous.

P. 139, 11. *Dinero de Valencia.* Covarrubias says:

"Dinero en el Reyno de Valencia es moneda menuda: vale lo que en Castilla tres blancas: un real Castellano vale veinte y tres dineros... Dinerillo, la dicha moneda Valenciana."

It would seem, therefore, that in our passage the expression means something very small, that easily slips through the fingers.

P. 140, 93-94, read: *mulas de collera*, 'draught mules.'

P. 142, 53. The editor has of course noticed that *mira*, in the passage on p. 90, l. 3, has for a subject *él* (that is Don Gil). The scene is curiously interesting for its use of the pronoun of address: first familiar *tú*, then scornful *él*, presently haughty *vos*, and again friendly *tú*.

It is curious to see that p. 1, l. 17, Tirso speaks of the sand of the Manzanares as *rojo*. The adjective is certainly not appropriate at present. Has the color changed in these three centuries, or did the word *rojo* denote a different tint? P. 110, l. 14 makes me suspect that it meant 'blond'; in fact, the distinction between shades of color is rather vaguely indicated in classical Spanish. In this passage there may perhaps be an intention to make the sand blush for shame of its river.

About the *casas á la malicia* (p. 110, l. 5) I may furnish this note, quoting from Mesonero Romanos (*El antiguo Madrid*, 1861, p. xxxix–xl; 1881—a much more accessible edition—tomo i, pp. 64–65):

". . . otra razón muy poderosa para limitar y reducir á mezquinas condiciones el caserío general de Madrid, fué la gravosa carga que el establecimiento de la corte trajo consigo, y era la conocida con el nombre de *Regalía de aposento*. Este pesado servicio del alojamiento de la real comitiva y funcionarios de la corte, recaía naturalmente sobre las casas que tenían más de un piso y cierta espaciosidad, . . . razón por la cual continuaron las construcciones *de malicia* ó sólo piso bajo., *etc.*"

The Vocabulary is in keeping with the excellence of the book. In many cases its renderings are made more valuable by specific references to the passages in the text. The only slips worth indicating here are: *á lo*

3 In the form of a *copla* we find it as follows:

La novia que pretendí
Todas las *efes* tenía:
Francisca, Francha y *fregonia*,
Fea, floja, flaca y fría.

(*Cancionero popular turolense* . . . por Severiano Doporto. Segunda edición, Madrid, Fé, s. a. (1900), no. 567.) See also: Rodríguez Marín, *Cantos populares*, tomo iv, no. 5830, and note.

4. In vol. i of the *Entremesses* of Quiñones de Benavente (*Libros de antaño*, tomo 1), an actress adresses all the occupants of the *cazuela* as "cazolería" (p. 151), and one single occupant as "cazolerilla" (p. 221). It therefore looks as if in our play Doña In.s, by her "¿Cazolero?" means: 'Would you like to sit down among us?' or to put it in the form of a noun: '[Are you] a ladies' man?' The continuation of the scene appears to bear out this assumption.

*caponil*, 'capon style, capon wise;' *correrse*, 'to get (be) ashamed' (p. 1, l. 18); *dar de*, 'to hit with, to deal (blows);' *sea á merced*, '[for pay] I'll take my chances on your generosity' (p. 16, l. 259); *ofrecer*, 'to promise' (p. 21, l. 14); *pasar*, *v. a.*, 'to do' (p. 39, l. 102); *plata quebrada* refers us to a note that, to my regret, seems to have dropped out in printing. It would, perhaps, have proven that the term can mean "small change," a signification with which I am unfamiliar—at least, it cannot pertain to the passage of p. 81, l. 62, where the translation is: 'battered plate' (that is, as good as coin, because the real ownership cannot be proven).

Summing up, it is a pleasure to record that Dr. Bourland has approached his task in a truly scholarly spirit. The text of the play, if overhauled once more (in which the publisher should also do his share, for the type betrays many signs of long use), may well be accepted as final and standard; while the Introduction and Notes are far and away the best that have yet accompanied a Spanish text published in this country. In short, this edition of *Don Gil* deserves to be ranked with our best school-editions of French and German classics, the more so, since for Spanish classic dramas, with hardly an exception, the editor must be his own pioneer, even to the establishing of his text and the making of his dictionary and grammar.

F. De Haan.

*Bryn Mawr College.*

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### *HISTORY OF THE INTERNATIONAL CORRESPONDENCE IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.*

To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes,

Sirs:—Some years ago, soon after the first introduction of the International Correspondence between Professors, Teachers, Students, professional men and women, and others, for the purpose of making a more complete and practical study of foreign languages, my attention was first turned toward this new departure in the educational field by Prof. Thomas A. Jenkins, then Professor of the Romance Languages in Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee, and now Professor in the same department in the University of Chicago. He had at that time a few students entering upon this work. Of course it will be understood that I refer to the system devised by Prof. P. Mieille, of the Lycée de Tarbes, of Tarbes, France, and who is this year the French editor of *Comrades All.* I introduced the system at once into Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania, and since that time a very considerable number of the students in French, and later quite a number of those in German, have been engaged in this correspondence. Gradually, by a series of letters in the public journals explaining this correspondence, and setting forth its advantages for all pursuing the study of spoken foreign languages, the attention of teachers, especially those of the Modern Languages, was turned toward the subject, and in several schools and colleges its introduction was begun. About this time quite an exhaustive history of the system abroad was prepared and published by Prof. Gaston Mouchet of Paris, and this was translated into English, and published in a leading educational New England magazine, the *Education* of Boston, Mass. This was the most effective public movement yet made, and about a year later the attention of the Modern Language Association of America was directed to it by a paper presented at their Annual meeting at the University of Virginia. At that meeting a committee of four was appointed to make further investigation, and report to the Association the result of their investigations at the annual meeting to be held the Christmas week of the following year. This was held at Columbia University (1899), when a very satisfactory report was presented, and the committee was continued, and five more members were added to the number, making a committee of nine, having general charge of the subject, with its central Bureau at Swarthmore College, at Swarthmore, Pa. That committee made a full report in 1900, at the annual meeting held at the University of Pennsylvania, and the committee was again continued without change. The present condition of the correspondence will be best understood by quoting from the Report made at

the Annual meeting at Harvard University, recently held in Christmas week. Without adhering to the exact language of the report, the general result reached can be stated as follows: The report of the previous year having been published in MOD. LANG. NOTES, of which a number of deprints were issued and distributed widely among teachers as circulars of information and encouragement, and later, the report having appeared in the published "Proceedings" of the Association, a very considerable impulse was given to the movement during the first year of the twentieth century, and during that year applications for correspondents were received at the central Bureau at Swarthmore, from eleven universities, seven colleges, four High Schools, and thirty one private persons. While this was encouraging, it leaves a very large part of our educational institutions, and the community in general, quite outside of the movement, yet to be reached by further strenuous effort, and an earnest propaganda worthy of so important a cause. The number of applications received in the year 1901 from the sources above named was as follows: three hundred and twenty-one for French correspondents, two hundred and fifty-seven for German, eleven for Italian, and six for Spanish correspondents. It will be seen that, these five hundred and ninty applicants having been supplied, it brings eleven hundred and eighty persons into communication with each other, each in two languages, during the past year, through the action of the Bureau direct, besides the large number of the friends of these who hear of the system, and are known to have furnished correspondents to each other, of which the Bureau has no account and no direct information.

And this introduces another side of this subject, never sufficiently considered, which requires explanation. Teachers often say that their hours for class instruction are so few and so crowded that they have not time to introduce this correspondence. It is precisely because of this condition of the class-work that this system affords relief, instead of giving an added burden to bear. No time whatever need be occupied with the correspondence during the recitation hours, but the students of different nationalities being once introduced to each other, and started in the work, carry it on themselves, without assistance from their teachers, receiving all needed assistance from each others criticisms and corrections. This is not mere theory, but practice, as I have observed it in my classes from year to year. An occasional letter of special interest, or amusing errors made in attempts at a foreign tongue, may occasionally be read in class as a variation of the monotony of what is sometimes too dull and tedious, and this can be done without at all exposing the names of the writers of such letters, if so desired. And it has been observed that the added interest in the class shown by those who are corresponding, and who have been corresponding longest, makes of a study which might otherwise become dull and monotonous, a study full of vitality and spirit. One may almost say that it gives the work a new meaning, changing it from the dull study of a dead unspoken language to that which may be called a living language indeed. And again, this work begun in term time, is not suspended in vacations, for the interest of vacation, at home and in travel, inspires the student with new themes, and thus the correspondence once well started in term time, is active throughout the entire year. And not only so, it goes on from year to year, long after leaving school or college, and may lead to many new friendships and business relations, and thus be a life long source of pleasure and profit to those thus engaged. It is hoped, therefore, that teachers will no longer say that they have not the time necessary for the introduction of the International Correspondence; on the other hand, they are too much crowded by the work, in the ordinary way, to be able to do without the relief which this correspondence affords.

The financial side of the question requires a brief notice. The aim of the bureau is to make as light a charge as possible, to cover the actual expense incurred for stamps, stationery, type-writing, printing circulars, etc., including foreign fees when charged abroad. And this expense is incurred but once, and not repeated in any individual cases after the correspondence is once begun. This may be illustrated by saying that the entire amount of fees paid this bureau in 1901 is an average of

about ten cents for each person supplied. Of course to secure this result the labor of office work is given without charge.

The report of the Committee on the International Correspondence given at Harvard concluded with an earnest recommendation to patronize and circulate as widely as possible the new Annual started last Easter, and issued from the office of the *Review of Reviews* in London, called in English *Comrades All.* It is believed that this annual, published in three or four languages, will prove an invaluable aid in propagating the correspondence in England, France, Germany, and America, and probably in Italy and Spain, where this movement is beginning to assume a promising condition.

EDWARD H. MAGILL,

*Chairman of the International Correspondence Committee of the Modern Language Association of America.*

*Swarthmore College.*

## *RABELAIS' PANTAGRUEL.*

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—In the February number of 1901 I called attention to the discovery, by Rosenthal of Munich, of what he believed to be the original text of the fifth book of Rabelais' *Pantagruel.* It looks very much as if the hopes at first entertained with regard to the value of the find must be given up.

A careful examination has been made by experts (Gaston Paris, Émile Picot, Abel Lefranc, Henri Stein, etc.) and they are unanimous in declaring that there can be nothing common between Rabelais and the text owned by Rosenthal.

The impression of those scholars who were in a position to judge *de visu* is well summed up by H. Stein, archivist at the "Archives Nationales" in Paris, in his communication to the *Bibliographe Moderne*, which is reprinted separately by Picard et Fils, Paris, 1901, under the title: *Un Rabelais apocryphe de 1549.*

The book was without doubt printed in the sixteenth century—1549 as the title page indicates—during the time of Rabelais; but it is nevertheless an important forgery. Moreover a poor and careless forgery. The style is absolutely colorless. As to the contents, several extracts given by Stein more than suffice to convince one that anything but the Rabelaisian genius is to be found in these pages.

Then, there is no fourth chapter, while on the other hand, there are two twelfth and two thirteenth chapters. The very handsome binding betrays almost certainly a Lyonnaise origin; thus probably the book was printed at Lyons; but the printing is very far from perfect. The capital letters at the head of the chapters are of different types. Occasionally they are missing altogether, or replaced by small letters of the ordinary type of the book in the midst of large blank squares. Again misprints are frequent, and a remarkable quantity of misplaced and senseless apostrophes are scattered all over the pages. In short, says M. Stein: "Ce serait folie que de voir là autre chose qu'une vulgaire et malhonnête contrefaçon."

The author probably belonged to the large class of the dissatisfied of the sixteenth century; he wanted a universal reform of society, and thought he might bring it about by attacking everybody and everything: State, church, nobles, the rich, priests, lawyers, women, etc. In order to give more force to his tirades he chose to publish them under the name of Rabelais.

Did Rabelais himself know anything about it? Among the "lettres patentes" of Henri II there is one (August 6, 1550) which shows that he complained of bad and inaccurate reprints of his books, and even of insipid and scandalous imitations. (See for a copy of this letter the Rabelais edition of the Bibliophile Jacob, Paris, 1840, p. li of the Preface.) But it is impossible to say whether he knew of the special text under discussion. Stein has found no condemnation of it in the "Arrêts du Parlement."

Thus it appears that the discovery of M. Rosenthal will not help to solve a single one of the numerous questions connected with the fifth book of Pantagruel. It leaves the problem exactly where it was before.

One minor point is interesting. Folio 14 contains a part of the text printed in the form of a bottle. Stein remarks about it:

"On ne peut, en la voyant [la bouteille] paraître ici, s'empêcher de songer immédiatement à la dive bouteille toute revestue de pur et beau cristallin, en forme ovale dont Bacbuc explique la glose à Panurge au V^e^ livre de

Pantagruel (chap. xlv). Je n'irai pas jusqu' à affirmer que Rabelais en a emprunté l'idée à son contrefacteur: j'admirerais l'ironie! mais il n'y en a pas moins là un rapprochement curieux qui éveille l'attention. C'est d'ailleurs l'unique point de ressemblance entre les deux publications."

ALBERT SCHINZ.

*Bryn Mawr College.*

## *OTWAY'S Orphan: SMOLLETT'S Count Fathom.*

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—Certain similarities between Otway's *Orphan* and Smollett's *Count Fathom* should be noted, if attention has not already been called to them. Otway's tragedy is the story of Monimia, the orphan daughter of a soldier named Chamout, a Bohemian gentleman, and a comrade in arms of Acasto, a Bohemian nobleman, who is one of the characters in the play. Chamout, dying a widower after losing his property in "the late and civil discords," left his daughter to the care of Acasto, by whom she was reared as if she had been his own child.

Acasto has twin sons, Castalio and Polydore. Castalio loves Monimia, and desires to make her his wife; and they are secretly married in the third act of the drama. Polydore professes to love Monimia, too, but his desires are not honorable. With the success of Polydore's designs, and the catastrophe that ensues we have nothing to do; but it may be mentioned that Monimia poisons herself, and that Polydore, in deepest contrition, impales himself upon Castalio's sword.

In Smollett's tale, Renaldo Melvil is a young Hungarian nobleman, who, wandering to Spain, falls in love with Serafina, the daughter of Don Diego de Zelos, a Spanish nobleman. His love is returned, but, as Renaldo is disguised as a poor, wandering music-teacher, Don Diego is enraged at the thought of his daughter wedding one in such a station. Smollett makes it appear that Diego has killed the lover, but it develops later that it was a burglar whom he slew in the darkness. He then administers poison to his wife and daughter, and, believing them dead, leaves Spain.

Renaldo then takes Serafina and her mother to England, where the mother soon dies. About this time, Ferdinand, who has assumed the title "Count Fathom," and who is the foster-brother of Renaldo, arrives in England, meeting Serafina there. Serafina's identity must be concealed to guard against her being discovered by a powerful Spanish suitor, and hence Smollett introduces her into the story as "a young lady whom for the present we shall call Monimia, a name that implies her orphan situation." This phraseology may refer directly to Otway's *Orphan*, or it may be a mere interpretation of the name itself. Fathom at once lays siege to Monimia's heart, with the most dishonorable intentions, not only towards his friend and foster-brother, Renaldo, but also towards Monimia herself. Here we have almost exactly the same situation as in Otway.

Renaldo returning to Hungary on a business visit, Monimia, or Serafina, is almost entirely in the power of Fathom, from whom Smollett rescues her by the clumsy artifice of illness, simulated death, and a pretended funeral.

It may be added that Fathom afterwards repents of his misdeeds, and appears to have reformed. See conclusion of the book. Moreover, in the person of Grieve, the apothecary, he reappears (not the only time that Smollett uses this trick) in *Humphrey Clinker*, being now a "sincere convert to virtue," and "universally respected." See, in *Clinker*, letter of Matthew Bramble, dated Harrowgate, June 26.

We know that *The Orphan* was popular in Smollett's day, and it seems that the novelist, himself also a dramatist and a student of the drama, deliberately used such parts of a favorite play as seemed desirable.

J. W. PEARCE.

*Boys' High School, New Orleans.*

## *MEYER'S Grundriss der neueren deutschen Litteraturgeschichte.*

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—Prof. Meyer having, in a private letter, taken polite exception to part of my notice of his *Grundriss* in the June number of MOD. LANG. NOTES, a few supplementary words may not be out of place.

Prof. Meyer questions the utility of the corrections regarding the change of publishers for

the works listed, and of the suggestion that the size and price of the works be noted. It is true that most German users of the *Grundriss* can get such added information, on matters subject to frequent change, easily and expeditiously from their booksellers. My suggestions, however, were made principally from the point of view of the user of the book who has no German bookstore conveniently at hand, and with the conception of a bibliography as essentially a time-saving device.—The somewhat obvious fact escaped me that dates of death are given in the *Grundriss* only for authors whose death occurred since the appearance of the author's *Litteraturgeschichte*.

I hope it was clear to everyone who read my review that the long list of corrections, printed for the behoof of the possessors of the *Grundriss* as well as of the author, applied largely to relatively unimportant details. It was furthest from my thought to suggest the least doubt as to the value of this important work, to which the much-abused word "indispensable" really applies.

JOHN SCHOLTE NOLLEN.

*Iowa College.*

## *ALLOTRIA II.*

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—1. In his *Bemerkungen zum Havelok*, *Engl. Stud.* xxix, 371, Morsbach seems to have taken a brief Homeric nap. He writes: "Das Wort *oure* (ae. *ōfer* m. '*ufer*') fehlt bei Stratmann-Bradley." And asks, farther on: "Ist *over* (ae. *ōfer*) sonst noch [that is, besides *Havelok* 321] im Mittelenglischen belegt?"

The word *ōver* 'shore' is in Stratmann-Bradley, 465 *b*, where this Havelok passage is cited, also *Layamon* 8584, Robert Manning's *History* 4336; to these may be added (from Skeat's Glossary to *Havelok*) *Layamon* 31117. In all, there are four passages. It is interesting to note that in all four the word is used in the rime *over: Dover;* apparently a riming formula in M. E. poetry.

In the interval between the writing and the printing of this paper Holthausen has pointed out Morsbach's error; see *Engl. Stud.* xxx, 343.

2. To the two Wulfstan passages containing O. E. *and*='if,' cited by Wülfing, *Angl. Beibl.* xii, 89, and the *Exodus* (Ælfric) passage cited by Einenkel, Paul, *Grundr.*² §164.*η* (the passage is *Ex.* iv, 23), may be added: *and* he larum wile . . . minum hyran, *Juliana* 378; *and* hæbbe on his wæstme ȝolian mycelnysse, *Angels. Homilien*, etc., ed. Assmann, p. 40/411 (tr. 'mag er auch haben' by Pogatscher, *Angl.* xxiii, 287); *ȝelice and*='sicut' in Alcuin *Virt.* lines 88, 97, 330 (*Anglia* xi, 371–391) and in *Oros.* 74/24, 92/15. Also to be noted in this connection is the use of *and*='quatenus'; see Abbo, *Glossæ* (*Zs. f. d. Alt.* xxxi, 1–27): quatinus valeas=and þæt þa mæge, 516, ast colat =and begæð, 402. In *Juliana* 636: *and* to þære stowe, the *and* seems to mean 'usque'. In *Wulfstan* 289/24 the sense 'quatenus' is obscured by Napier's interpolation. The passage reads: God hit ðe forgife and *me geunne þæt* ic mote. The *me geunne þæt* is not in the MS.; the priest says to the penitent: God forgive thee so far as in my power lies.

For a discussion of the German *unde* see Kraus, *Zs. f. d. Alt.* xliv, 149–186.

3. Usually Logeman's English is unimpeachable for its accuracy. In *Engl. Stud.* xxix, 431, however, he has fallen into an error which defeats his purpose. Speaking of Cushman's *The Devil and the Vice*, he says:

> "The uncomfortable feeling one has, when working through this book, is that precisely subsequent investigations are necessary, *i. e.*, it is not a *definite* book,—not by any means the last word on the subject."

The italicizing is mine. Now the results in Cushman's book are *definite* enough; the objection to them is that they are not *definitive* 'abschliessend, zum Abschluss führend.' I should hardly feel justified in playing the schoolmaster towards a scholarly foreigner, were it not for the observation that only too many Anglo-Americans who ought to know better commit this very blunder.

4. Permit me to raise a voice of indignant protest against the paper in *Engl. Stud.* xxx, 91–117, entitled *Zum Ursprung des Burenkrieges*. With the merits of the paper I have nothing to do. The writer's views may be perfectly sound; I certainly am far from asserting that they are not. What I do assert is that they have *nothing to do* with an *Organ für englische Philologie*. Is the domain of pure and quiet scholarship to be invaded by this rattle of arms?

5. Arthur J. Roberts, in his paper, *Did Hrotswitha Imitate Terence*, NOTES xvi, col. 478–481, may be correct. Yet his remark:

"one cannot imagine any reason why the learned Celtes—poet of reputation as well as scholar—who discovered the manuscripts, should have manufactured them,"

leads me to suspect that he has not perused carefully Aschbach's study *Roswitha u. Conrad Celtes*. Originally printed in the Vienna *Sitzungsberichte*, 1867, lvi, pp. 3–62, it was printed in a second and enlarged edition in 1868. Now Aschbach tells us pretty plainly that the Roswitha dramas are a fabrication of the sixteenth century and supplies for Celtes quite adequate motives. Those scholars who, for example Creizenach, severely ignore Aschbach's investigations and cherish the myth of a Gandersheim dramatic literature in the tenth century, are believing something "too good to be true."

6. Cook, in his edition of the *Christ*, undertakes to explain *āttres ord*, 768. In itself the phrase is not self explanatory, and is equally obscure in *Juliana* 471, where the Devil boasts:

misthelme forbræȝd
þurh attres ord eaȝna leoman
sweartum scurum, etc., etc.

In *Riddles* lxi, 13, the word *ord* is puzzling:

hu mec seaxes ord *ond* seo swiþre hond,
eorles inȝeþonc *ond* ord somod
þinȝum ȝeþydan, etc., etc.

Why should *ord* be repeated so stupidly? Nor is the trouble remedied by Herzfeld's substitution of *ecȝ*; 'point' and 'edge' amount to the same thing in this connection. We can, however, improve all these passages by reading *or* oð 'breath' for *orod*, as in *Sol. Saturn*, 221,

ðurh attres oroð inȝanȝ rymaþ

7. Why do Kluge-Lutz, *English Etymology*, adhere to the impossible derivation of Mn.E. 'tight' from Icel. *þéttr*, M.E. *thight*. Even Bradley-Stratmann equates *tiȝht* with *þiht*. One would like to know what other instances are found of initial *þ* appearing as *t*. No; *þéttr*, *thight*=German *dicht*, whereas *tight* is the Skandinavian *títt*, adverbial neuter of *tíðr*, for example in the formula *hart ok títt*. The *gh* in English is mere spelling analogy, as in *delight*.

J. M. HART.

*Cornell University.*

## *GERMAN LITERATURE.*

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—Messrs. F. Schneider & Co. in Berlin have just issued the second (concluding) volume of their encyclopedic work, *Das deutsche Jahrhundert, in Einzelschriften* by a number of specialists, under the general editorship of George Stockhausen. These generously proportioned volumes, of some eight hundred pages each, offer a comprehensive account of the aims and achievements of the Germans during the nineteenth century, grouped under the successive heads of literature, art, philosophy, economics, jurisprudence, history, music, military and naval science, and the several departments of natural science. The work is a small library in itself—or rather, a library of historical treatises, supplemented by the data of a *Grundriss*, for the reader finds at the foot of each page statistical information about all important personages mentioned in the text, together with references to biographical and critical literature.

The first section, *Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung im neunzehnten Jahrhundert* (pp. 160), is by Dr. Carl Busse of Berlin, who is himself favorably known as a poet and story-writer of the younger generation, and this section, like the others, is obtainable separately (br. M. 3.—geb. M. 4 —). I am acquainted with no more suitable *vade mecum* for students of contemporary German literature. Dr. Busse gives a bird's-eye view of the whole period from the last years of Schiller's life to the present time, in a series of necessarily brief, but precise, clear, and illuminating characterizations. This is a handy book of reference, but not merely that. The writer is not a mere compiler of statistics, nor yet a juggler with epigrams. He presents a narrative, properly proportioned and skilfully arranged, which can be read with pleasure from beginning to end. He does not profess to make any new contributions to knowledge of the subjects that he treats. His point of view is that of an impartial and independent critic, who sees clearly, feels sympathetically, and sets down his thoughts or impressions with directness and sincerity.

W. G. HOWARD.

*Harvard University.*

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

**Baltimore, December, 1902.**

## *ETYMOLOGIES.*

*Cheap, cope, coup, kaupatjan, caupo, κάπηλος, etc.* II.

We may now devote particular attention to some of these words, especially to the English representatives.

The Gothic verb *kaup-at-jan* is clearly only an intensive or rather iterative derivative of *kaupōn*. Compare OHG. *slagazen*<*slagōn*, *worphazen*<*worfōn*, *swan(ke)zen*<*swanken*, etc. That the iterative derivative should have been the usual form in the past and so become in Old Norse the regular preterit of the simple *kaupa*, is very interesting. It is due to the fact that we most frequently have occasion to use an iterative in recounting what we have observed and what, therefore, *has happened*. Compare the many Indo-European verbs that have reduplicated past tenses but simple presents. That the iterative retained in Gothic (*kaupatjan*) the meaning 'strike' longer than the simple verb (*kaupōn*) did, is perfectly natural. The word that meant simply 'strike' easily came to mean 'bargain,' 'barter,' etc.; but the word that meant to 'pummel' had first to lose its iterative force before it could assume a figurative meaning based on the notion of simple striking. When the simple *kaupōn* got the meaning 'barter,' *kaupatjan* took its place and in time followed its example in assuming the meaning 'barter', as is shown by the Finnish *kaupata*.

It has long been customary to derive English *cope* 'barter', 'buy', from LG. *cōpen*, and to regard *coup* 'barter', 'buy', as a northern dialectic variant of it. It is now, however, recognized that *coup* is from ON. *kaupa*=Goth. *kaupōn*, cf. the Oxford Dictionary under *coup* v. i. It is my desire to show that *cope* has the same origin and is not from Low German. The idea that we got the word *cope* from LG. *cōpen* was natural enough. In the first place, we have from Lydgate: *Flemynges began on me for to cry, Master, what will you copen or buy?*, and from Heywood *The Ducheman saieth, that segging is good cope*. But, on second thought, we must recognize that this is certainly no evidence that the English word was derived from the Dutch. As much might we to-day prove the German origin of the words *glass* and *beer* from a magazine article containing the following: "I was walking slowly on, when I was hailed by a German saloon-keeper, who asked me, 'Vill you haf a glass of beer?'" If English *cope* had come from Low German or Dutch, we should expect to find it most at home in the South or in the sea-port towns. As a matter of fact, the evidence of the living dialects proves that its habitat is that part of England where the Scandinavian influence was pronounced. It may be asked: How can we account for the *au* or *ǫu* of *coup* and the *ō* or *vo* of *cope* as both coming from Old Norse? This is, however, perfectly regular. Old-Norse *au* had become *ǫu* before it was carried over to England. In the few Old-Norse words containing *ǫu* that were introduced into English in Old-English times it appears that the English found in their *ō* the best substitute for the foreign *ǫu*, cf. OE. *lahcōp*, *landcōp*, <ON. *lǫgkǫup*, *landkǫup*, and OE. *ōra*<ON. *ǫurar*, Kluge, Paul's *Grundriss*², i, p. 934. It was, however, in ME. times that Scandinavian words really became a part of English speech and by that time English had developed an *ǫu* diphthong out of OE. *oʒ*, for example, in *boʒa* 'bow'. The ON. *ǫu* naturally fell in with this and, from that time on, *ǫu* developed alike in native words and in those adapted from Scandinavian. In parts of England, as in standard English, this *ǫu* became *ou*, later *ō*, which has since begun to break into a diphthong again. In parts of northern England and of Scotland, the *ǫu* remained unchanged and to this day differs but little from our *au* (or *ao*)<*ū* in *how*, *house*, etc., which in the districts involved still have *ū*. Thus the Scandinavian words *kaup* and *naut* (=OE. *ċēap*, *nēat*) have come down to us dialectically as *coup* and *nout*, corresponding to the Scotch *bow* (pronounced pratically as we pronounce the verb *to bow down*), and also as *cope* and *note* corresponding to the English *bow* (pronounced so as to rime with *go*.)

English *cope*, *coup*, 'strike', 'contend', 'fall heavily', presents at first sight more difficulty.

This word is generally derived without hesitation from OF. *couper*, *co(l)per*, 'strike,' now 'cut.' That the word has in part this origin, I would not dispute, especially when used of formal contests, as at tournaments, and in the figurative sense 'to cope with many difficulties.' The fact, however, that in the more original senses 'strike,' 'knock over,' 'tip over,' 'fall heavily,' the word is to-day confined to dialects spoken where Scandinavian influence was strong, makes it clear that as a common man's word it was of Scandinavian origin. It thus betrays the earlier meaning 'strike' that was displaced in the Old Norse of literature by the derivative meaning 'bargain', 'barter', 'buy'. In other words, English *cope*, *coup*, is a blending of an Old-French word and an Old-Norse word for 'strike'.

There is in German an interesting parallel to the change of 'strike' into 'tip over,' 'fall heavily', namely *kaupeln*, *käupeln*, 'tip', 'turn somersaults'; cf. also *kaiplen*, *koiplen*, *keibeln*, etc., 'stumble,' 'fall heavily'. Hildebrand's attempt to derive *kaupeln* (with original *au*) from *kaupe* (with *au*<*ū*) 'topknot', cannot stand. In the first place, if *kaupeln* were a verb derived from the noun *kaupe*, we should expect the same vowel, not one related by gradation. But the diversity that the various forms show in vowel and consonant makes it clear that we have to deal with slightly different imitations of the sound of striking and falling bodies. Compare *kaukeln*, *kokeln*, *gaukeln*, and the many other words in which the idea of tipping or tumbling merges into that of practicing the arts of professional tumblers, jugglers, etc. *Kaupeln* 'swap', 'trade', from older *kūpeln*, cannot be the same word as *kaupeln*, 'tip', which has original *au*. But there is no reason to doubt that we have in *kaupeln*, *kūpeln*, in *kauten*, *kūten*, and the many like-sounding German words that mean 'swap' or 'trade secretly,' simply more words that were originally imitations of the sound of striking and acquired the idea of 'bargain', 'barter', 'trade', just as we have found that *kaufen*, *swap*, and the others did.

It may be well to add a few words as to the theory of the Latin origin of Germanic *kaup-*. Any attempt to justify this theory must take the form of an effort to make a whole series of improbabilities appear passably probable. First of all, we are confronted with the very obvious richness of Germanic forms throughout the Germanic territory, in contrast with the fact that there is no trace whatever of the word in any Romance language. The situation is not improved by referring, as Kluge does, to the fact that the name *Cæsar*, *Kaiser*, spread widely in Germanic while the Romance languages adhered to *Imperator*. The cases are entirely different. This use of the proper name was clearly an innovation and naturally established itself more easily where the ground was not already preempted, as it was by *Imperator* in Latin itself. If *caupo* had been a native Latin word, being the name of a person who was familiar to the common people, we may be sure there would be traces of its use in one or another Romance tongue. If, however, it arose as a designation of a class of foreign tradespeople in the city of Rome, we can easily understand why it did not spread throughout the Latin-speaking world. Moreover, it would not be strange at all if Germanic traders, of however humble a class, should on settling in Rome call themselves by what was in their tongue a dignified term for their calling; while, on the other hand, it would be absurd to suppose that Roman traders in foreign parts should designate themselves by what was in their own tongue almost a term of contempt (cf. the first edition of Kluge's dictionary).

Furthermore, the word *caupo*, *caupōnis*, is a derivative form that stands quite without the support of any more primitive word.[1] I know of no explanation of *caupo* as a pure Latin word that would stand the test of present ideas of phonological development. But it is on this *caupo* that all other related Latin words are based, for example, *caupōna*, *caupōnāria*, *caupōnius*, *caupōnor*, etc., most of which are rare or late. But Latin *caupo*, *-ōnis*, corresponds to the OHG. weak noun *koufo*<Gc. *kaup-an-*. The Latin theory compells us, first, to assume an unexplained Latin *n*- derivative. Then, to suppose that this word went north and became the South-German *koufo*, but, when it passed

1 The exceedingly rare, or even questionable *cūpa*, *cūpa*, 'a female tavernkeeper and castanet-dancer' has no weight in this question. It is most natural to explain it as a jocose use of *cūpa* 'a wine cask;' in the form *cūpa* it was possibly influenced by *cŭpo*, the popular form of *caupo*.

still farther north, assumed what Kluge calls a "verdeutlichendes Element" and became OE. *čēapman*, etc. Furthermore, that, though starting in South Germany as an *n*- derivative stem designating a noun of agency, it gave birth to many Germanic forms, some of them of primitive type and signification, for example, *kaup*, *čēap*, meaning 'trade', 'market', 'purchase', 'price', etc.! The theory of the Germanic origin supposes that the word started as a verb meaning first 'strike' and later 'bargain', and as an abstract noun meaning first 'stroke' and later 'bargain', and that when in different parts of the Germanic territory nouns of agency arose, in some it was a weak *n*- stem, in others a compound in *-man*, for example, OE. *čēapman*, corresponding to *čēapstōw* 'market place', *čēapdæg* 'market day,' etc. The *n*- stem arose in the Germanic territory nearest to Italy and so it was this form that crossed the boundary and appeared in Latin. For there is nothing in the way of supposing that this Germanic word came to Rome exactly as at a later date *mango* came over the Alps, as I have shown in *The American Journal of Philology*, vol. 22. It may be objected that a Germanic word might have come to Rome in post-Augustan times, but that we have traces of the use of *caupo* as early as the time of Plautus. This objection, however, ignores the well-known fact that in practically all countries the peddler, the huckster, and, in large cities at least, the inn-keeper, is very likely to be a foreigner,—and we know that this was equally true of Greece and Rome. These people pass from country to country long before armies invade and international relations are thought of.

In dealing with Latin *caupo*, scholars have sometimes associated with it Greek κάπηλος 'huckster', 'tavern-keeper.' How they would reconcile the Greek α with the Latin *au*, I do not know. There is, however, no need of it, for there is a very simple explanation of κάπηλος. It is formed from κάπη 'a crib for the food of cattle', 'a manger'. For this explanation it is immaterial whether κάπη was thus alluded to in a jocose way, as we sometimes speak of food as "fodder" and a bed as a "roost", or whether the κάπηλος was originally a man who provided travelers with the bulky food required for their beasts of burden and only incidentally with food for themselves.

GEORGE HEMPL.

*University of Michigan.*

## *DID BOCCACCIO SUGGEST THE CHARACTER OF CHAUCER'S KNIGHT?*

STANZA 40 of Book vi of the *Teseide* reads as follows:

> "In cotal guisa co'suoi rugginoso
> Dell'arme e del sudor venne in Atene:
> E benchè bel non pala, valoroso
> Chiunque il vede veramente il tene;
> E fe', del modo suo non borioso
> Ma umile, parlare a tutti bene:
> Ben s'ammiraron della condizione
> Chiunque il vide a sì fatto barone."[1]

This is the last of six stanzas describing King Evander, who was one of the combatants in the tournament. The details mentioned in this stanza are so similar to the most prominent characteristics of Chaucer's knight, as he is described in the *Prologue* to the *Canterbury Tales* (ll. 43–78), as to suggest that Chaucer may have got the first conception of his knight from this source.

Boccaccio, in the previous five stanzas, has described a Greek warrior-king. He has told Evander's birthplace and parentage, how he was mounted and how he was armed. He has described his dress and that of his followers; and he has devoted especial attention to a description of Evander's shield, on which were depicted scenes illustrating former adventures and experiences.

There is nothing in these stanzas that is exactly the same as in Chaucer's *Prologue*. There are some correspondences but these might easily be accidental,—thus: (a) both are distinguished warriors. (b) Each has followers with him. (c) The previous deeds of valor are told for each, though in different ways—for Evander, it is done by a description of his shield; for the knight, the means is direct narration. But if Chaucer was influenced by this description of Evander, he could not possibly have made use of the details found in these five stanzas,—because the settings are too different. Boccaccio had described a Greek king going to a tournament, while Chaucer wished to present an ideal English knight riding in a company of pilgrims.

But the stanza first quoted seems to bear toward Chaucer a different relation from the other five. There are the following agreements:

[1] 'In this way, with his followers, he came into Athens, begrimed from his arms and from sweat. Although he did not look beautiful, whoever sees him holds him truly valorous. He was not haughty in manner but humble: he spoke well to all. Whoever saw him marveled at this in such a baron.'

Evander came into Athens begrimed from his arms and from sweat.

The knight joined the pilgrims with his clothes stained by his armor.

Evander, though he did not look beautiful, was held to be valorous by all.

The knight was not gay, but he was worthy and wise.

Evander was not proud in manner but humble; he spoke well to all.

The knight was in bearing as meek as a maid; he never said anything discourteous to his inferiors.

It hardly seems to me that these agreements can be explained as due to mere chance. What all found striking in King Evander, we find striking in Chaucer's knight—that such a distinguished warrior should be so humble and courteous in bearing toward those of lesser rank. Chaucer knew the *Teseide*, having early made some sort of translation or paraphrase of it in his lost work, *Palamon and Arcite*. He must, therefore, have been familiar with this description long before he conceived of the *Canterbury Tales*. The *Knight's Tale* is itself the story of the *Teseide*. The character of the knight had to harmonize with the story he was to tell. There is, therefore, a close relationship between the two, and one might suggest the other. If then the *Teseide* has within itself an unneeded character suitable to act as narrator of the story to the Canterbury pilgrims, what is more natural than to suppose that Chaucer might have taken the essential traits of this personage as the nucleus around which to build up his own character of the knight?

FRANK E. BRYANT.

*University of Kansas.*

## *CHAUCER AND THE Roman de Thèbes.*

PROF. LEOPOLD CONSTANS in *Le Roman de Thèbes* (Société des Anciens Textes Français, Paris, 1890), Part ii, p. clix, says:

'Les formes corrompues *Polimites* (*Troylus and Cryseide*, v, 1488) pour *Polinices*, qui se rencontre un peu plus loin, et *Parthonolope*, prouvent que Chaucer connaissait une des redactions en prose de notre poème'.

But Prof. Constans does not mention the argument of the twelve books of Statius' *Thebaid* placed after l. 1498 in all the MSS. of the *Troilus* except Harl. 2392 and Rawlinson Poet 163 (Globe Chaucer, p. 552). In the Campsall MS. the first line of this argument reads,

Associat profugum Tideo primus Polimitem,

and the form *Polimitem* or *Polymytem* is found in all the other published MSS. except Gg. 4. 27, which has *Polimite*. There is no similar argument of the *Thebaid* in the *Roman de Thèbes*, and the fact that in the *Troilus* it occurs in Latin is against the theory that Chaucer made use of the French romance.

Prof. Constans supports his view by citing also the form *Parthonolope* for the *Parthonopaeus* of Statius, but here again his assertions are not borne out by the MSS. Campsall, Corpus, and St. John's have *Parthonopea;* Harl. 1239 and Harl. 3943, *Partonopea*; Harl. 2280, *Parthonopes*; and Gg. 4. 27, *Parte-nopea*, in the ninth line of the argument of the *Thebaid*. But since Cb., Cp., Gg. 4. 27, and St. John's give *Parthonope*, Hl. 3943 *Partonope*, Hl. 2280 *Parthonopo*, and Hl. 1239 *Parthenope* as the form of this name in l. 1503 of Chaucer's own text, we may conclude that the *Parthonolope* of the French romance had no influence whatever on the form used by Chaucer.

Prof. Constans continues:

'Une autre preuve nous semble resulter de deux passages où *Theodamas* (évidemment le *Thiodamas* de Stace, puisque, une fois sur deux, il est question du siège de Thèbes), est donné comme un fameux joueur de trompette, à côté de Joab, à qui il attribue le même talent:

> At every cours in came loude minstralcie,
> That never Joab tromped for to here,
> Ne he Theodamas yet half so clere
> At Thebes, whan the citee was in doute.
> (*The Merchant's Tale*,—E. 1717-21.)
>
> There heard I Joab trumpe also,
> Theodamas, and other mo,
> And all that used clarion
> In Casteloigne and Aragon,
> To learnen saw I trumpen there.'
> (*The House of Fame*, iii, 155-160.)

The account of the election of Thiodamas as successor to the augur Amphiaraus is given in the *Roman de Thèbes* ll. 4951-5172, but there is no mention of Joab; neither is there anything to indicate that Chaucer was following the *Roman* rather than the account in the *Thebaid*, viii, 343.

As a final proof that Chaucer was familiar with a version of the *Roman de Thèbes*, Prof.

Constans cites a passage containing knowledge which he thinks Chaucer could not have obtained from Statius:

'Enfin, il convient de mentionner aussi ce fait que le *Roman de Thèbes* que lit Cryseide (*Tr. and Cr.*, ii, 99 sqq.) donne en tête l'histoire d'Œdipe:

> This romance is of Thebes that we rede,
> And we have heard that kinge Laius deide
> Through Edippus his sonne, etc.

Nous croyons donc que si Chaucer, dans l' œuvre tout entier de qui déborde l'erudition, a connu la *Thébaïde*, il a connu aussi le *Roman de Thèbes* ou, du moins, une de ses rédactions en prose'.

However, this knowledge could have been derived from the *Thebaid* i, 60-68, where Œdipus, addressing Tisiphone, prays:

> Si bene quid merui, si me de matre cadentem
> Fovisti gremio et traiectum vulnere plantas
> Firmasti, si stagna peti Cirrhea bicorni
> Interfusa iugo, possem cum degere falso
> Contentus Polybo, trifidaeque in Phocidos arto
> Longaevum implicui regem secuique trementis
> Ora senis, dum quaero patrem, si Sphingos iniquae
> Callidus ambages te praemonstrante resolvi.

Other allusions to the death of Laius are found in the *Thebaid* ii, 64 and vii, 355.

There would seem, then, to be no well-grounded reason for asserting that Chaucer was acquainted with one of the versions of the *Roman de Thèbes*.

J. D. Rodeffer.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

## *THE SOURCE OF TENNYSON'S THE LADY OF SHALOTT.*

Why does the story of *The Lady of Shalott* differ so greatly from that of *Lancelot and Elaine* and from Malory? The earliest virtual answer that I find is in Professor Palgrave's *Lyrical Poems by Alfred Lord Tennyson* (1885). He says,

"An Italian romance upon the *Donna di Scalotta*, in which Camelot, unlike the Celtic tradition, was placed near the sea—suggested No. xxix [The Lady of Shalott]. It is under the very different guise of the maid of Astolat that the legend reappears in the *Idylls of the King*."

This is the entire note, and the only one on the poem (p. 257, ed. 1899). Subsequent commentators give without criticism the substance of the note—Luce in his *Handbook* making the *lapsus* of ascribing it to *Sir* Francis Palgrave. John Churton Collins, referring to it, remarks, "On what authority this is said I do not know, nor can I identify the novel. In Novella lxxxi, a collection of novels printed at Milan in 1804, there is one [I tranpose, "In a collection of novels printed at Milan in 1804 (date of vol. i) there is one, Novella lxxxi] that tells, but very briefly, the story of Elaine's love and death .... and as in this novel Camelot is placed near the sea this may be the novel referred to."[1]

If Mr. Collins could not identify the romance we may assume that the larger British libraries do not contain it. I can say that the libraries of Harvard, Yale, and Cornell have no such romance. Obviously Palgrave had never seen it, or he would have given us something more definite for a title than "An Italian romance upon the *Donna di Scalotta*." If a "romanzo" on that theme is in existence it would be likely to be in the Biblioteca Nazionale at Florence, and I would suggest to literary tourists who may visit that city to search for it in that library, to which foreigners have free access. Through the kindness of the present Lord Tennyson I can say that he believes Palgrave to be right. But where is that romance? and is it likely that a volume that cannot now be found in the great libraries of England and America was accessible to Tennyson in 1832?

In the circumstances, it seems worth while to read carefully the Novella referred to by Mr. Collins. By the kindness of Mr. Kiernan of the Harvard Library I have a copy, which is as follows:—

Raccolta di Novelle
Volume I.

Novella lxxxi.

Quì conta come la Damigella di Scalot morì per amore di Lancialotto de Lac.

Una figluola d'un grande Varvassore si amò Lancialotto de Lac oltremisura, ma elli non le volle donare suo amore; imperciocchè elli l'avea donato alla Reina Ginevra, Tanto amò costei Lancialotto, ch'ella venne alla morte, e comandò, che quando sua anima fosse partita dal corpo, che fosse arredata una ricca navicella, coperta d'un vermiglio sciamito con un ricco letto ivi entro, con ricche, e nobile coverture di seta, ornato di ricche pietre preziose; e fosse il suo corpo messo in su questo letto

1 *The Early Poems of Alfred Lord Tennyson*, 1900, p. 43.

vestito de' suoi più nobili vestimenti, e con bella corona in capo ricca di molto oro, e di molte ricche pietre preziose; e con ricca cintura, e borsa. Ed in quella borsa avea una lettera dello infrascritto tenore. Ma in prima diciamo di ciò, che va dinanzi alla lettera. La Damigella morio del mal d'amore. E fu fatto di lei ciò, che ella avea detto, della navicella sanza vela, e sanza remi, e sanza neuno sopra sagliente, e fu messa in mare. Il mare la guidò a Camalot, e ristette alla riva. Il grido fu per la Corte. I Cavalieri, e Baroni dismontaro de' palazzi, e lo nobile Re Artù vi venne: e maravigliandosi forte molti, che sanza niuna guida questa navicella era così apportata ivi. Il Re entrò dentro, vide la Damigella, e l'arnese. Fe' aprire la borsa; trovaro quella lettera. Fecela leggere, e dicea così. A tutti i Cavalieri della ritonda, manda salute questa Damigella di Scalot, siccome alla miglior gente del mondo. E se voi volete sapere perch' io a mio fine sono venuta, cioè per lo migliore Cavaliere del mondo, e per lo più villano, cioè Monsignore Messer Lanciallotto de Lac, che già no'l seppi tanto pregare d'amore, ch'elli avesse di me mercede. E così, lassa! sono morta per bene amare, come voi potete vedere.

['Here it is related how the Damsel of Shalot died for love of Lancelot du Lac.

A daughter of a Grandee loved Lancelot du Lac beyond measure, but he would not give her his love for the reason that he had given it to the Queen Guinevere. So much did she love Lancelot that she drew near to death; and she commanded that when her soul should depart from her body, there should be made ready a rich boat covered with red samite, with a rich bed therein, with rich and noble coverings of silk, adorned with rich precious stones; and that her body should be placed upon this bed, clothed in her most noble garments, and with a beautiful crown on her head rich with much gold, and with many rich precious stones; and with a rich girdle and purse. And in that purse was a letter of the tenor written below. But first let us speak of that which went before the letter. The Damsel died of the malady of love. And then was done what she had said, of the boat without sails and without oars, and without anyone on board, and it was put to sea. The sea guided it to Camelot, and it stood at the shore. The news went through the Court. The Knights and Barons came down from their palaces, and the noble King Arthur came thither: and many marveled greatly that without guide this boat should have been brought thither. The king entered within, saw the damsel and the adornment. He caused the purse to be opened; they found the letter. He had it read, and it said thus: To all the knights that are roundabout, this Damsel of Shalot sends greeting, as to the best people of the world. And if you would know wherefore I have come to my end, it is for the best knight of the world and for the most cruel, that is, Sir Lancelot du Lac, whom indeed I knew not to care enough for love to have pity on me. And so, alas, I die for loving well, as you can see.']

The first impression on reading this is that Tennyson's poem deviates as much from this novella as from Malory. It should be noticed, however, that the first edition of this much-revised poem (1833) resembles the novella more than the second (1842). The first adorns the Lady more splendidly, and mentions crown and girdle,

> "A cloud-white crown of pearl she dight
> All raimented in snowy white
> That loosely flew (her zone in sight,
> Clasped with one blinding diamond bright."

The second,

> "Lying, robed in snowy white
> That loosely flew to left and right."

The first, like the Novella, does not introduce Lancelot at the final scene.

The first gives the contents of the Lady's letter, but the second makes no allusion to a letter.

> "There lay a parchment on her breast,
> That puzzled more than all the rest
> The well-fed wits at Camelot:
> *The web was woven curiously,*
> *The charm is broken utterly,*
> *Draw near and fear not—this is I*
> *The Lady of Shalott.*"

But the poem in both editions has a very different story from the novella. It contains no reference to King Arthur or his Queen. The mirror, the weaving, the curse, the song, the river and island are all absent from the Novella. The circumstances of the Lady's death, the journey to Camelot, the adornment of her person and her boat, and the contents of her letter are quite different. The main bond of connection between novella and poem is that Camelot is made the end of the funeral voyage, and is on the sea-shore. Until, then, some other romance is forthcoming, we must say that Tennyson took what he pleased from Malory, and what he pleased from novella

lxxxi. What he added to the story doubtless pleased the fancy of the young poet more than what he took from it. The Arthurian myth was just touched, not for its own sake, as in later work, but as a good setting for a new version of the old theme of Dying for Love. The home-maiden at first sees the world only in the mirror of her imagination, and weaves the web of her fancy. By-and-by comes the sweet but fatal reality.

L. S. Potwin.

*Adelbert College.*

## *NOTELETS ON THE CANTERBURY TALES.*

*Cant. Tales*, A 3159-3165.—This passage is neither obscure nor irregular, yet Prof. Skeat contributes two notes to the elucidation of the sense and one to that of the metre. Sheer inattention suggests the surprising alternative "or, possibly, an ox (l. 3159)." This may divert the untrained reader from the simple effectiveness of the lines in which the Miller swears, by his oxen, that he will not borrow trouble by groundless assumption or by undue scrutiny. So, too, "sufficient abundance" is rather a hindrance than a help to the understanding of *goddes foyson*; it may turn the mind from the meaning of *goddes* 'God's'. A complete commentary upon this line is furnished in D 39.

Finally a 'headless line,' or one with 'direct attack,' is not metrically "defective"; it represents a permissible variation from the usual line, as Prof. Skeat himself teaches with special emphasis upon his peculiar right to do so (Vol. vi, p. lxxxviii, note 1; see also note to D 869).

*Cant. Tales*, A 3869:

> This whyte top wryteth myne olde yeres.

Prof. Skeat comments thus: "I take this to mean—'my old years write (mark upon me) this white head,' that is, turn me grey." But why this wriggle when everything is plain? The line is a fine one and 'reads itself' in straightforward fashion: 'This white head chronicles (writes down in visible characters) my advanced years.' The *constructio pregnans* of *wryteth* is, of course, not to be overlooked.

*Cant. Tales*, A 3871-3873.—Against the second line, *That ilke fruit is ever leng the wers*, may be placed the words of Rosalind, "for you'll be rotten ere you be half ripe, and that's the right virtue of the medlar" (*As You Like It* iii, 2, 126). From Furness's edition of the play (p. 146) it may be learned that "Chaucer gives it [the medlar] a very prominent place in his description of a beautiful garden" [see *Rom. of the Rose*, 1375], but the editor has neglected the more important matter. He should have referred back to his first volume, *Romeo and Juliet*, p. 91, and Mercutio's quibbling should have reminded him of the rustic vocabulary of Chaucer's Reeve. This omission is all the more surprising because of the note that directs attention to Chaucer's use of the name *Popering*, on which Mercutio doubles his quibble. The Reeve and Mercutio understand each other when talking of the fruit of the medlar, and this begets a reflection, in the mind of the curious observer, upon the persistence of special words on the lips of such as to "long purples" are wont to give "a grosser name."

*Cant. Tales*, B 1404.—*Qui la? quod he.* The rhythmic 'direct attack' is here effective in making distinct the colloquial accent of *Qui*. The three vocative accents *Qui*, *Peter*, and *I* are characteristic of the line, which is, therefore, not "imperfect at the cæsura" (Skeat).

*Cant. Tales*, B 1436.—The reading *husband* is not to be dismissed as so altogether inapplicable as Prof. Skeat would have it appear. The application would not be "to a housewife." 'Thou hast everything that a husband can provide,' says *this noble Marchant*, according to the report of many good MSS., and so there are two good versions of the line from which to choose.

*Cant. Tales*, C 952-953.—There is an obvious relation between this passage and *Le Roman de la Rose* 7855f., Michel's edition, 1864.

James W. Bright.

## *HERRICK'S INDEBTEDNESS TO BEN JONSON.*

It is only within a comparatively short period that the minor works of Jonson have been carefully studied and edited. As Shakespeare's sonnets, overshadowed by his plays, were long forgotten, so Jonson's prose, his

masques, and his lyrics have been neglected. Charles Lamb called attention to the fact that the "supposed rugged old bard" was capable of writing graceful verse, but Jonson's position in English lyrical poetry has been tardily recognized. Recent anthologists have discovered that *Queen and huntress, chaste and fair*, *Still to be neat*, and *Drink to me only with thine eyes* are by no means the only fine songs to be found in his writings, and the increasing number of selections from Jonson published in the latest collections of English verse show the growing interest in this side of his genius.

It is a rather remarkable fact that the greatest of the "Sons of Ben" was a lyric poet. The dramatists who followed him as his disciples were men of little ability, now read only by the special student of the drama. If Jonson's influence really lives to-day, it lives in the songs of Herrick. Herrick himself leaves no doubt as to his indebtedness to the "best of poets" whom, in his *Elysium*, he places above Homer, Pindar, Catullus, and the other immortals. The number and nature of his references to his "Father Ben" are remarkable and can hardly be paralleled in the case of any other poet of the period and one of his followers. They express not merely friendship and admiration; Herrick asks Jonson to aid him "when he a verse would make," and these words are not to be taken wholly in a figurative sense.

The editors of Jonson and Herrick, and the essayists who have treated of their writings naturally do not fail to recognize the relation existing between these poets, but speak of it in general terms. Gifford early pointed out the fact that Herrick "abounds in imitations of Jonson whom he loved and admired."[1] Palgrave, in his selections from Herrick, says more definitely, "Jonson's non-dramatic poetry supplies models, generally admirable in point of art, though of unequal merit in their execution and contents, of the principal forms under which we may range Herrick's *Hesperides*. The graceful love song, the celebration of feasts and wit, the encomia of friends, the epigram as then understood, are all here represented."[2] Swinburne, in characteristic fashion, writes, "Herrick, as a writer of elegies, epithalamiums, panegyrical or complimentary verses, is as plainly and as openly an imitation of his model as ever was the merest parasite of any leading poet, from the days of Chaucer and his satellites to the days of Tennyson and his. No Lydgate or Lytton was ever more obsequious in his discipleship."[3]

It is perhaps worth the while to test the truth of these statements by collecting Herrick's imitations of Jonson (many of which have been noted by editors of these poets) and by examining them in detail. In every case, the assumption is made that Herrick is the imitator. This is justified when we remember Jonson's independent spirit; moreover, Herrick's senior by eighteen years, he had published in 1616 his best plays, his epigrams, and his *Forest*. Herrick at this time was a student at Cambridge and did not leave the University until 1620. Of his poems, fifty-eight can be accurately dated, and of these forty-six were composed after Jonson's death.[4]

Of Jonson's longer pieces, his lines on *Penshurst* and to Sir Robert Wroth[5] were plainly followed by Herrick in his *Panegyric to Sir Lewis Pemberton*.[6] His *Country Life, to his Brother, Mr. Thomas Herrick*[7] written in the same meter as Jonson's poem to Sir Robert Wroth resembles it so closely in its general tone that it may fairly be placed in the list of Herrick's imitations. The *Epithalamy to Sir Thomas Southwell and his Lady*[8]—one of Herrick's earliest pieces—closely resembles the epithalamium in Jonson's *Masque of Hymen*,[9] Herrick having simply added a refrain to Jonson's verse scheme. Necessarily, the epithalamia of the period are somewhat alike; they followed a conventional plan, but in Herrick's Classical allusions and in the turning of certain phrases in the poem, he

1 *Works of Ben Jonson*, Gifford-Cunningham ed., 1875, Vol. 8, p. 247.

2 *Chrysomela*, 1877, Preface, p. xix.

3 *A Study of Ben Jonson*, 1889, p. 98.

4 See Hale's *Die Chronologische Anordnung der Dichtungen Robert Herrick's*, Halle, 1892, pp. 25-33.

5 *Jonson*, Vol. 7, pp. 243-252.

6 *Herrick's Works*, ed. Pollard, 1891, Vol. 1, p. 183.

7 Ibid., Vol. 1, p. 40.

8 Ibid., Vol. 1, p. 63.

9 Jonson, Vol. 7, p. 65.

may be fairly said to show himself again the "Son of Ben." Three, then, of Herrick's longer pieces may be called imitations of Jonson's verse.

From Jonson's *Epigrams*, *Underwoods* and *Forest*, Herrick, to use his own phrase, has "adopted" several short poems. At times the imitation is very exact. As has been often pointed out, *Still to be neat, still to be drest*, evidently inspired Herrick's charming poems on clothes—*A sweet disorder in the dress*,[10] and its companion piece *When I behold a forest spread*.[11] *Drink to me only with thine eyes* re-echoes in such a poem as

"Reach with your whiter hands to me,
Some crystal of the spring,
And I about the cup will see
Fresh lillies flourishing.

Or else, sweet nymphs, do you but this,
To th' glass your lips incline,
And I shall see by that one kiss,
The water turned to wine."[12]

Or, more plainly still, in the quatrain

"'Twas but a single rose,
Till you on it did breathe,
But since, methinks, it shows
Not so much rose as wreathe.[13]

At times, Herrick varies Jonson's theme. In the *Underwoods*, is the following translation from Jerome Amaltheus.

THE HOUR GLASS.

"Consider this small dust, here in the glass,
By atoms moved;
Could you believe that this the body was
Of one that loved;
And in his mistress flame playing like a fly,
Was turned to cinders by her eye;
Yes, and in death, as life unblest,
To have't exprest,
Even ashes of lovers find no rest."[14]

In Herrick's *Hour Glass*[15] we have instead of lover's ashes, lover's tears that, dropping in the water glass,

". . . in a trickling manner tell
By many a watery syllable,
That lover's tears, in life time shed
Do restless run when they are dead."

One of the most striking of all Herrick's imitations seems to have been unnoticed by the critics. In the *Gypsies Metamorphosed*,[16] perhaps the most interesting of Jonson's masques—is the following song:

"The faery beam upon you,
The stars to glister on you,
A moon of light
In the noon of night,
Till the fire drake hath o'ergone you.

The wheel of fortune guide you,
The boy with the bow beside you,
Run aye in the way,
Till the bird of day,
And the luckier lot betide you."

Comparing this with the *Night Piece to Julia*,[17] it will be seen that Herrick has not only followed the rather unusual meter, but the situation, the thought.

The eight poems of the *Hesperides* just cited represent practically all Herrick's important borrowings from his master. The cases where both poets have translated the same ode of Horace or song of Catullus, or used, in general, the same Classic models, have not been considered.[18] It should be noted that Herrick's epigrams, in many instances, unfortunately resemble Jonson's; even the gnomic distich of which the Devonshire poet has left us too many examples, is to be found in Jonson's pages.

"He that fears death, or mourns it in the just,
Shows of the Resurrection little trust"[19]

might well belong to the *Noble Numbers*.

Herrick's epitaphs, at times reminding one forcibly of Jonson's, can hardly be classed under Herrick's formal imitations. Similarly one might point out a number of poems which are in striking correspondence with Herrick's spirit, but from which he has actually borrowed nothing.[20] For example, Herrick's *College or Tribe*[21] in which he enrolls his friends, is certainly a reminiscence of the more famous "Tribe of Ben."

10 Herrick, Vol. 1, p. 32. 11 Ibid., Vol. 1, p. 254.

12 Ibid., p. 232. 13 Herrick, Vol. 1, p. 61.

14 Jonson, Vol. 8, p. 310.

15 Herrick, Vol. 1, p. 52. See Schelling's *Elizabethan Lyrics*, 1895, note p. 291.

16 Jonson, Vol. 7, p. 363. 17 Herrick, vol. 2, p. 17.

18 Cf. Jonson, vol. 9, p. 125, and Herrick, vol. 1, p. 85; Jonson, vol. 8, p. 225; and Herrick, vol. 1, p. 27.

19 Jonson, vol. 8, p. 162.

20 Cf. Jonson, Epigram ci, vol. 8, p. 203 and Herrick, vol. 1, p. 249, Jonson Epigram, xiii; vol. 8, p. 151, and Herrick, vol. 1, p. 152. The lyrics in the *Triumphs of Charis*, Jonson, vol. 8, p. 293, in their graceful meter and rich coloring constantly recall Herrick.

21 Herrick, vol. 1, p. 240, vol. 2, p. 129.

Certain phrases, common to both poets, are scattered here and there through their writings,[22] their diction is often strikingly similar, both affecting a latinized vocabulary.[23] Herrick's evident fondness for Jonson's favorite meter—the couplet—is certainly an important point in establishing his position towards Jonson. Confining ourselves, however, to formal imitation, it may be said that at the most Herrick has directly borrowed from Jonson in some dozen poems; in some instances he has "adopted" very little indeed.[24]

This, however, by no means dismisses the subject. Herrick's indebtedness was greater than the mere borrowing of meters, phrases, or even ideas. The most interesting point in Herrick's indebtedness to Jonson is the fact that for once the elder poet's theories were followed, with the greatest success. A doctrinaire, Jonson could not force his Classic principles upon the English stage: his theories in regard to lyric verse were readily accepted by Herrick. Palgrave suggests that to Jonson, Herrick owes his careful style, his artistic, self-critical spirit. While Lovelace and Suckling were putting together verses which can only be called slovenly, Herrick would "rather that his book be dead, than to live not perfected" and it is this perfection of style that saves from oblivion so many of his trifles, deficient in thought and feeling.

To Jonson also, Herrick certainly owes his love of the Classical lyrics and his almost utter disregard for the so-called "Metaphysical" school. In the number of his lyrical translations and adaptations from the Greek and Latin poets, he far surpasses his contemporaries, and these poems rank with his best work. That Herrick escaped the influence of Donne and the extravagance of his school is somewhat remarkable when one considers his fondness for playing with a thought, repeating it with variations, and that, lacking in strong romantic feeling, he chose to write so often on the one subject of love. It is in this class of poetry especially that a writer, lacking in deep feeling, substitutes for emotion strained conceits and fantastic ingenuity of thought, yet there are scarcely a dozen poems in the Hesperides where the conceit is carried too far.[25]

It may be seen then that Herrick's debt to Jonson is decidedly a substantial one and, in the growing study of Jonson's works, this fact should not be forgotten for it is no small part of Jonson's achievement to have attracted and stimulated this delicate songster, the greatest trifler in the language. In this instance, the disciple is above his master and one might almost apply to the verses of his poetic son the line which Jonson placed over his own child's grave:

"Ben Jonson his best piece of poetry."

EDWARD B. REED.

*Yale University.*

22 Herrick's "silvery feet" is a frequent phrase in Jonson's masks.

23 On this point see Hale's, *Poems of Herrick*, 1895, introduction p. lxii.

24 See Herrick, vol. 2, p. 42, No. 683.

25 See Nos. 46, 127, 133, 301, 560, 564, 689.

## *A POSSIBLE SOURCE OF MATTHEW ARNOLD'S Dover Beach.*

AMONG the *Pensées* at the end of *Portraits Littéraires*, Vol. iii, p. 540 (Garnier, Paris, 1864), Sainte-Beuve has placed the following sentence: 'Mon âme est pareille à ces plages où l'on dit que Saint Louis s'est embarqué; la mer et la foi se sont depuis longtemps, hélas, retirées, et c'est tout si parfois, à travers les sables, sous l'aride chaleur ou le froid mistral, je trouve un instant à m'asseoir à l'ombre d'un rare tamarin.' It was 'près d'Aigues-Mortes' that these lines were written; Aigues-Mortes is a small place in southern France, at a short distance from the Gulf of Lyons. This seems to me the central thought of Matthew Arnold's *Dover Beach*, which appeared in the *New Poems* of 1867 (Macmillan). Certainly all the desolation is expressed in Arnold's lines

> The Sea of Faith
> Was once, too, at the full, and round earth's shore
> Lay like the folds of a bright girdle furl'd.
> But now I only hear
> Its melancholy, long, withdrawing roar,
> Retreating, to the breath
> Of the night wind, down the vast edges drear
> And naked shingles of the world.

In 1863, Sainte-Beuve had sent to Arnold his new edition of poems (2 vols., Lévy, Paris). There was nothing in Arnold akin to the sui-

cidal tendencies of *Joseph Delorme* nor to the celestial sighs of the convert in *Les Consolations*, but his admiration for Sainte-Beuve and 'a certain circle of men, perhaps the most truly cultivated in the world' (*Letters of Matthew Arnold*, Macmillan, London, 1900, vol. i, p. 253), was great and it seems probable that he might develop the poetic suggestion of the *Pensée*, which appeared the following year.

A previous edition of Sainte-Beuve's volume had been published in 1851 under the title *Derniers Portraits*. This I have been unable to obtain, and, therefore, cannot say whether the *Pensées* appeared earlier than 1864 or not.

Sainte-Beuve uses the same figure, with slight difference, in a letter to M. Colincamp dated March 25, 1867: 'Vous êtes frappé comme moi de ce que perd journellement cette grande chose qui on appellait autre fois la tradition, et qui est comme une mer qui lentement se retire d'un rivage qu'elle baignait autre fois à pleins bords' (*Correspondence*, Lévy, Paris, 1878, Vol. ii, p. 153).

CLARENCE C. CLARK.

*Yale University.*

---

## *INCIDENTS FROM THE LIFE OF ST. GEORGE, 1416.*

THE visit of the Emperor Sigismond in England in 1416 was the occasion of elaborate festivities at the court of Henry V. The celebration of the Feast of St. George was deferred until his coming, and then (the 7th May) "solempnely holden at Wyndesore."[1]

The occasion has been made of importance in dramatic history by Collier's account of

"a performance before [the emperor] and Henry V. on the incidents of the life of St. George. The representation seems to have been divided into three parts, and to have been accomplished by certain artificial contrivances, exhibiting [the three events described below.] Here we have clearly the outline of the history of St. George of Cappadocia, which often formed the subject of a miracle play: but whether, in this instance, it was accompanied with dialogue, or was (as is most probable) merely a splendid dumb shew, assisted by temporary erections of castles, etc., we are not informed. The wardrobe accounts of Henry V. do not supply us with any information regarding this or other similar representations."[2]

Collier's conjecture is accepted by Dr. Ward, who speaks of a "magnificent dumb show" and pronounces the event a "memorable occasion."[3]

The MS. (in part quoted by Collier) relates that at the banquet after the celebration of the Mass, all the royal party

"saten on that oon side of the table. And the first sotelte was oure lady armyng seint George, and an angel doyng on his spores; the ii$^{de}$ sotelte was seint George ridyng and fightyng with the dragon, with his spere in his hand; the iii$^{de}$ sotelte was a castel, and seint George, and the kynges doughter ledyng the lambe in at the castel gates. And all these sotelties (sic) were served to the emperor and to the kyng, and no ferther,—and the other lords were served with other soteltes after their degrees."[4]

The last sentence, in connection with the fact that they all sat "on that oon side of the table," seems at once to preclude any "magnificent" scale of presentation.

From the descriptions of *soteltes* below one may form a fairly clear opinion of what they were. The name is of course equivalent to *subtlety*, derived apparently from the ingenuity of the device, its most valued characteristic. The form *subtilty* occurs, and the Latin form is given in the *Privy Purse Expenses of the Princess Mary*,[5] where xii d. are paid "Olivero Hunt pro iiii$^{or}$ skinnes pergameni per ipsum empt' pro factur' divers' subtilitš."

Usually the significance of the *sotelte* was explained by a writing, called the "reason," often put in the hand of one of the figures. The sentiment was religious or political, or frequently only personal.

At the coronation banquet of Queen Katherine (1419) elaborate *soteltes* were served, one after each course, paying compliment to the Queen's name:—

1. A sotelte callid a Pellican on hire nest with briddis and an ymage of Seint Katerine with a whele in hire hande—disputyng with the Hethen clerks—having this Reason in hir hande—Madame la Roigne—The Pellican answeryng Cest Enseigne. The briddes an-

1 *Chronicle of London, 1089—1483*. Edited by Edward Tyrrell, London, 1827, p. 159. Note FF, from a Cotton. MS.

2 *English Dramatic Poetry*, i, 29.

3 *History of English Dramatic Literature*, i, 143.

4 *Chronicle of London*, as above.

5 Madden: London, 1831, pp. xxvi—xxix.

sweryng Est du roy pur tenir joie. A tout gent il met sentent.

2. A panter with an ymage of Seint Katerine in the same tariage and a whele in hire hande, and a Reason in hire other hande—The Reason was this—La Roigne ma file—The panter answeryng In cest Ile: another best answeryng with this Reason, Of Albion—Another best saiyng Aves Renowne.

3. A mete in paste with iiij aungels in form of Seint Katerine whele in the middes with a Reason

| | |
|---|---|
| Il est escrit | Par mariage pure |
| Pur voir et dit. | Ce guerre ne dure. |

A fourth *sotelte* also is given, much like the above.[6]

Similarly elaborate *soteltes* were served at the coronation of Henry VI. (ætat. 8) ten years later, in which images of the King himself and of his father were presented, with St. Edward and St. Louis.[7]

That the *soteltes* representing incidents of the life of St. George were served to the King and the Emperor only, and others to the other lords "after their degrees," suggests a method of paying discriminating compliments to distinguished guests. *Soteltes* were served specially in compliment to foreigners, to whom they seem to have been a novelty. Cavendish[8] tells of the elaborate devices that were served to the French ambassadors in 1527. "The cooks wrought both night and day in divers subtleties and many crafty devices," which were brought up "with such a pleasant noise of divers instruments of music, that the Frenchmen, as it seemed, were rapt into a heavenly paradise." "But to describe the dishes, the subtleties, the many strange devices and order in the same, I both lack wit in my gross old head, and cunning in my bowels to declare the wonderful and curious imaginations in the same invented and devised." "Among all one I noted: there was a chessboard subtilely made of spiced plate, with men to the same: and for the good proportion, because that Frenchmen be very expert in that play, my lord gave the same to a gentleman of France, commanding that a case should be made for the same in all haste, to preserve it from perishing in the conveyance thereof into his country."

From the foregoing examples, it appears that the *sotelte* was not a magnificent dumb-show; that it was a figure, or more frequently a group of figures, made of sweet-meats of various kinds (or of more substantial "mete"), to be set in the middle of the table chiefly for show, ingeniously devised to present incidents, or circumstances, or sentiments, appropriate to the occasion or the persons for which or for whom it was prepared. And Collier might have spared himself the regret that the wardrobe accounts of Henry V. supplied him no helpful information on the Windsor Incidents of the Life of St. George in 1416.[9]

JOHN CHESTER ADAMS.
*Yale University.*

6 *Chronicle of London*, pp. 162-5. Strutt, *Manners and Customs of the English* (London, 1775, ii, 101-2) gives a more intelligible version of the French Reasons, with translation.

7 *Chronicle of London*, pp. 168-9.

8 *Life of Wolsey*, London, 1827, pp. 193 ff.

9 The note on "marchpane" on p. 70 of *Romeo and Juliet* in Dr. Furness's Variorum Edition quotes or cites passages showing the Elizabethan use (but without the name) of the same sort of device, still familiar, of course, at present day banquets.

## *FRENCH LITERATURE.*

A. *Easy French Plays*, edited for school use by CHARLES W. BENTON, Litt. D., Professor of French in the University of Minnesota. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1900.

B. *Easy French Stories*, edited for school use by H. PARKER WILLIAMSON, A. M., of the University of Chicago and BENEDICT PAPOT, of the Lake Forest Academy. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1901.

C. *Easy French History*, edited for school use by ERNEST SICARD, of the Robert A. Waller High School, Chicago. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1901.

D. *Le Petit Chose par Alphonse Daudet*, abridged and edited by O. B. SUPER, Professor of Romance Languages in Dickinson College. Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1901.

A. *La Grammaire* by Eugène Labiche, *La Joie fait peur* by Mme de Girardin, and *Les Doigts de Fée* by Eugène Scribe, are the selections contained in Prof. Benton's book. There are already several editions of *La Grammaire* in the market and many years ago Prof. Bôcher annotated the last two for Henry Holt and Co.

The introduction gives a summary of the

history of the French theater and ends with a few paragraphs devoted to the biographies of the authors. Its beginning is really too scholarly and high-toned for its conclusion. It is such as we should expect if Dr. Benton were preparing us to read masterpieces of the Nineteenth Century. So, on reaching the passages which treat of the selections, we cannot help thinking of Horace's comparison: "desinit in piscem."

Many examples of wrong use or omission of signs of punctuation are going to be brought forth in the course of this review. Let it be understood, however, that only cases which are obvious mistakes are criticized and that it is not at all a question of personal preference.

In l. 205, supply a hyphen between *annoncez* and *lui*. The same omission was found in this passage in Prof. Piatt's edition of the same play (see MOD. LANG. NOTES, Vol. xvi, p. 491). In Prof. Schele de Vere's (1888, W. R. Jenkins, New York) the hyphen is also missing; the passage is properly punctuated in the French edition (Calmann Lévy). It would be better to drop the comma in l. 308 after *Caboussat* although the French edition has the same punctuation; drop the comma in l. 487 after *écrit;* replace the comma by a colon in l. 343 after *dis;* drop the dash in l. 681 before *bas*. In l. 790 of the first play, we read *là dedans* and in l. 794 of the second play, *là-dedans*. The editor kept the hyphen after *très* throughout the book.

L. 249, *Abruti* should read *abruti; Q', Qu';* l. 620, *Ecrire, Écrire* since accents are used everywhere else in the book over capital E; l. 747, *pan, plan;* l. 883, *emmaillotte* is the old spelling (cf. l. 848, *emmaillotant;* l. 884 *emmailloté* and in the vocabulary *emmailloter;* also Hatzfeld and Darmesteter dictionary).

In the list of characters of *La Joie fait peur* and everywhere in the text where *Noël* is printed in capital letters, the diæresis is omitted. Drop the comma in l. 219 after *le*, in l. 355 after *santé*, in l. 724 before *à*. Supply a comma on p. 49, l. 5 of the stage directions after *fenêtre*, in l. 40 of the text after *tu;* in l. 136 after *que*, in l. 452 after *là* and in l. 1390 after *dis*. Drop the dash in l. 53 after *pas*. Supply a comma in l. 623 after *Adrien;* a hyphen in l. 170 before *même* and in l. 694 before *tu;* and a semi-colon or a comma in l. 1336 after *vrai*. Replace the comma by a semi-colon after *porte* in the stage directions following l. 605, after *pense*, l. 1466, and by a period in l. 740 after *Adrien;* the dash by a hyphen in l. 849 before *moi* and the period by a comma or an exclamation point in l. 1126 after *bon*.

P. 49, ll. 8 and 11, l. 953, l. 1521, and in vocabulary, *pouff* should read *pouf;* p. 49, l. 11, *facé, face* and *publie, public;* l. 413, supply *que* before *cela;* l. 436, *clle* should be *elles;* l. 465, *adroitment, adroitement;* l. 759, *C'a, Ç'a;* l. 828, *mesétudes, mes études;* l. 1088, *cest, c'est;* l. 1100, *à, a;* l. 1296, *reseignements, renseignements*.

In *Les Doigts de Fée*, supply a comma in l. 269 after *raison*, in l. 699 after *louer*, in l. 1354 before *que*, in l. 1556 after *conçois*, in l. 1633 after *dire*, in l. 2162 after *sûrs*, and in l. 3653 after *vous*. Supply a hyphen in ll. 258 and 2458 after *est*, in l. 271 after *réjouissez*, in ll. 872 and 1608 before *même*, in ll. 1172 and 1174 between *demi* and *voix* (cf. l. 1021 and *passim*), and in l. 2277 after *dites*. Replace the comma by a semi-colon in l. 194 before *dès* and the period by a question mark in l. 1029. Drop the hyphen in l. 1968 after *vois* and in l. 2558, after *moi;* the comma in l. 2047 before *des*, in l. 2866 after *gauche* and in l. 2959 after *asseoir*. L. 1546, the first hook of the parenthesis is missing.

In the title, p. 97, *Feé*, should be *Fée;* l. 202, *en, on;* l. 455, *s'asseoient, s'assoient;* p. 117, *Acte Deuxieme, Acte Deuxième;* p. 141, *Acte Troisième, Acte Troisième;* p. 168, *Acte Quatrieme, Acte Quatrième;* p. 193, *Acte Cinquieme, Acte Cinquième;* l. 781, *compag-non* and l. 2221, *Rich-ard* should be divided *compa-gnon* and *Ri-chard;* l. 813, *collége* and l. 1704, *poëme* should be modernized (cf. *siège* on p. 133 in the stage directions); l. 1382, *courier* should be *courrier;* l. 1399, *Française, française;* l. 1682, *embarrassée* should be masculine; l. 1757, *ideés* should read *idées;* l. 1769, *Ecoutez, Écoutez* (cf. l. 220 of the same play); l. 1774, *conaissez, connaissez;* l. 1808, *ou, où;* l. 1921, *s'asseoit, s'assoit;* l. 1963, *pardons, pardon;* l. 1977, *grand' mere, grand' mère;* l. 2049, *La, Le;* p. 164, l. 1 of the stage direction, *méme, même;* l. 2345, *Saiton, Sait-on;* l. 2450, *clièntele, clientèle;* l. 3519, *desirs, désirs*. In the

body of a sentence, *monsieur, madame, mademoiselle, messieurs*, etc., should not begin with a capital (cf. ll. 1559, 2534, and 2437).

In the notes on *La Grammaire*, l. 82, *entendu* should agree in the first example; p. 143, the comparison is wrong: the Chamber of Deputies does not correspond to the American Congress; l. 714, *Etait, Était.*

In the notes on *La Joie fait peur*, l. 649, the translation would be right if the student were told that the meaning is sarcastic; l. 828, *Etudes, Études;* l. 1292, *agit, agît.*

In the notes on *Les Doigts de Fée*, l. 30, the explanation of *mon Dieu* ought to have been given much earlier: it is used for the first time in *La Grammaire*, l. 288; l. 517, *Hotel-Dieu* should be *Hôtel-Dieu;* l. 652, *Eté, Été;* l. 715, *ou, où;* l. 1927, *egal, égal;* l. 2395, *ce qui, ce que;* l. 2688, *où, ou;* l. 2691, supply a semi-colon after *charmes.*

A few more passages might well have been explained. For instance, the editor explains *d'une fatigue* in l. 2619 and *d'un joli* in l. 3123 of the third play, but does not say a word of *d'un juteux* in l. 587 of the first play.

In the vocabulary we have to point out the following misprints; *attenuer* should be printed *atténuer; chef d'œuvre, chef-d'œuvre; energique, énergique; entretcuir, entretenir; fièreté, fierté; flaire, flair; Gaules, Gaule; moëlleux* is now spelled *moelleux* (cf. p. 163, l. 2297); *parceque, parce que; retablir, rétablir; siége, siège* (cf. p. 133, stage directions).

The translation for *couronne* is wreath instead of *wreathe; passer sur* should read *passer sur* or *par-dessus* (see ll. 970 and 1081 of *La Grammaire*). The gender of *canton* should be added; that of *gent* is *f.* not *m.; deuil* should come before *devant, peser* after *personnifier, renflement* before *renier; rouge* after *rose, verre* before *verrou* and *ver* before *vérifier.* The translation *chargé d'affaire* (see *affaire*), *ambassador*, is not exact. The translation of *accueillir* is unsatisfactory for that verb on p. 127, l. 1052; that of *remettre* for p. 158, l. 2115 and p. 161, l. 2205; that of *malheur* for p. 180, l. 2834; that of *garçon* for p. 145, l. 1664; that of *voix* for p. 32, l. 634; that of *jeu* for p. 36, l. 783 and p. 49, l. 17; those of *mémoire* for p. 37, l. 817.

Finally, we should expect a complete vocabulary since we find in it such words as *fortune, riche, branche, futilité*, etc. A rapid perusal of the vocabulary showed that the following words are missing: *appliquer*, see text, p. 33, l. 660; *artiste*, p. 110, l. 447; *attendrissement*, p. 32, l. 646; *bizarre*, p. 198, l. 3340; *blessure*, p. 156, l. 2039; *cavalier*, p. 130, l. 1162; *certificat*, p. 32, l. 627; *châle*, p. 163, l. 2266; *cliente*, p. 182, l. 2871; *configuration*, p. 22, l. 302; *le contre*, p. 44, l. 1053; *du côté de*, p. 75, l. 884; *décadence*, p. 36, l. 786; *en dehors*, p. 159, stage direction; *démarche*, p. 199, l. 3466; *diviniser*, p. 164, l. 2311; *égarement*, p. 140, l. 1511; *élection*, p. 16, l. 102; *électeur*, p. 18, l. 151; *estime*, p. 198, l. 3429; *fin, -e*, p. 195, l. 3325; *folio*, p. 182, l. 2880; *geste*, p. 174, l. 2637; *hypothèque*, p. 156, l. 2046 and *passim; ingénieux*, p. 81, l. 1088; *interrompre*, p. 198, l. 3434; *longuement*, p. 44, l. 1052; *médiocre*, p. 191, l. 3194; *midi*, p. 142, l. 1580; *note*, p. 162, l. 2257; *onduleux*, p. 163, l. 2297; *paquet*, p. 200, l. 3492; *par-dessus*, p. 44, l, 1035; *pesant,-e*, p. 138, l. 1436; *piquer*, p. 36, l. 757; *prisonnier*, p. 81, l. 1102; *ramasser*, p. 32, l. 633; *rejoindre* and *rempart*, p. 81, l. 1075; *vase*, p. 36, l. 778; *volume*, p. 182, l. 2875; *voter*, p. 200, l. 3518.

B. The preface of *Easy Stories* contains a short biography of the five authors from whose works the stories have been borrowed: Ludovic Halévy, Alexandre Dumas fils, Guy de Maupassant, Henri Lavedan and Paul Margueritte.

It seems that the selection might have been better. Of course it must be acknowledged that it is now a pretty hard task for editors to gather a new collection of short stories. The harvest seems to be over, the field is bare and the late comers cannot but glean here and there what has been scorned by earlier reapers.

The text is carefully edited. The following misprints were noticed: drop the hyphen, p. 47, l. 10, after *très*, since it is omitted in this case everywhere in the text; p.68, l.2, after *deux* and *cent.* Drop the comma, p. 53, l. 12, after *vous* and the dash at the beginning of l. 13, p.67. Supply a hyphen, p.108, l.18, after *Saint.* In the preface, p. 7, l. 23, *Etrangère* should be *Étrangère*, since accents are used throughout the text over capital *E;* p. 18, l. 22, *Chaud-ron* should be divided *Chau-dron;* p. 43, l. 22, *de* should be *du;* p. 50, l. 13, *Etre, Ètre* (cf. p. 105, l. 5); p. 60, l. 22, *Leon, Léon;* p. 60, l. 28, the word *air* is

missing; p. 63, l. 11, *poëte* should be modernized; p. 67, l. 27, *Ecosse* should be *Écosse;* p. 69, l. 3, *pasun, pas un;* p. 99, l. 5, *laiser, laisser;* p. 104, l. 18, *çà, ça;* p. 119, l. 16, *La, Le;* p. 128, l. 9, *tous, tout.*

The notes are satisfactory, except p. 144, note p. 41, 1: *si vous êtes fils*, "if you are a child"; the translation should be: "if you are a boy". P. 141, note p. 19, 17, *Etre* should be *Être* (cf. p. 105, l. 5); p. 142, note p. 30, 21, *pardessus, par-dessus;* p. 145, note p. 45, 6, *en question*, "in question": I do not see the necessity of such a note; p. 145, note p. 49, 17, supply a comma after *bien;* p. 148, note p. 67, 6, *trouves* should be *trouvez;* p. 148, note p. 65, 18 and p. 153, note p. 103, 16, *oû, où;* p. 149, note p. 70, 13, supply a hyphen after *belles;* p. 157, note 118, 30, *a, à;* p. 159, note p. 138, 29, *The Bigorgne's terrace* should read *The Bigorgnes' terrace.*

The vocabulary seems to be almost complete; the words which were missed were *à* (the other prepositions are given), *instantanément* (see text, p. 55, l. 10); *aube*, p. 108, l. 1; *alouette*, p. 109, l. 4; *également*, p. 22, l. 21; *ministère*, p. 62, l. 31; *bas*, p. 96, l. 6.

Unfortunately the proof of the vocabulary was not corrected with the same care as that of the text: *aïeux* should be spelled *aïeux; amertune, amertume; arrivé, f., arrivée; dernière, dernier; dévoument, dévouement* or *dévoûment; dineur, dîneur; dure, dur; Ecosse, Écosse; égoiste, égoïste; entre-baillé, entrebâillé; epouse, épouse; essouflé, essoufflé; étonnament, étonnamment; fourmis, fourmi; helléniste, helléniste; imprevu, imprévu; indiscretion, indiscrétion; maisonette, maisonnette; mangeoir, mangeoire; marronier, marronnier; mathématique, mathématiques; mignonette, mignonnette; naïve, naïf; perclu, perclus; perplex, perplexe; pupître, pupitre; rafoller, raffoler; ravis, ravi; déduit, réduit; rénommé, f., renommée, f.*, and a special line should be devoted to *renommé, adj.*

The gender of the following nouns is omitted: *jouissance, juin, Londres, louis, plan, société, visite;* are marked *m.* (masculine) instead of *f.* (feminine): *centaine, halte, peur, pratique*, and *f.* instead of *m.*: *congé* and *mouvement.* The abbreviation *refl.* could be dropped everywhere since the editors took the trouble to add *se* in every case. The principal parts of irregular verbs are given in the vocabulary and that is a good idea, but one wonders why those of *descendre*, a regular verb, were added. In the principal parts of *falloir*, the dash should precede *fallu.* Finally the translation of *gilet* should be "vest" instead of "west"; of *gouttelette*, "little drop," not "little drops;" of *parcourir*, "glance, read rapidly" instead of "glancing, reading rapidly."

C. The preface is written by Prof. E. P. Baillot of Northwestern University, under whose guidance the Lake French Series is edited. He treats in two pages of the desirability of putting such a book in the hands of beginners, and the way of using it with the greatest profit. Teachers cannot help agreeing with him.

The text is based, we are told, upon a short History of France used in French schools; the style is very simple and questions are to be found at the end of each chapter, that is almost every other page; their number is limited and seldom exceeds ten, sufficient however to summarize the main facts of the preceding chapter. The whole history of France, from its beginnings to the present day, is related in one hundred and sixty-three pages.

The punctuation of the book is very peculiar, commas being used where they are not absolutely necessary and being omitted when they should be used. For instance, the comma is used throughout the book after *mais* and *puis* except where *mais* does not come after a period or a semi-colon (cf. ll. 3565, 3577), and is often missing before nouns in apposition.

Besides, the comma must be dropped in l. 588 after *Normands;* in l. 773 after *Turcs;* in l. 1427 before *se;* in l. 2691 before *général;* in l. 3227 before *succéda;* in l. 3608 before *des;* in l. 3682 before *le;* in l. 3697 before *au.* Add a comma in l. 53 before *son*, in l. 520 after *Normand*, in l. 884 before *ayant*, in l. 1162 before *mort*, in l. 1172 before *surnommé*, in l. 1479 before *sentant*, in l. 1599 after *Bourbon*, in l. 2006 after *Médicis*, in l. 2068 after *Espagne*, in l. 2920 after *Napoléon*, in l. 3209 before *ayant*, in l. 3365 after *paix*, in l. 3567 after *communistes*, in l. 1562 before *n'en*, in l. 2170 after *Europe*, in l. 3037 before *voulant.* Replace the comma by a semi-colon in ll. 3037 and 3294. Drop the hyphen after

*très* in ll. 465 and 800, also after *Hôtel* and *de* in l. 3090; drop also the point in l. 860 after *Innocent III*, p. 165, l. 1, after *Louis IV*, and p. 166, l. 10, after *Napoléon III*, since in French the numbers in titles do not stand for abbreviated ordinal numbers as they do in English.

Some words in which *é* has been replaced by *è* in the last edition of the Dictionary of the French Academy (1878) are sometimes modernized, sometimes retain the old form: cf. *privilèges*, p. 7, l. 22; p. 111 in the title; ll. 1846, 2027, 2454, and *privilèges*, l. 1421; *collège*, ll. 1653, 2652 and note on l. 1653; *assiégent*, l. 1870; but *siège*, *règne*, *complètement* in every case. Notice also the old spelling *poëtes*, l. 2239. The spelling of such words should be modernized, or at least made uniform.

Misprints in the text are not numerous: p. 7, l. 18, *Etats* should be *États* (cf. l. 3183); p. 7, l. 32 and l. 1091, *Egypte*, *Égypte;* l. 296, *Ebroïn*, *Ébroïn* (cf. l. 289); l. 403, *il*, *ils;* l. 922, supply *de* before *son*; l. 1342, *Bourguignons* should be italicized (cf. *Armagnacs*, l. 1341); p. 74 in the title and in the headings of Part vi, *Suites* should be *Suite* (cf. Table of Contents, title and headings of Part vii); p. 74, in the title, *Angouleme*, *Angoulême*; l. 1759, *Elisabeth*, *Élisabeth* (cf. l. 1727); l. 1828, *ça*, *çà;* l. 1888 and p. 89, tenth question, *des Guise*, *des Guises* (cf. any French Grammar and *Histoire des Temps Modernes* by Victor Duruy, pp. 244–247); l. 2060, *côte*, *côté;* l. 2224, *trops*, *trop*; l. 2445 and note, *Lafayette* is the American spelling for *La Fayette*; cf. *Cons-tituante*, l. 2504, and *con-stitutionnelle*, l. 2976: the division of words should be at least uniform; p. 119 in the title, *Européene*, *Européenne;* l. 3306, *missionaires*, *missionnaires;* l. 3391, *les début*, *le début;* l. 3519, *exceptionellement*, *exceptionnellement;* ll. 3585, 3597, *ôtage*, *otage*; ll. 3631, 3639, *Députés*, *députés* (cf. l. 3094); l. 3699, *Emile*, *Émile* (cf. note). Notice in general the careless spelling of titles although used in the same meaning: *empereur* and *Empereur*, *impératrice* and *Impératrice*, *président* and *Président;* *Dauphin* is always found here with a capital although it is generally spelled with a small *d* (see V. Duruy and Larousse); cf. also *empire* and *Empire*, *gouvernement* and *Gouvernement*, *bonapartistes*, *Bonapartistes*. In l. 1439, *Montlhéry* is properly spelled; it is written *Montléry* in the small dictionary of Larousse.

In the questions supply an interrogation point at the end of the fourth, p. 31; of the eighth, p. 105; of the first, p. 153, and of the tenth, p. 161. P. 48, ninth question, *developpait* should be *développait;* p. 56, fifth question, *jugment*, *jugement;* p. 95, first question, *Henry*, *Henri;* p. 141, sixth question, *Phillippe*, *Philippe;* p. 155, second question, *gouvernment*, *gouvernement*. In the Table, p. 165, l. 8, *Henry*, *Henri*.

Note l. 761 should be marked l. 722 where the word *excommunication* is used for the first time in the book; note l. 1169, the various statements disagree; note p. 1287, *la Molte-Broons* should read *la Motte-Broons* (see dictionaries and maps). On consulting Larousse the following conflict was noticed: in his short biography of *Du Guesclin* (also spelt *Dugueselin*) he states that he was born at *La Motte-Broon* (sic) (*Ille-et-Vilaine*) and under the word *Broons* he says that *Broons* (*Côtes-du-Nord*) is the native place of the great warrior. The second statement is correct. Note l. 3140, *machine infernale* must be added; note l. 3674, *affair* should read *affaire*.

The usefulness of this text-book is much impaired by the incomplete state of the vocabulary. We can see by the presence of words alike in both languages (cf. *résistance*, *secret*, *secrètement*, *statue*, *réputation*, etc.) that without any doubt the aim of the editor was to give a complete list of the words contained in the text. Repeatedly, however, as may be seen by the following list, our attempts to look up the translations of words were baffled. *Abruptement*, see text, l. 3686; *accroissement*, l. 2170; *affaiblissement*, l. 2161; *antisémitisme*, l. 3674; *atrocité*, l. 780; *atteindre*, l. 3253; *carnage*, l. 1825; *communiste*, l. 3567; *concitoyen*, l. 1464; *considérablement*, l. 3563; *cousu*, l. 790; *définitivement*, ll. 3075, 3613; *démembrement*, ll. 1593, 3499, 3505; *désarmement*, l. 3572; *désarmer*, l. 3565; *durable*, l. 1836; *échouer*, ll. 1596, 2395, 3624; *écueil*, l. 3702; *également*, l. 1553; *encouragement*, l. 2237; *épouvantable*, p. 62, ninth question; *expiation*, l. 869 and p. 31, fourth question; *extrême*, ll. 3691, 3703; *faillir*, l. 1781; *formidable*, l. 3264; *franc*, *franque*, l. 282 and *passim*; *foyer*, l. 3564; *ignominie*, l.

1399; *imprudemment*, l. 1451; *incarcéré*, l. 3584; *incessant*, l. 3604; *lâchement*, ll. 1789, 3598; *maint*, l. 3505; *moitié*, l. 1370; *munificence*, l. 2237; *multitude*, l. 1821; *national*, l. 3471 and *passim*; *néanmoins*, l. 1773; *officiellement*, l. 3230; *outrage*, l. 3072; *organisation*, l. 3481; *organiser*, l. 3477; *orgie*, l. 3582; *patriotisme*, l. 2424; *poursuivre*, l. 1781 and *passim*; *préalablement*, l. 3497; *privilège*, l. 1421 and *passim*; *privilégié*, l. 2398; *régulier*, l. 3592; *relèvement*, l. 3606; *repartir*, l. 836; *résulter*, l. 3663; *rétablissement*, l. 3593; *subit*, l. 3697; *tâcher*, l. 1332; *terroriser*, l. 3588; *tyrannique*, l. 1143; *tyranniser*, l. 3588; *traître*, l. 1359; *trompeur*, n., l. 1452; *trompeur*, adj., l. 1796; *uniformément*, p. 161, first question; *vestige*, l. 3662; *victorieusement*, l. 1388; *vitalité*, l. 3645 and I may add etc., for this list is the result of casual glances while perusing the French text.

The following mistakes were also noticed: *afin* (*de*, *que*) *adv.* instead of *afin de*, *prep.* and *afin que*, *conj.*; *agraver*, *aggraver*. The editor fails to make a difference between *ça*, *pron.*, *that* and *çà*, *adv.*, *here* (used in *çà et là*); *construisis* should be divided *construi-sis*; *coup*, *m. bowl* should read *coup*, *m. blow*; the principal parts *cru*, *crois*, *crus* of the verb *croître* should be *crû*, *crois*, *crûs*; *deça*, *deçà*; *décadance*, *décadence*; *déja*, *déjà*; *dela*, *delà*; *entrefaîtes*, *entrefaites*; *gâgner*, *gagner*; *hopital*, *hôpital*; after *impuissance*, *f.* and *i* of the English word "impotence" are missing; the translation of *nationaux* by *compatriots* looks queer; that of *valoir* does not fit l. 1546; *personne*, *f.*, *person*, *nobody*, should read *personne*, *f.*, *person*; *m.*, *nobody*; *pleuplade*, *peuplade* and should come after *peu*; *poigneé*, *poignée*; *Vandal*, *Vandale* (could not be found in the text); *lorsque*, *mais*, *parce que*, *quoique*, *tandis que* are marked *adv.* instead of *conj.* and *malgré*, *adv.* instead of *prep.*; *Caire* (*le*), *hiver* and *Noël* are marked *f.* instead of *m.*; *étoffe*, *fête*, *fin* are marked *m.* instead of *f.*; *n.* after *dépit* should be *m.*; *pl.* should be added after *mœurs*, *f.*; *Pâques* is marked *f. pl.*; it is feminine only in the expressions *Pâques fleuries* and *faire ses pâques*. The principal parts of irregular verbs are sometimes given, sometimes omitted (see *apprendre*, *complaire*, etc.).

A few maps would have materially increased the interest and the usefulness of the text. With the vocabulary revised, the misprints corrected, *Easy French History* should become popular with teachers of elementary classes.

D. *Le Petit Chose* should be one of the most successful French text-books ever published in the United States and one wonders why it was not brought out long ago. The only objection teachers in high schools may offer is the absence of a vocabulary. The second edition could easily be provided with one. The introduction is short, adequate to the needs of scholars in preparatory schools, insufficient for college students.

On comparing it with that of the German edition by Dr. Joseph Aymeric (Leipzig: Gebhardt und Wilisch, 1895, 1900) one cannot fail to notice a great similarity in the statements concerning Daudet's life, which may be explained by the fact that both editors followed closely the same sources. But the almost literal correspondence between a French summary of the pranks of *Le Petit Chose* in the American edition (p. 112, l. 24, to p. 113, l. 7) and a part of the French summary of the same subject in the German edition (p. 101, l. 19, to p. 102, l. 5) is all the more surprising as Prof. Super does not acknowledge it in his introduction.

The following misprints should be corrected: p. v, l. 8, *La Belle-Nivernaise* was first published in 1886, not in 1866; p. v, l. 12, *L'Évangeliste* should be *L'Évangéliste*; p. 5, l. 8, *instalai*, *installai*; p. 6, l. 18, supply an exclamation point after *Dieu* (cf. p. 106, l. 21); p. 13, l. 24, a row of dots might have been added,—there is no transition; p. 18, l. 20, *à grand pas* should be *à grands pas*. I have no French edition of *Le Petit Chose* at hand, but the abridged German edition by Dr. Joseph Aymeric. Although it has the same spelling as Prof. Super's, I am sure it is a misprint. *Grand* was probably spelled in the singular in the Paris edition and both editors failed to correct the misprint. Cf. in the American edition, *à grands pas*, p. 44, l. 27; p. 67, l. 21; p. 84, l. 4; also *à grandes enjambées*, p. 67, l. 22 and p. 111, l. 21. P. 27, l. 16, supply a comma after *donne*; p. 34, l. 8, *Vio* should be *Viot*; p. 36, l. 8, the editor added this sentence to summarize the passage. The use of the imperfect is incorrect: two coördinate principal clauses must be in the

same tense; p. 39, l. 7, we read *mon chez-moi*, the German edition has no hyphen. In *Soutien de Famille* (Paris: Eugène Fasquelle), the last book by Daudet, we read, p. 224, l. 13, *notre petit chez nous*, and p. 247, l. 21, *votre petit chez nous* (sic). P. 39, l. 32, *chataigniers* should read *châtaigniers*; p. 49, l. 21, *leur*, *leurs*; p. 62, l. 29, *degoût*, *dégoût*; p. 66, l. 5, *règlerons*, *réglerons*. This is an anomaly since we write *règlement*, but according to the grammars *é* becomes open before a syllable containing an *e* mute, except in the future and conditional (cf. *succéderait*, p. 89, l. 23); p. 68, l. 30, *Nous montâmes* is strange. The text of the German edition is more satisfactory: "Je montai . . . L'homme que j'avais amené . . ." P. 72, l. 6; p. 81, l. 9; p. 86, l. 22, and twice on p. 134 in the note on p. 72, *Saint-Germain-des-Près* should be printed *Saint-Germain-des-Prés*; p. 74, l. 14, *où*, *ou*; p. 74, l. 25, *sceaux*, *seaux*. The German edition has the same misprint. This is a striking example of the result of blind confidence in the French edition. P. 78, l. 25, *Jaques* should be *Jacques*; p. 79, l. 3, *chandes*, *chaudes*; p. 98, l. 7, supply a comma after *revois*; p. 106, l. 3, supply a colon at the end; p. 106, l. 15, *chef d'œuvre* should be *chef-d'œuvre*; p. 109, l. 13, *garcon*, *garçon*; p. 114, l. 16, *dex*, *des*; p. 115, l. 31, supply a hyphen after *Broum* (cf. p. 116, l. 16); p. 117, l. 17, drop the hyphen after *dormez*; p. 123, l. 24, *quelle*, *qu'elle*.

Note on p. 2, l. 3, the editor says the Revolution of 1848 is meant, and he is right since Daudet was born in 1840 and *Le Petit Chose* is a sort of autobiography. But he failed to see that on p. 91, l. 30, Daudet, who is sometimes inaccurate, contradicts him flatly; "C'était en plein 1830." Note on p. 11, l. 2, *Epitome Historiæ Sacræ* in which the present reviewer began the study of Latin was only a reader, not a grammar; note on p. 13, l. 2, *boursier*, free scholar; *holding a scholarship* would seem clearer; note on p. 21, l. 2, the editor might have added that *le Mont-de-piété* is a French governmental institution; note on p. 36, l. 1, *bon* should be *bons*; note on p. 39, l. 3, *licentié*, *licencié*; note on p. 40, l. 5, *disorderly* is not a very good translation for *ébouriffés*; note on p. 42, l. 4, *quatres* should read *quatre*; note on p. 51, l. 1, *plein* is not an adjective in this construction; it is used as a preposition and is always invariable; note on p. 54, l. 2, the pronunciation *painsome* of *pensum* is incorrect unless the editor expects the reader to pronounce *pain* as in the French word *pain* (see Larousse); note on p. 110, l. 3, says: "The *galeries* in front (of the Odéon) are chiefly occupied by book-stores." *Around* should replace *in front*.

One would have to re-read the whole story as it was written by Daudet to state whether the text was cleverly abridged or not. The German edition, already mentioned, omits the story of the attempt to commit suicide. As it is not essential to the plot, the omission is commendable. Nevertheless the story as it is in Prof. Super's edition cannot fail to delight American students.

VICTOR E. FRANÇOIS.
*University of Michigan.*

## *GERMAN LITERATURE.*

### II.

*Der Talisman.* Dramatisches Märchen in vier Aufzügen, von LUDWIG FULDA. Edited with Introduction and Notes by C. WILLIAM PRETTYMAN, Ph.D., Professor of German in Dickinson College. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co, 1902.

THE editor's sketch of Fulda's life is too slight. We should have been told that he came from a wealthy Jewish family, that his father tried in vain to employ the dreamy youth in his immense coal and coke industry. Mention should have been made of his infatuation for the poet Günther. The editor should have consulted not only Meyer, but also the well-known books of Bartels, Wolff, Hanstein, Litzmann and Hassel. The *première* of the *Talisman* should have been noted, February 4, 1893, at the *Deutsches Theater* in Berlin. The prize taken by *Die Aufrichtigen* was not from the Concordia in Prague, but from that in Vienna. The date of *Das Recht der Frau* is not 1885, but 1884; of *Der Talisman* itself not 1892, but 1893. Some mention at least should have been made of *Die Kameraden* (1894) and *Der Sohn des Kalifen* (1896). The editor might well have given us some account of Fulda's other dramas, and especially of his several volumes of poetry and epigrams. The English note on

p. ix is out of place in the Introduction: it should have been given in a preface.

As to the text itself: P. 1: under the line *Dramatisches Märchen in vier Aufzügen* should have been inserted, as in all German editions of *Der Talisman* (*mit teilweiser Benutzung eines alten Fabelstoffes*). P. 3: the title *Der Talisman* is out of place. P. 33, l. 668 should read *teilen* not *theilen*. P. 47, l. 991 should read *mittaglichem* not *mittäglichem*. P. 63, headline should read *Dritter Aufzug. Erster Auftritt* not *Erster Aufzug. Dritter Auftritt*. P. 68, l. 1475 should read *geb'* not *geb*. P. 75, headline should read *Sechster Auftritt* not *Siebenter Anftritt*. P. 80, l. 1719 should read *geschehn* not *geschehen* to rhyme with *sehn*, l. 1722. P. 82, l. 1777 should read *Du?!* not *Du?:* l. 1784 should read *Was denn?* not *Was denn?!*. P. 90, l. 1965: the line-number is lacking. P. 93, l. 2017* (l. 4, first word of stage-directions) should read *seine* not *eine*. P. 98, l. 2125 should read *Rasest du?* not *Rasest da?* P. 107, l. 2331 should read *Einsamkeit;*, not *Einsamkeit!*. P. 108: under the last line insert as in original text (*Ende*).

Heath & Co's unfortunate innovation in printing the text with the dramatis personæ in the margin has injured the edition on p. 51, l. 1081; p. 71, l. 1539; p. 90, l. 1941; p. 93, l. 2026. On account of this change pp. 51 and 79 are among many others very difficult to use in the class-room: let anyone compare them with pp. 73 and 110 corresponding in the original and he will be convinced of the inadvisability of this innovation. Faulty type should have been replaced on p. 53, l. 1127 (*darin*); p. 61, l. 1324 (*sein*); p. 84, l. 1826 (*satt*). Poor setting is displayed on p. 66, l. 1426 (*des Siegs*); p. 90, l. 1955 (*plumpen*).

Of the notes over seventy are of no value whatever; indeed, from a pedagogical point of view they are directly deleterious since they simply give the English equivalent for German words to be found in any good German-English dictionary. The student would remember such words better if he had looked them up for himself. What possible reason is there in merely translating such words as *Freitreppe* (1*), *Lumpengeld* (36), *Racker* (107), *Gehämmer* (181), *gespieltem* (289), *fassungsloser* (313*), *Gewährung* (323), *Überhebung* (441), *meinesgleichen* (483), *Anstand* (531), *plumpen* (650), *Festgelag* (697), *Ringkampf* (737), *Stundenplan* (788), *Kronsaal* (789), *verzwickten* (849), *tagtäglich* (853), *fett* (927), *umgekehrt* (942), *beschränkte* (980), *der Fetzen* (1077), *verschwommen* (1136), *gewähren* (1754), *abgefeimte* (1890), *entfacht* (2170)? Why, pray, translate such common phrases and locutions as, *Für mein Leben* (75), *eh' ich mich noch recht besann* (182), *doch dem ist es schlecht bekommen* (215), *flott und schmuck* (731), *Doch mir ist's gleich* (881), *Was kann ich dafür* (886), *keinen blassen Schein* (955), *Dienst gegen Dienst* (1131), *nun heisst es flink sich regen* (1462), *Ei, da mag ein anderer rasten* (1924), *in gleicher Frist* (1962)? The notes, then, are superfluous, if not pernicious to ll. 1*, 36, 41, 55, 58, 75, 90, 107, 181, 215, 289, 305, 313*, 323, 405, 441, 472, 483, 506*, 531, 628, 631, 650, 697, 731, 737, 746*, 788, 789, 822, 849, 853, 881, 886, 895, 926, 927, 945, 946, 955, 963, 970, 976, 980, 1039, 1041, 1066, 1077, 1117, 1131, 1136, 1148, 1157, 1304, 1405, 1409, 1434, 1462, 1491, 1544, 1563, 1708*, 1754, 1808, 1890, 1908, 1924, 1947, 1962, 2013*, 2170.

In the note on *Famagusta*, the importance of the city in the Middle Ages should have been remarked, since for that reason Fulda localized his drama there.—Note 5, *derweil* does not stand for *derweile*, but for *dieweil(e)*. Note 93, *grade* does not mean *easy* here, but *just* (*grade zu greifen, just within reach*).—Note 106, *schaue nach dem Rechten* means neither to to "see to what is right" nor to "prepare the meal." *Nach dem* (*zum*) *Rechten schauen* (*sehen*) means *to see that everything is put in its right place* ('to rights').—Note 150, *Sieh mal an* does not want *mich* supplied: the phrase does not mean 'look at me,' but is a very common idiom for *did you ever! well I never!*—Note 381-383, there is no need of translation.—Note 503, *Du bist es doch* is much stronger than the suggested equivalent *nicht wahr.*—Note 653, *Nun aber kommt zu meiner Tafelrunde*. The editor remarks,—

"The king in his blindness compares himself to King Arthur, and the crowd of sycophants who surround him to the heroes of the Round Table."

The king had no thought whatever of King Arthur. *Die Tafelrunde* (MHG. *tavelrunde* from French *table ronde*) simply means *Tisch-*

*gesellschaft*, was a common word in Middle High German, and is still so to-day. Cf. Goethe (21, p. 102): "Indessen besetzte sich die Tafel-Runde nach und nach, so dass Spätere kaum Platz fanden;" and Wieland, *Oberon*, v, 40:

> "Wie schlug das Herz ihr erst, da er geflogen kam,
> Im Angesicht der ganzen Tafelrunde."

The editor should at least have consulted Grimm, Sanders, Kluge, and Paul *s. v.*—Note 635, *Der Hass der Einen* does not refer to Maddalena alone, but to both her and her father Diomed: *der Einen* is plural, not singular. Cf. Thomas's Grammar 116, 2.—Note 672, *in blanker Wehr* does not mean literally "in naked weapons:" *blank* (MHG. *blanc*, OHG. *blanch*, Eng. *blank*) means "shining," "bright."—Note 674, *neue Willkürlaune:* the editor remarks, "lit., 'capricious fancy;' trans., *is our number not increased daily by voluntary recruits?*" This is entirely wrong. The passage is:

> "Schon in blanker Wehr
> Steht hinter uns ein kampfbereites Heer;
> Und mehrt nicht täglich neue Willkürlaune
> Der Unsern Zahl?"

The *Willkürlaune*, which increases the number of Berengar's conspirators, is the king's capricious tyranny over his subjects.—Note 768, *des* (in the line *Wie ich das Fräulein des öftern belehrt*): the editor remarks,—"objective genitive anticipates the next line and is not translated." *des öftern* is simply an adverb of time meaning *often*, *frequently*.—Note 806, *Hanswurst:* the note is too meager, cf. Scherer, i, 399.—Note 1045, *augenfälliger* does not mean *conspicuously*, but *more conspicuously*.—Note 1078, *Kreuzelement: Kreuz* is not merely emphatic, it means *by the cross* (and the sacrament).—Note 1080, *Schockschwerenot: Schock* is not merely emphatic, it means *a heap* (of dire distress).—Note 1124–1126: the editor failed to see that Omar speaks in bitter irony.—Note 1248, *ob:* there should be a reference back to line 116 note.—Note 1437, *der lautre Hort:* the image is reminiscent of the *Nibelungenhort*, but *Hort* itself has always meant a hidden treasure (Goth. *huzd*, OHG. *hort*. MHG. *hort*, Norse *hoddr*, Eng. *hoard*).—Note 1792, *störrisch* is just as good as *störrig*.—Note 2046, *Die Folgen eurer That* is the subject of *würden* (2045).—Note 2093, *Die du allein im Kleid gesucht* should read *Die du im Kleid*, etc.—Note 2195, *schmiegt sich* does not mean *submits*, but *crowds around* here.

Orthographical errors in notes are 976 *Vortheil* for *Vorteil*, 1023 *Gamt* for *Samt:* miscited lines are 551 for 549, 2309 for 2308. The editor is extremely capricious about citing the beginnings of lines; sometimes they are given their due capital letters, sometimes not. To be consistent the following should also begin with capitals in the notes 10, 31, 34, 93, 450, 454, 551, 711, 760, 866, 1031, 1039, 1197, 1248, 1338, 1850.

Instead of the long list of mere English equivalents noted above the editor might much better have given us remarks upon the following for linguistic or literary reasons: *schnuppert* (58*), *kalter Küche* (62), *die alte Leier* (91), *Brrr!* (97), *guter Dinge* (98), *Der Starke* (165, cf. Grillparzer, *Traum, ein Leben*, 744), *Jedoch* (339, characterization of King), *Unendlich* (360, characterization of Maddalena), *O Herr* (386, cf. Schiller, *Don Karlos*, iii, 10), *Gelichter* (429), *auf Erden* (469), *Schalk* (639, reminiscent of old story: cf. *Schelmen*, 2020), *Grandezza* (706*), *verschnaufen* (712), *des öftern* (768), *elfe* (800), *im Nebel* (857), *Mein Handwerk* (1070, cf. Grillparzer, *Traum ein Leben* 1639 ff.), *sammelt sich* (1552*), *Gruppen* (1596* political parties—*rechts* and *links*), *Schleife* (1678*), *kredenzt* (1686*), *wiedersprechen* (1713, political satire), *aufgeknüpft* (1886), *Stürb'* (1894), *Das Morgen* (1915), *verstünde* (1945), *gelebt* (2013, cf. Schiller, *Die Piccolomini*, 1766, and *Des Mädchens Klage*), *Jenseits* (2016), *seit Monden* (2171), *meiner Seel'* (2344), *Ein Menschenherz* (2361, cf. Wagner, *Der fliegende Holländer*, p. 17, l. 11).

In conclusion just a word as to the manner in which several modern or new texts have been edited recently. Dr. Walz and Prof. Heller have already shown in MOD. LANG. NOTES that Holt & Co's. editions of Hauptmann's *Die versunkene Glocke* and Keller's *Romeo und Julia auf dem Dorfe* were not what they should have been. Anything worse than Heath & Co's. edition of Sudermann's *Der Katzensteg* it would be hard to imagine. (In it we find *Kreig* for *Krieg*, *der fürchterlicher Winter*, *deser* for *dieser*, *die alten Knabenangst*, *bas* for *das*, *Spass* for *Spatz*, etc.,

etc.)[1] In their edition of von Wildenbruch's *Harold*, the author's most important and best-known drama, *Heinrich und Heinrichs Geschlecht* is given and referred to as *Heinrich und sein Haus!* Now it is just a modern or new text which should put an editor upon his mettle. Lessing, Goethe, and Schiller have been edited so often and so well in this country and abroad that a careful compiler can scarcely go astray. But a new text requires original work, and is always a good test of scholarship and accuracy, of literary taste and insight. If the modern men are to be edited let us not have the hasty, careless, and unscholarly work recently displayed, but such careful scholarship and fine literary insight as we find in Prof. Hatfield's edition of Freytag's *Rittmeister von Altrosen*, Prof. Nollen's edition of von Kleist's *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg* and Prof. Gruener's edition of Sudermann's *Frau Sorge*.

EDWARD STOCKTON MEYER.

*Western Reserve University.*

---

## *SPANISH GRAMMAR.*

*A Spanish Grammar for the Use of Colleges and Schools.* By SAMUEL GARNER, Ph.D., recently Professor of Modern Languages at the U. S. Naval Academy. New York: American Book Company [1901]. 12mo, 415 pp.

THE attention that has been brought to the Spanish language by recent commercial development and political change, has made publishers' announcements teem with grammars, methods, dictionaries, readers, etc.; but if those yet to appear are upon no higher educational plane than a number that have been published within the last few years, the acquisition of Spanish is not likely to be furthered in a way to be desired. In the grammar under consideration, however, we have something distinct from these, for it is clearly the work of a trained scholar who has, in addition to long experience as a teacher, a practical knowledge of the language of which he treats.

Naturally the preparation of an elementary grammar must be, principally, a compilation of the results of previous investigators; nevertheless, Dr. Garner has been quite as original as was possible under the circumstances, and his book is remarkably free from that very common fault of copying, bodily, from other text-books, statements, illustrations, and portions of exercises.

Although not specifically so divided by the author, the contents of the book may be classified according to the following scheme:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| I. | Orthography and Pronunciation, | 7 | pages |
| II. | Accidence, | 177 | " |
| III. | Syntax, | 47 | " |
| IV. | Social and Epistolary Forms, | 8 | " |
| V. | Exercises (Span.-Eng. and Eng.-Span.), | 54 | " |
| VI. | Selections for Reading, | 55 | " |
| VII. | Vocabularies and Index, | 69 | " |

From the foregoing table it is at once apparent that a comparatively large space has been accorded to the mere presentation of forms of the several parts of speech, while the subject of phonology has been unduly slighted. This diminutive section (pp. 9–15) is the least satisfactory portion of the book: it is neither wholly popular nor thoroughly scientific. It follows the common system of attempting to give English equivalents of the Spanish sounds, and, on the other hand, uses phraseology which would not generally be clear to students in "colleges and schools." This phraseology, it may be remarked, does not always conform to that adopted by leading authorities on phonetics; as, for instance, medio- and velar-palatals are called "gutturals (throat sounds)" while *ll* is classed under the head of "dento-linguals." The following note, on p. 12, is open to similar criticism:

"Observe also that the Spanish *r* is made with the tongue vibrating against the gums just back of the upper teeth, *never in the throat.*"

The intention is evidently to refer to the prevailing absence of the "uvular *r*."

The statement (p. 10) that "in Spanish, nearly all consonants are pronounced more indistinctly than in English" seems rather too general. In initial position (with the exception of the breath-aspirate and the labials), the opposite is really the case, as it is also with regard to final liquids,[1] and the medial combination

1 It is to the credit of Holt & Co., and Heath & Co., that they insisted at once upon a revision of the editions of Hauptmann's *Die versunkene Glocke* and Sudermann's *Der Katzensteg* respectively.

1 It is true that final *r* falls in the Andalusian dialect; but elsewhere the trill is noticeable for its rapidity and force.

of dental stop+liquid. In fact, the author is rather too much inclined to make general, and sometimes diffuse, statements. For instance, on p. 113, he says that

"in the development of Spanish words from Latin, it is found that *e* breaks up into *ie*, and *o* into *ue*, whenever the tonic (syllabic) accent falls on these letters,"

and adds "it is of the highest importance to keep this simple principle in mind when learning Spanish irregular verbs." Whereas, it is only open *e* and *o* that diphthongize under the accent—and then rarely if followed by a palatal consonant or cons.+*l*. Again, in speaking of derivative adverbs, he says (p. 160) "adjectives of one termination are added to *-mente* without change." If it be correct to say that one part of a derivative adverb is "added" to another, it seems more logical to consider *-mente* as the addition.

Section 3 on p. 12 is likely to lead the uninformed to suppose that the assimilation of two concurrent vowels in speech is a "dialectic peculiarity."

The second division of the book follows the time-hallowed arrangement of presenting article, noun, adjective, numeral, etc., in sequence, with their syntax postponed until interjections have been reached. The forms and usages are clearly and concisely set forth, affording an orderly presentation of the essential features of the language. This portion of the work is open to the objection, previously mentioned, of rather overbalancing the rest of the book, and the arrangement is more adapted for purposes of reference than for elementary classwork. The conjugations might have been presented in much more compact shape; but if this be blameworthy, the burden may possibly rest upon the compositor.

The division allotted to syntax is meagre even for an elementary grammar, but conforms to the accepted usages of the language. The subjunctive is exceptionally well handled in small space. But the treatment of conditional sentences and of the gerund seems peculiarly insignificant, as the two topics together occupy but two pages. In contrast we note the eighteen pages devoted to prepositions, which present a more exhaustive and better treatise upon the subject than is contained in any other Spanish text-book of this size.

In the alphabetical list of irregular verbs, a brief definition has been added to each, thus imparting some interest to what is to the average pupil a dull catalogue of meaningless words.

The Exercises are throughout admirable for the originality, zest, and modern trend of thought which the author has displayed. Nothing further from Ollendorffian triteness has yet appeared in a Spanish text-book; and it is really a matter of regret that they are not distributed under the headings to which they pertain, instead of being isolated in a group at the end of the book, so that the student can utilize them only by means of constant cross-references to all parts of the text. While the earlier exercises are extremely simple, they are preceded by directions for preparation that involve an unusual amount of study on the part of the class; for example, before writing Exercise 1, the student is required to learn the infinitive, gerund, past participle, and the present and imperfect indicative of *haber*, *tener*, *ser*, *estar*, and of the three model verbs, together with the subjective forms of the personal pronouns (incl. *usted*), the articles, and the formation of the plurals of nouns. As such a task would be appalling as a "first lesson," the teacher's only alternative is to delay the assignment of any exercise until the class has assimilated quite a deal of material. There is also a pedagogic objection to the introduction of long lists of nouns (examples of what is meant may be found in Exercise 7, sentences 8–10; Exercise 10, sentence 5; p. 340, lines 1–16; and especially the enumeration of 55 articles of commerce without a verb to relieve the monotony, on p. 336). Students lose interest when they have to look up so much vocabulary devoid of "action"; and among the mass of words sought for, few are remembered.

In the Reading Exercises at the end of the book, Dr. Garner has essayed something decidedly novel. He commences with five *Escenas Sociales*, composed by himself, and intended to present, in simpler language than that found in any Spanish original, a series of dialogues that shall have the true colloquial ring. It is a venturesome task for one who is not "to the language born" to attempt to com-

pose or to criticise such matter. However, when the reader finds, in the first two pages, such expressions as *pienso que no* (for *creo que no*), *excelentemente bien* (for *enteramente bien*), and *para decirlo así* (for *por decirlo así*), he may be inclined to be somewhat sceptical about several less self-evident points.

What few defects may exist in this portion are, in a large measure, redeemed by the extract from Alarcón's account of the battle of Tetuan, and the citations from Admiral Cervera's official report to the Spanish Navy Department,—the latter being especially new and timely. Upon the whole, however, one may question the advisability of inserting fifty-five pages of reading matter into an elementary grammar that is elsewhere provided with Spanish exercises composed mostly of connected description.

In the vocabularies, which are otherwise commendably full, the students' convenience would be served by entering compound expressions under each component part, instead of only one. To cite two examples, the military term *á boca de jarro*, "point blank," is put under *boca* but not under *jarro*, which latter has no separate place in the vocabulary. To the majority of students *boca* would be familiar, and *jarro* would be the first word looked for, thus necessitating a second search. Similarly, the neologism *telegrafía policiaca*, "burglar-alarm," is entered only under the more familiar of its components, *telegrafía*.

The book is clearly printed on good paper. and its matter tastefully displayed; and the whole is remarkably free from typographical errors. The following, however, have been noted: p. 26, l. 19, *an*, *on*, *in* for *án*, *ón*, *ín*; p. 54, l. 18, *aquellos* for *aquéllos*; p. 55, l. 9, *Esta* for *Ésta*; p. 55, l. 10, *Ese* for *Ése*; p. 163, l. 11, *Ciudad, abajo* for *Ciudad abajo*; p. 175, l. 2, *durerá* for *durará*; p. 201, l. 7, *te* for *té*; p. 232, l. 3, *como* for *cómo*; p. 259, l. 12, *dónde* for *donde* p. 303, l. 12, *esfuezos* for *esfuerzos*; p 301, l. 31, *que* for *qué*; p.360, l. 8, *navigante* for *navegante*; p. 360, l. 9, *neapolitano* for *napolitano*; p. 376, l. 17, *cardinal* for *cardenal*; p. 394, l. 39, *missive* for *massive*; p. 405, l. 12, *salvatoje* for *salvataje*. The following errors in syllabication occur: p. 184, §262, *cotidi-ano*; p. 204, §283 e, *teni-ente*; p. 294, l. 25, *cor-riente*; p. 315, l. 13, *confi-anza*; p. 315, last line, *experi-encia*; p. 324, l. 25, *Gen-eral*; p. 326, l. 9, *sigui-entes*.

The following emendations are suggested, varying in degree from corrections of errors to improvements in the mode of expression: p. 66, l. 12, *obligate* instead of *oblige*; p. 68, §155, *se puede ser feliz* should be *puede uno ser feliz* (otherwise there would be nothing with which the adjective could agree); p. 96, l. 20, *occur only* instead of *only occur*; p. 136, l. 17, *caer al agua* instead of *caer en el agua*; p. 228, l. 17, *estudiaré hasta saber* instead of *estudiaré hasta que sepa*, as there is no change of subject (cf. p. 231, l. 26, *preguntaré hasta saberlo*, where the infinitive is correctly used); p. 233, l. 30, *establezca* instead of *establece*; p. 237, l. 15, *salimos á la caza*, or *salimos al monte*, instead of *partimos á cazar*; p. 249, l. 21, *los cabellos cubren*, or *el pelo cubre*, instead of *el cabello cubre*; p. 250, l. 14, *están unidos*, instead of *son unidos*; p. 252, l. 24, *echa el café*, instead of *derrama el café* (*derramar*= spill); p. 261, l. 23, *los labios*, instead of *sus labios*; p. 259, l. 5, *mucha fruta*, instead of *mucho fruto*; p. 266, l. 31, *ha muerto*, instead of *es muerto*; p. 267, l. 8, *contento con*, instead of *contento de*; p. 292, l. 22, *se han dado* would be more colloquial than *se han declarado*; p. 292, l. 25, *creo que no*, or *me parece que no*, instead of *pienso que no*; same line, *las señales* would be more colloquial and usual than *los síntomas*; p. 293, l. 5, *de él el* should be avoided; p. 294, l. 2, *servirle*, instead of *servir á usted* (as *usted* has just been expressed; p. 294, l. 3, *se lo agradezco*, instead of *le agradezco*; p. 296, l. 18, *otra dama*, instead of *otra señora* (as *señora* occurs with a different value four times previously); p. 296, l. 26, *sea V. bienvenida*, instead of *sea V. la bienvenida* (a gallicism); p. 315, l. 10, *otros muchos*, instead of *muchos otros*; p. 315, l. 23, *una misma*, instead of *la misma*, p. 347, l. 86, *acknowledge receipt*, instead of *acknowledge reception*; p. 348, l. 19, *la asistencia*, instead of *el auditorio*; p. 355, l. 33, *pluma tintero*, instead of *pluma de fuente* (an anglicism); p. 356, l. 37, the rendering of so colloquial an expression as "hold one's tongue" should not be *callarse* but *callarse el pico*; p. 362, l. 30, *función*, instead of *drama*; p. 364, l. 41, "return ticket"

is rendered by *billete de ida y vuelta* (=round-trip ticket); p. 367, l. 7, technically "surgeon" is *cirujano*, in the colloquial phraseology of the army and navy, *fisico*.

Considering Dr. Garner's grammar independently, it might appear from the foregoing criticisms that it has many defects; but when we compare it with the other elementary grammars and methods that have preceded it, the faults sink into relative insignificance. It is unquestionably the most thorough and concise text-book of its kind that has yet been given to the public.

M. M. Ramsey.

*Leland Stanford, Jr., University.*

## *SWEDISH LANGUAGE.*

*Die Alt- und Neuschwedische Accentuierung* unter Berücksichtigung der andern Nordischen Sprachen von Axel Kock. Quellen und Forschungen, 87. Heft. Strassburg, Karl J. Trübner, 1901. 8vo, pp. xii + 298. M. 7.50.

What may, from certain points of view, be considered as preliminary work to the present excellently balanced and thoroughly rounded out exposition of the subject in its broad bearings has been done by the author in his well-known *Sprdkhistoriska undersökningar om svensk accent* (1878 85), *Studier öfver fornsvensk ljudlära* (1886), and in numerous articles of greater or less extent in Scandinavian and German journals. The present book makes use not only of these results of the author's own investigation and the work of others in the field—Storm, Verner, Jespersen, Vilh. Thomsen and others—but it contains new material and new conclusions, some of them far reaching and important. The book, as its title indicates, while it considers primarily the principles of accentuation in Old and New Swedish, also takes account of the other Scandinavian languages. In his preface the author expresses the hope that inasmuch as the conditions of accent in the Scandinavian languages are of importance for their bearing upon common Germanic conditions, his work may also be of interest to Germanists elsewhere. As his conclusions throughout, not only by inference, but by careful exposition, are frequently made to focus general Germanic and even Indo-Germanic conditions, their value is in reality immediate along broad lines, and the book must henceforth be reckoned with in any extended discussion of the general, as well as the special, problems which it considers.

Swedish is incontestably of the Scandinavian languages the one *par excellence* that has preserved the most of what were common Scandinavian conditions of accentuation, and is, accordingly, the fittest to serve as the fundamental basis for a study like the present, which is intended, as has already been stated, to cover the whole Scandinavian field. By a not unintelligible process of natural selection, in Swedish, too, these facts of accent have been as a whole most closely observed and accurately apprehended.

Anders Nicander, as long ago as 1737, observed the double accent system that is characteristic of Swedish, as well as of Norwegian and Danish. This is formulated by Kock for the Stockholm pronunciation in effect as follows. A first category (called throughout *acc. 1*) comprises those words that are now monosyllabic; words that in the older languages (O. N.) were monosyllabic, but have now become dissyllabic through the development of a svarabhakti vowel, or by contamination or analogy, or are dissyllabic or polysyllabic through the use of an enclitic word, usually the post-positive article; words that are now dissyllabic, but in original Norse were trisyllables in which the second syllable during the common Norse period was syncopated; various words in the sentence often relatively unaccented; various words which are immediately preceded by a relatively unaccented word; dialectic words with the root vowel in hiatus; a number of words now regarded as simple, but which were originally composite; numerous loan-words in *-el*, *-en*, *-er;* dialectic dissyllabic imperatives, and the vocatives of dissyllabic feminine proper names in *-a*—the minor categories are here introduced in detail to show the author's close analysis of his material. These words have on the single or the first syllable, as the case may be, a strong expiratory single-point accent, which is strongest at the beginning of the vowel and afterward somewhat decreases

in force. This fortis accent is combined with the highest musical accent in the language (*acutus*) which remains essentially unchanged during the pronunciation of the syllable, although to a slight extent it may rise or fall. The next following syllable, in the case of dissyllables or polysyllables, has the weakest expiratory stress in the language (*levissimus*). This weak accent is combined with the lowest musical accent (*gravis*). The ultima of polysyllabic words bears an expiratory accent next to the weakest in the language (*levior*), and usually has the same musical accent as the penult.

A second category (*acc. 2*) comprises those words which were in original Norse and still are dissyllabic or polysyllabic. Dissyllables have on the penult a strong expiratory two-point accent, which is strongest at the beginning of the vowel, but afterwards decreases in force to increase somewhat again at the end of the syllable. With this fortis accent is combined a composite musical accent (*compositus*). On the ultima falls an expiratory secondary accent (*levis*). With this is combined the highest musical accent (*acutus*). Polysyllables, on the contrary, have on the antepenult a single stressed fortis, and the secondary accent does not fall upon the next following syllable; upon this, too, is dependent a different musical accent.

In manner the two accent systems in Norwegian also essentially correspond with those in Swedish. In Danish the fortis syllable of words with *acc. 1* has the characteristic glottal catch, while the corresponding syllable of words with *acc. 2* does not. Not all the problems of Danish accentuation find here, or elsewhere, a definitive solution. It is still, for instance, an open question as to whether Danish words with *acc. 1* and those with *acc. 2* have the same or a different musical accent. The question has been answered variously. It is considered probable by Kock that in the Copenhagen pronunciation there is no constant, or only a minimal, difference in musical accent between *acc. 1* and *acc. 2*, while in other localities such a difference definitely exists. In New Icelandic and Faroese, languages which at an earlier time belonged to Norwegian linguistic territory, there is but one accent system. Here the fortis is simple, and the fortis syllable lies as a rule musically somewhat higher than the syllables which have a relatively lesser expiratory accent. This is brought with right into connection with local conditions of accentuation in western Norway, from which region Iceland and the Faroes in the main were settled. In parts of Sweden, also, there is dialectically but one accent system. This is true of the dialects of Esthonia and the adjacent islands, of the Finland pronunciation of Swedish, and of minor dialects in Dalecarlia and elsewhere.

In composita a primary question concerns the position of the *fortis*. As a rule the first element of the composition retains the old place for the *fortis*. If the first word has after the fortis syllable a syllable with *levis*, this letter is changed to *levissimus*. In the second element the original fortis is changed to a semi-fortis. With the exception of a few original juxtapositions, the *fortis* lies in the present language on the first and only with extreme rarity on the second member of the composition. A number of words, however, although they are conceived of as one composition, are pronounced for various reasons with two fortis accents. In modern Swedish there is considerable variation in the accentuation of composita in that in the same locality the same word may have both *acc. 1* and *acc. 2*, or the same word may have unlike accentuation in different localities.

On the basis of the present accentuation the author considers in detail the older accentuation for simplicia and composita, first in Old Swedish and then in common and original Norse. Kock's processes in this phase of his investigation meet thoroughly the dictum of Brugmann, in the *Grundriss*, that "conclusions drawn from the younger periods of a language are not to be applied to the older without great care," etc., and his decisions are usually convincing. The author has, however, from the nature of the ground not always been able to make a definite statement and the book contains not a little that is still put forward as hypothesis. It is only possible here to summarize results.

The author justifies the well-known 'tendency in the Scandinavian languages to throw

the principle accent back to the beginning of a word, where previously it had stood nearer the end,' as Noreen elsewhere has stated it. In all the modern dialects, with extreme frequency, two-point expiratory and combined musical accents have arisen through the loss of a relatively unaccented syllable. The expiratory and musical accents of the lost syllable have been thrown on the syllable next preceding and have been united with the expiratory and musical accents already present on that syllable—a process, as for the rest, well known in other than the Norse dialects and present even in Indo-Germanic. The two-point expiratory and combined musical accents of common Norse are to be explained in accordance with this principle.

The older accentuation is formulated along fundamental lines as follows. In the case of simplicia, those words which late in the original Norse period had lost the levissimus accented vowel of the second syllable in common Norse had *acc. 1.* for example, *steinn* < **stainăR*, etc. A two-point fortis lay on a long root-syllable. This fortis arose through the union of the fortis of the root syllable with the expiratory accent which in original Norse had stood on the lost vowel. On a short root-syllable lay apparently a single-point fortis. It is impossible to state definitely the conditions of the musical accent of the root-syllable for the common Norse period. Those words which late in the original Norse period had in the second syllable a long vowel pronounced with a secondary accent (levis) in common Norse had *acc. 2.* The greater number of these words either had lost in the common Germanic period a vowel in the third syllable, through which the second syllable had received a two-point expiratory and a combined musical accent, and, in case it was not already long, had been lengthened; for example, Norse **bindōm* < Gc. *bindomiz*, etc.; or they had from Indo-Gc. on the long second syllable the circumflex; for example, **windōR*, etc. There resulted, accordingly, a two-point fortis for a long root-syllable, the second syllable being short with weak levis; a musical accent medius + gravis lay on the penult, and acutus on the ultima, for example, *bindum*. For a short root-syllable there resulted a single-point fortis, the second syllable being half-long with a strong levis; a medius musical accent lay on the first, gravis + acutus on the second when this was still long, later the gravis alone, for example, *fărŭm*.

The probability is asserted that dissyllabic words in original Norse (**windōR*, etc.), whose second syllable had in Indo-Germanic 'schleifender Ton,' during the common Norse period still had a two-point expiratory and a combined musical accent on the second syllable. If this is true, those words which in common Norse received *acc. 2* in great part in late original Norse had the second syllable long with a two-point expiratory and a combined musical accent. The ultima had levis, which in short-syllabled words was stronger than in long-syllabled. In the latter, the second syllable was shortened and a part of both the expiratory and the musical accent apparently went over to the penult, which thus received a two-point expiratory and a combined musical accent, as already described. In short-syllabled words, the second syllable, on the other hand, retained at the outset its length, and as a consequence a single-point expiratory and a simple musical accent. The original long vowel of the ending was not, however, ultimately able to persist and in the later period became half-long. It has not been possible, as the author is constrained to admit, to bring the two accentuation systems into historical connection with the 'gestoszener' and 'schleifender Ton' in Indo-Germanic.

With regard to composita it is shown that a large number of juxtapositions which now have but one fortis in the older language had two; and that the older language, as the older Germanic dialects in general, allowed the fortis to rest upon the second member of the composition to a much greater extent than is at present the case. This latter process again illustrates the general tendency of accent shifting already noticed in the case of simplicia. Down to the beginning of the nineteenth century many words still had the fortis on the second member of the complex which now have it on the first. This process is, however, simply the continuation of a development begun at a very early time and only gradually consummated. The manner of the actual shifting of accentuation in composita is

one of the most interesting phases of Kock's investigation, and one of the most carefully carried out. He scouts the idea of the purely mechanical common Germanic transference of the fortis accent to the first syllable, either in simplicia or composita, that is loosely assumed. Words like Icel. *torb̃ann*, without *R*-umlaut, Goth. *naudi-bandi*, with *d* instead of *þ*, etc., etc., show conclusively that the fortis could still rest on the second member of the composition. The fundamental principle in the Germanic shifting of accent is, nevertheless, that the principal accent shall fall upon that part of the word that bears the principal meaning, that is, upon the stem syllable. This new principle, however, was carried out in the dialects gradually and was only consummated long after the common Germanic period. The stem syllable of the simplicia is, as a matter of fact, almost always the first, and these words, accordingly, after the accent shifting had, as invariably, the fortis upon the first syllable. The great mass of composita through regular process of development had also placed the fortis on the first syllable, and in course of time, as the result of juxtaposition, a great number of new composita accented in the same way were added to the list. Gradually in the Germanic dialects the consciousness was developed that the fortis should inevitably fall throughout upon the first syllable of simplicia and composita alike. In accordance with this rule, in the course of time and differently in the different Germanic dialects, the fortis, when it lay upon that part of the complex, was for the most part shifted from the stem syllable of the second member of the composition to the first syllable of the word.

The book closes with a short chapter, not the least important in the work, on sentence accentuation, in which the various parts of speech—nouns, numerals, pronouns, verbs, adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions and interjections—are considered with some degree of detail with reference to the accent of the sentence in which they stand. A word register at the end adds still further to the usefulness of the book, which, as had already been indicated, is one of the most notable contributions of recent years to the subject which it treats.

W. H. Carpenter.

*Columbia University.*

## *ROMANCE PHILOLOGY.*

*Einführung in das Studium der romanischen Sprachwissenschaft.* Von W. Meyer-Lübke. Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, Heidelberg, 1901.

The volume before us is the first of a series of elementary textbooks in the field of Romanic Philology, to be edited under the general supervision of Prof. Meyer-Lübke with the aid of many of the most prominent scholars in Europe. When complete the collection will contain Grammars, Histories of Literature and Dictionaries of the various Romanic languages.

It is apparent that the plan, though larger in scope in some ways and quite different in others, bears some similarity to that of Prof. Gröber's *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie*, but it will be seen also that the advantages are decidedly with the new venture. Gröber's *Grundriss* was antiquated in part before the last fascicule had been distributed, but even if the publication had kept pace with the desires of the subscribers the same result would have been inevitable. The work will always stand as a monument of the scholarship of the last two decades of the nineteenth century, but the articles contained in it in places fail to give even now the information which is readily found in more recent volumes on similar subjects. This new series will take somewhat the place of a new edition of the *Grundriss*, and it will have this decided advantage that it will be a comparatively simple matter to bring it up to date, whenever the progress of the science shall demand a revision.

It differs fundamentally from its rival in the pedagogical atmosphere which is evident in the volume before us. This book is distinctly, in part at least, an introduction to the methods of Romanic Philology. On the basis of carefully selected examples fully representing the various phases of linguistic study, Prof. Meyer-Lübke points out the paths to be followed and the pitfalls to be shunned. The object of the book was *eine Orientierung über das Gebiet der romanischen Sprachwissenschaft zu geben, dem, der als Neuling herantritt, zu zeigen, welche Aufgaben zu lösen sind, auf welchem Wege die Lösung zu suchen und wie weit sie schon gefunden sei.*

The introductory chapter contains first an

enumeration of the principal literature of the subject (periodicals, grammars, dictionaries and monographs) followed by a discussion of the geographical distribution of the various languages and dialects.

Then follows a first part (chapter 3) treating of the materials of Romanic Philology: Latin, pp. 27–35; Celtic, pp. 35–41; and German, pp. 41–54. The discussion of the Latin substratum leads to a most lucid exposition of the nature of the popular vocabulary, its relation to the literary vocabulary, and the difficulties in the way of always clearly separating the two categories of words. The Germanic words are divided into strata both as to the period of their introduction and the dialects from which they derive.

The second part (pp. 56–206) deals with the problems of Romanic Philology. Here Prof. Meyer-Lübke has made a very happy selection of two terms, which are not commonly applied to linguistic science, but which are admirably adapted for the purpose for which they are chosen. He divides the subject into biological problems (chapter 4, pp. 57–81) and paleontological problems (chapter 5, pp. 81–206).

Among the biological problems are discussed such subjects as Physiological and Experimental Phonetics, the study of modern pronunciation and the velocity of speech, the question of dialects and the making of speech maps with reference to sounds, forms, syntax, and vocabulary, the sociological and psychological aspects of speech, the struggle between literary language and dialect, and all these problems are constantly illustrated by carefully selected examples, often containing also the counter-illustration of wrong method, so that the learner can find a safe guide and the investigator will meet with many a new point of view, which will render the perusal of the book both interesting and profitable.

The following chapter containing the discussion of the paleontological problems (*die ganz eigentliche Aufgabe der romanischen Sprachwissenschaft*) is the longest and also the most important portion of the book. Here the pedagogical feature of the discussion falls somewhat into the background, while the encyclopedic side becomes more evident. The chapter is practically a revised edition of the author's Popular Latin article in Gröber's *Grundriss* with elaborations and expansions, and as it stands it forms the best and most complete Grammar of the form of Latin from which the Romanic languages derive. It contains besides a discussion of the relation of Latin to the native idioms with which it came in contact (pp. 170–186), and finally a most important exposition of the uses to which the study of geographical proper names might and should be put in the study of historical grammar. These pages (186–206) form the longest of the many new features of the book.

In the case of a treatise of this sort it is manifestly impossible to touch upon the many varied points of interest with which it deals within the limits of a brief review. We cannot refrain, however, from adding a few notes upon some paragraphs selected somewhat at random.

In § 50 appears the statement that the change of *tl*>*kl* (as in VETLUS>VECLUS) is *durchaus naturgemäss*. As a matter of fact the process involved is neither a change of *tl*>*kl* nor of *kl*>*tl*, but it represents a compromise between the *t* or *k* articulation and that of *l*. Both are drawn toward the place of the *l* articulation, the one backwards, the other forwards, and the resultant stop, though acoustically suggesting both, is in reality neither one nor the other, but *t'* or *k'*. A reference to Prof. Schmidt-Wartenberg's article on this subject in MOD. LANG. NOTES, Vol. iii, col. 126, would have been in place.

§ 72. The objections advanced against the acceptance of a form TRAGERE for TRAHERE, to explain the modern forms of this infinitive, are not convincing. Latin AEREM gives Fr. *air*, not *aire* as Prof. Meyer-Lübke writes, so that TRAHERE should have become **trair*, and the Italian has *traggo*, *traggere* by the side of *trarre*, for which the analogy of *porre*, *corre*, *torre*, etc., might possibly account.

§ 80. O.Fr. *jagonce*, *jagunce*<*ἰάκυνθος* are cited as an example of a certain group of words where Greek *υ* became *u*. However, the Greek form was *ὑάκινθος*; for an explanation of the *υ* cp. Thomas, *Mélanges d'Étymologie française*, p. 95.

§ 87. In discussing the effects of Ten Brink's law the lengthening of the vowel in *tĕnebræ*> *tenẽbræ*>*tenē̆bræ* is explained *aus dem dem r, l anhaftenden Stimmton . . . . . man sprach tenēberæ vēcelus u. s. w.* The inherent vocalic quality of *r*, which causes *tenebræ* to become

*tenebŗrœ* (the transcription *teneberœ* is misleading) may have been the cause for the original shifting of the accent (cp. Neumann, *Z. f. R. Ph.*, Vol. xx, p. 519, an explanation which Prof. Meyer-Lübke does not seem to admit, cp. § 99), but it is not necessary to account for the open quality of the syllable before *br*. Mute + liquid in Latin syllabification stand at the beginning of the following syllable, so that the accented vowel before them comes naturally under the sway of Ten Brink's law. But even granting the existence of a pronunciation *tenẹ̆berœ*, a form *vẹ̆celus* is excluded by the history of medial *cl* and *tl* > *t'l* > *l'*.

§ 92. This is one of the most interesting paragraphs of the book. While accepting in general the fact that long vowels may have been pronounced closed in Latin and short vowels open, Prof. Meyer-Lübke presents some strong evidence tending to prove that the Latin knew also long open vowels and short closed vowels. Priscian's rule that vowels before *gn* are long has been shown to be a later interpolation, and since the Romanic developments of *signum*, *tignum* demand *ẹ*, everything seems to be plain, if the rule of the interpolator, which seems to represent the actual fact, went into effect after the passage of *ĭ* > *i*, so that original *sĭgnum* became *sịgnum* and then *sịgnum*. Similar examples are Greek *χρῖσμα* > Latin *chrịsma*, Greek *ἐκκλησία* > Latin *eclẹ̆sia*, and short closed vowels seem to have existed in *ŭlŭlare* > Fr. *hurler*, *tŏndit* > It. *tọnde*, *frŏndem* > It. *fronda*, Sp. *fronda*, and others.

In this connection O.Fr. *roide* < Latin *rĭgidus* is cited as an argument against the early loss of the vowel of the penult in this word, while Sp. *recio* compared with Sp. *frio* is adduced to prove that *rĭgidus* and *frīgidus* did not influence each other's development. However, the O.Fr. has also the regular form *reit* > *roit*, so that it seems reasonable to suppose *roide* is the feminine form used as masculine. The history of *recio* from *rĭgidus*, moreover, is not clear and the row *frīgdus* > *frịjdo* > *frịjdo* > *frẹddo* has no parallel to substantiate it, while both sense and form of *rīgidus* and *frīgidus* would certainly have favored reciprocal influence of the two words, and It. *reddo* presupposes the same history as *freddo*.

The question of the palatalization of *c* before *e* and *i* is summed up in §§ 115–118. A new argument for an earlier date than that admitted by M. Gaston Paris is drawn from the name of place *Erlach* in the canton of Bern in Switzerland, French *Cerley*, Latin CÆRELLIACUM. The German form derives from *Zerlach*, where the *z* was evidently looked upon as the abbreviation of the preposition *zu*. In that case a stage *ts*, or something very similar to it, must have existed in that region at the time of its occupation by the Alemanni in the fifth to the sixth century. As to the ultimate date of the beginning of the process (*k* > *k'*), Prof. Meyer-Lübke accepts Prof. Guarnerio's conclusions for the third century.

The author rejects the current explanation of influence of the labial upon the change of *ọ* > *ǫ* in certain well-known words. *Colọbra* is said to have received its tonic open vowel through influence of its pretonic *ǫ* (§ 111), *juefne* < *juvenis* is cited as unexplained (§ 143), and *ọvu* is explained as due to analogy within the word (§ 121). Latin *v* fell before *u*, hence *ovum* became *oum*. According to § 100 *ọ* in hiatus before *u* became *ǫ*, hence *ǫum*; but *ọvi*, *ọva* remained, and from these the *v* is reintroduced into *ǫum*, which thus becomes *ǫvum*.

§ 140. The term *ficatum jecur* should not be repeated after the statement of M. Gaston Paris, *Miscellanea Linguistica in onore di Graziadio Ascoli*, p. 48, that it does not exist.

§§ 181–185. These paragraphs contain a discussion of the origin of *ü* from Latin *ū* in French, Provençal and the North Italian dialects. The objections to the Celtic theory are clearly stated, proof is brought forward that *ü* is not equally old in the languages and dialects where it is found, and that it does not extend over the whole of the so-called *ü*-territory. The thesis is then maintained that at least two modes of articulation existed for the sound. It seems to have been *u* + *i* in the East and South-East of France and in Northern Italy, and *u* + *ẹ* in the larger part of France extending from Picardy to Burgundy. The one articulation, when delabialized, gives *i*, the other may become *ö* as in Milanese *tornör*, *parör* for French *tournure*, *parure*. The theory appears attractive, but demands further investigation. Experimental phonetics will show whether the varying color of the *ü*-sound depends upon the

tongue or lip position, or upon both, but I think few English teachers will accept Prof. Meyer-Lübke's contention that *für Individuen, die ü nicht sprechen können, i nicht u der nächste Ersatzlaut ist.*

Many problems of similar interest might be discussed, but what has been said will serve to show, I think, the high importance of the work, the suggestive treatment of the subject, and the great profit to be derived from its study by both students and investigators.

JOHN E. MATZKE.
*Leland Stanford Jr. University.*

## *SPANISH PUBLICATIONS.*

### V.[1]

9. *Guzmán el Bueno, drama en cuatro actos por Don Antonio Gil y Zárate.* Edited with introduction and notes by SYLVESTER PRIMER, Ph. D., Professor in the University of Texas. Boston: Ginn & Company, Publishers. The Athenæum Press, 1901. 8vo, pp. xx+154.

IN striking contrast with the book discussed is the edition of Gily Zárate's *Guzmán el Bueno*. The Introduction is divided: i. Introductory. ii. Biographical. iii. Sources of the play. iv. Plot and characters. v. Versification. (*a*) Introductory. (*b*) Kinds of verse. (*c*) Assonance. (*d*) Rhyme. vi. Conclusion. Follows the play (two thousand four hundred and eighty-seven lines, one hundred and thirty-five pages), nine pages of Notes, two of Synopsis of the Subjunctive Mood, three of Bibliography, and four of Index.

All this looks attractive and represents a good amount of well-intentioned work, but unfortunately the editor has centred his efforts upon the trimmings, instead of upon the real body of the book.

The first four chapters of the Introduction can be called satisfactory, although Chapter iii, on the sources of the play, would gain in clearness by being condensed. However, the play would be just as valuable and instructive as a text for our Spanish classes if its subject had been boldly invented by an anonymous author, in which case three of these chapters would have remained unwritten.

1 Cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, Nov., 1902.

In Chapter v, on versification, the editor begins by deploring the necessity of writing it at all and the difficulty of securing "the necessary information for a proper understanding of the elementary principles upon which Spanish versification is based." After this he says:

"The fundamental principle of Spanish versification consists in not making the quantity of the syllables the basis of the meter, as in Latin and Greek, but a definite number of feet or syllables; in other words, syllables count, not vowel quantity."

This would be correct and fairly clear if the word "feet" were omitted; as it stands, it is neither, for it gives the impression that feet and syllables are synonymous words, or else, that a verse sometimes is made up of feet and at other times of syllables.

Another remark (p. xvi) is:

"In our poem we have two groups of feet: the iambic, which represents the rising inflection, and the trochaic, which represents the falling inflection."

It so happens that the first five pages of the play are in modernized *coplas de arte mayor*, a verse-form which the editor (p. xix) calls trochaic. The first line (the other ninety-five are built just like it) reads:

"Pues ya el sacerdote las armas bendijo,"

a verse that no amount of protestation can ever make trochaic.[2]

Again, we read (p. xvi):

"The older poets were very careful to attend to the feet and syllables in order that the verse might be as perfect as possible. Gil y Zárate apparently pays attention only to the syllables, hence he often has metrically poor verses."

An observation of this sort should tend to put a commentator on his guard, for it may be presumed that a practised versifier knows more about versification than we who proceed to criticise him. In the Notes the editor only once marks a verse as bad, saying to l. 366:

"scan: que va | le lo | que yo le a | pruebe | .

Indeed, if Gil y Zárate had actually written that line, he would not only have written a verse that no Spanish audience could allow to pass unhissed, for the chance combination "lelo" would alone suffice to condemn it, but

2 Dr. Ford, on p. xxxvii of the Introduction to his *A Spanish Anthology* (New York, 1901) classifies the *versos de arte mayor* as twelve-syllabled amphibrachs; Spaniards, strange to say, have called them anapestic, and others consider them as dactyls with an anacrusis.

he also would have written impossible Spanish. What he should have written is:

¿ qué | va | le ⁀el | que | yo | le ⁀a | prue | be?

in which *el* is the article before the phrase-noun "que yo le apruebe," the two together being the subject of "vale"—an absolutely correct verse in absolutely correct language. And this is what the author did write; for although the Preface says: "The text is based on that of Pedro de Novo y Colson in *Autores Dramáticos Contemporáneos y Joyas del Teatro Español del Siglo xix.*," no one but our editor is responsible for the wretched versification throughout the play. The Colsón text is, as far as I can see, faultless, except for half a dozen places where the punctuation might be improved, and one misprint (l. 2163, *solo* for *sola*); while our editor has "based" his text upon his prototype by, in four places (424; 746; 803; 2249), omitting a syllable; in one (2325) adding a superfluous word; in one (366) spoiling the grammar and the verse by substituting one word for another; in one (425) writing one verb-person for another; in one (761) spoiling the sense by substituting one participle for another; in one (571) substituting an impossible verb-tense for the correct one, thereby over-lengthening the verse; in two (1066; 2316) using a nominative form of a pronoun for an oblique; in one (543) changing "más que," which was correct, into "más de," which is wrong; in one (2353) writing "frente" for "afrenta"—and by bringing in several glaring misprints and additional wrong punctuation.

In the Notes, that might in part have redeemed an otherwise bad text, the only serious difficulty which the text offers (ll. 1453–1455) is explained wrong, while the information these Notes furnish is mainly confined to translations and matters of elementary grammar that should be known by a student before he is expected to read a play in verse. On the other hand, many cases where the text demands instructive comment (39; 105–108; 110; 403; 715; 970; 1081; 1292; 1441; 1768–1770; 1939 2427); receive no attention.

Might it not be to the advantage of all concerned if publishers' readers of Spanish text-books, submitted for approval, were to take their task somewhat more seriously?

F. De Haan.

*Bryn Mawr College.*

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### *GENDER OF Kalevala.*

To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes,

Sirs:—A gender-language, like Modern High German, when it becomes the vehicle of scientific expression, is unable sometimes to secure that unanimous verdict which elsewhere its *Sprachgefühl* achieves so often without any apparent trouble. The question of the gender of the word *Kalevala*, the name of the national epic of the Finns, has been discussed recently by Gustav Schmidt.[1]

The first appearance of *Kalevala* with its gender marked in German was in 1846, when Mühlberg published his *Proben einer ehstnischen und deutschen Übersetzung* der *Kalevala* and Jakob Grimm his "Über das finnische Epos." Both these authorities treat the word as feminine, but Grimm, who distinguished between (*die*) *Kalevala*, the epic, and *Kalevala* (articleless neuter), the Finnish word itself, which signifies "home of heroes," seems to have used the word generally without any article. A rapid glance over German Kalevala-literature up to 1895 reveals no "das *Kalevala*" and but one "der *Kalevala*," the rest being all feminine. Many writers get over the difficulty by using periphrases, such as "das Kalevala-epos," "das finnische Epos," etc. The German translator of Comparetti renders the "il *Kalevala*" of the Italian by "der *Kalevala*." In French, Léouzon le Duc and others use "le *Kalevala*." The employment in the pages of the *Anzeiger* of the word *Kalevala* as neuter created some discussion and occasioned the article of Schmidt, who tells us that, on first acquaintance with *Kalevala* (accented *Kálevala*) he felt it to be neuter,—it is worth noting, however, that an accentuation *Kalevála* has given rise to the feminine *Kalevále*, used by Weis-Ulmenried in a very recent publication in the *Grenzboten* (lx, No. 43). The neuter gender is favored by the etymology (—*la*= AN. *heimr*, OHG. *land*) and has several other arguments in its support.

This discussion of *Kalevala* is of interest, as revealing the rise of the gender in the mind of an individual and his attempt to change the current of thought of his fellows concerning it.

Alexander F. Chamberlain.

*Clark University.*

1 *Die, der* oder *das* Kalevala? *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen. Anzeiger.* Bd. ii (Helsingfors, 1902), p. 48–51.

## *GERMAN LITERATURE.*

To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes,

Sirs:—Searching reviews of several school editions of French and German texts have recently appeared in Mod. Lang. Notes. They should have exercised a salutary and restraining influence, but it still seems necessary to call attention to glaring and at times ludicrous mistakes. An abridged edition of Freytag's *Soll und Haben* has lately been published,[1] the notes of which, to say the least, suggest the propriety of reminding editors of German texts whose mother-tongue German is not of the fact that there are dictionaries that might be consulted profitably in the translation of German terms.

I call attention to some of the mistakes found in the editor's notes:

P. 45, 1 "*abgefeimteste*, most accursed;" even small dictionaries give the correct meanings *crafty*, *astute*, *arch-*. As to the etymology of the word advanced by the editor, its connection with *Fehme*, I need not say anything.

P. 99, 2 "*Mausche*, translate here, *the miserable Jew*. The word originally meaning Moses is here, as frequently, used in a derogatory sense;" here certainly not, it is simply the form in which the name Moses appears in later Jewish pronunciation, the term used in contempt being *Mauschel*, not *Mausche*.

P. 103, 3 "*der Rosskamm*, proper name (*der* is familiar)." Even Feller's dictionary gives the correct meaning of the term, not to speak of Kluge where the explanation may be found.

P. 159, 2 "*der vornehme Braune soll heute merken, was ein Kommissschenkel durchsetzen kann*, this proud bay shall find out to-day what the shinbones of a clerc are good for. Said in humorous depreciation of himself, since he was trained for business, not for soldiering." It seems that the editor is familiar neither with the fact that Carl Sturm has served in the cavalry (cf. note 132, 2), nor with the fact that the word *Kommiss* (not *Kommis*) has reference to the army, as in *Kommissbrot*, etc., not to any clerical duty. The meaning of the passage is, therefore, about the opposite of the one given by the editor, namely, that Carl does not 'depreciate' himself, but expects to put 'the proud bay' to a most severe text.

P. 182, 2 "*eines Herrn Bratzky*, of a Herr Bratzky. One of the corrupt noblemen of the neighborhood who made Anton's early days on the Polish estate troublesome and dangerous." Apparently, the editor has forgotten what position Mr. Bratzky had formerly occupied on the estate, and does not seem to feel the force of *eines* in this passage.

Further, why is *Hanswurst* always translated by 'clumsy fool?' Is a *Herbergsvater* necessarily 'an *old* innkeeper,' or a *Kauflustiger* 'an *eager* purchaser?'

A curious misunderstanding of the social and political conditions of Germany has led the editor, in the Introduction, to use the expression "the middle or merchant classes" about synonymously with "the common people," "the working classes," "the working people," as a consequence of which the conservative Liberal Freytag comes near being a Social-Democrat, and the *Grenzboten* the organ of the Social-Democratic party.

It is needless to extend the list of errors; they make it apparent that the notes have not been written with such care as should have been exercised in the preparation of a school book; they suggest the query—and herein lies the object of this note,—is the work of modern language instruction in any way furthered by the multiplication of poor editions of excellent reading material, as illustrated by the book under consideration?

Ernst H. Mensel.

*Smith College.*

[1] *Soll und Haben* von Gustav Freytag. Abridged and edited with introduction and notes by George T. Files, Ph.D. Boston, D. C. Heath & Co., 1901.

## BRIEF MENTION.

The next annual meeting of the Modern Language Association of America will be held at the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., on December 29, 30, 31, 1902. The Central Division will meet in Chicago, Ill., on January 1, 2, 3, 1903.

## PERSONAL.

Dr. C. Alphonso Smith, formerly of the Louisiana State University, has assumed charge of the department of the English language in the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C. He is succeeded in Louisiana by Dr. W. A. Read, of the University of Arkansas.

# Index to Volume xvii, 1902.

Modern language notes