
Review

Author(s): P. Hamelius

Review by: P. Hamelius

Source: *Modern Language Notes*, Vol. 22, No. 1 (Jan., 1907), pp. 19-21

Published by: [Johns Hopkins University Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2916824>

Accessed: 27-01-2016 14:39 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Johns Hopkins University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Modern Language Notes*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

On page cxxxv, note, for "tomo XVI" read "tomo XVII, pp. 513-541, tomo XIX, pp. 562-591, y tomo XXII, pp. 345-363." Joly would refer Benoit de Sainte-More's *Roman de Troie* to 1184 rather than to 1160 (p. cxlv). Guido delle Colonne appears to have compiled the *Historia Trojana* at the suggestion of Mateo della Porta who died in 1272; it may therefore be presumed that he began the work somewhat before this date (p. cxlv). The relation of the *Conde Partinuples* to the Icelandic *Partalopa Saga* and the Danish *Persenober* is shown by Eugen Kölbing in *Die verschiedenen Gestaltungen der Partonopeus-Sage* (*Germanistische Studien*, vol. II, pp. 55-114 and 312-316): a reference to it might be useful on p. cxlviii. Robert Kaltenbacher in *Der altfranzösische Roman, Paris et Vienne* (Erlangen, 1904) reprints the Catalan text of 1495 and the Spanish text of 1524; the story was translated by Caxton in 1485 (p. clii). An early version of the Swanchildren legend in *Dolopathos* deserves mention on p. clvi. The Lansdowne ms. 362 in the British Museum proves that *Florence de Rome* was current in England during the thirteenth century. The serviceable list of books recommended on p. clx should be completed by the addition of Professor Rhys' *Hibbert Lectures* and *Studies in the Arthurian Legend*, Professor Anwyl's contributions to the *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie*, and Mr. Alfred Nutt's remarkable essays in Professor Kuno Meyer's edition of *The Voyage of Bran, Son of Febal, to the Land of the Living*. On p. clxvi others besides readers of English will look for a reference to Mr. Nutt's indispensable *Studies on the Legend of the Holy Grail*. *Tristán de Leonís*, as stated on p. clxxxiv, has been ascribed to Philippe Camus (to whose publications Mr. Foulché-Delbosc refers in the *Revue hispanique*, vol. XI, pp. 587-595); the Spanish *Tristán de Leonís* derives apparently from the French of Luc, Seigneur du Château de Gast. As an illustration of the rapid diffusion of *Amadis* in Italy (p. ccxxxix), a sentence from a letter written by Bembo to Ramusio on February 4, 1512, is worth quoting:—"Ben si pare che il Valerio sia sepolto in quel suo Amadigi" (Vittorio Cian, *Decennio della vita del Bembo*, p. 206). The vogue of the book in France is shown by M. E. Bourciez in *Les mœurs polies et la littérature*

de cour sous Henri II. Señor Menéndez y Pelayo's work was probably already in print before Maximilian Pfeiffer's *Amadisstudien* (Mainz, 1905) was available; otherwise it would have been included on p. dxxvi, for it contains one or two bibliographical details usually overlooked. It is doubtful, to say the least, whether the first two parts of *Palmerin de Inglaterra* were translated into English before 1596 (p. cclxxv): Mr. Purser, indeed (*op. cit.* p. 391) is not altogether satisfied that they were printed before 1609. Lastly, on p. cdLxxvii, "Wilcox" should be "Wilson."

Possibly some of these suggestions may be utilized in the second edition which is certain to be forthcoming before long. Meanwhile, all students of Spanish literature will rejoice in the possession of a book which is at once a monument of learning and a masterpiece of artistic exposition.

JAMES FITZMAURICE-KELLY.

London.

Histoire de la Mise en scène dans le Théâtre religieux français du Moyen-Âge, par GUSTAVE COHEN.
Paris, Honoré Champion, 1906. 8°, 304 pp.

The present work is a prize essay printed by the Belgian Academy, who are responsible for the choice of its subject. In this instance, they aimed less at favoring original research than at obtaining a consistent and systematic survey of the somewhat scattered results of the latest investigations. In this Mr. G. Cohen has fully succeeded, and reference to his essay will palpably lighten the labors of future students of the mediæval drama by providing them at once with the necessary facts and authorities. The author may thus pride himself on having made a valuable addition to the extant literature on the subject.

As its title implies, his work deals less with the texts themselves than with the rubrics settling the details of stage management and stage business, and with documents of every description throwing light on the external history of the mystery plays. It is divided into three books: I. *La mise en scène dans le drame liturgique*, describing the chanting of sequences and scenes in connection with services inside the church. II. *La mise en scène dans le*

drame semi-liturgique, mainly confined to the Norman *jeu d'Adam*, which was acted just outside the porch. III. *La mise en scène dans les mystères*, covering the whole huge mass of French vernacular mysteries down to the Renaissance. The amount of materials surveyed in the last book is such, that we should have welcomed another subdivision into early and late plays, as the mainly spectacular and courtly shows arranged on behalf of, or in honor of, princes and noblemen in the fifteenth century were, on Mr. Cohen's own evidence, gotten up in a style quite different from that of the earlier plays managed by the clergy and city guilds. In fact, the *secretz, feintes*, and other machinery formed so prominent a feature of these entertainments, that they nearly belong to the same kind as the masks so ably discussed by Mr. Brotanek in his well-known work.

Throughout Mr. Cohen's three books, we get a careful account of whatever details have come down to us throwing light on the scene (church or square) where the plays were enacted, on the stages, the screens, the costumes and other paraphernalia used, on the class from which the players were drawn and the rehearsals that they had to go through. In the two first books, where the subject is well-defined and limited, all these particulars fall easily into their places, while in the third they bulge somewhat chaotically, owing to the amount of heterogeneous matter to be digested. Our author's attitude is on the whole sensible and sound, though I should have liked him to assume a less patronizing tone towards the artists whom he disdainfully styles *acteurs maladroits*. Why on earth could not a gifted citizen, guided by proper training and attention, and sustained by the consciousness of a high social and religious function do in the Middle Ages what many underbred and underpaid courtesans can nowadays perform on provincial stages of the continent? I have myself seen an elderly Flemish farmer act and sing his part in a religious procession and mystery with a composed and fervent zeal that could not have been excelled.

Although acquainted with Mr. E. K. Chambers' book on the mediæval stage, Mr. Cohen makes no mention of that writer's theory on the possible influence of the heathenish folk-plays on the Christian stage. The current account of the

growth of the mystery out of the sequence has appealed to the sense of symmetry of contemporary scholars with such force that they have overlooked the possible grafting of foreign slips upon the main stock, and have shut their eyes to the many points of likeness between the Teutonic folk-plays and the mysteries of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Since the appearance of Mr. E. K. Chambers' volumes, these points, though not easy to clear up, can no more be entirely neglected. One circumstance supporting Mr. Chambers' views is pointed out by Mr. Cohen himself when he writes: "Les échafauds comprenaient, comme nous venons de le voir, des constructions en bois, et, en avant des mansions, une plate-forme réservée aux évolutions des acteurs. Cet espace libre s'appelait le champ, la terre, le parc ou parquet. C'est le 'deambulatorye' des Anglais."

"Tous ces termes, comme on le voit, rappellent un temps où il n'y avait pas encore d'échafauds et où le jeu se faisait sur la terre, dans un parc, sur une pelouse" (pp. 88-89).

If the origin of the mysteries had been merely liturgical, the names applied to the stage and its parts should have shown a trace of it. The folk-plays were and are still performed on greens or meadows, and such names as field, ground or close (*champ, terre, parc*) point decidedly to the folk-play, and away from the church. However, the evidence is far too scarce and vague to allow us unduly to press this point. Real and counterfeit animals (asses, horses, dragons) are a prominent feature of the folk-plays and reappear in the mysteries, seeming to form a connecting link between the two kinds. Mr. Cohen might have entered into a closer discussion of Mr. Chambers' views, instead of simply stating that the feast of the asses was *not* imagined for the ass's sake (p. 31), and when mentioning the *serpent monté avec art* (54) ought at least to have briefly alluded to the numberless dragons and monsters that aroused and in Belgium still arouse the wonder of children young and old at folk-plays and processions.

The *forte* of Mr. Cohen's work lies in his knowledge of manuscript sources and miniatures, which he has successfully searched for testimonies on the players' costumes and on the connection between the evolution of the pictorial arts and that

of the stage. Here he has fully availed himself of the wealth of materials treasured in the libraries of Belgium and France, and while following in the footsteps of Louis Male, has unearthed a plentiful supply of fresh evidence, and put it before us in a clear and convincing manner. This book is thus another step forward in the right direction.

Its interest and usefulness are enhanced by half-a-dozen appropriately chosen photographic plates.

P. HAMELIUS.

University of Liège.

RECENT STUDIES OF *THE PEARL*.

The Author of The Pearl, Considered in the Light of his Theological Opinions. By CARLETON F. BROWN. Reprinted from the *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, XIX, 1. Baltimore, 1904. 8vo, pp. 39.

The Nature and Fabric of The Pearl. By WILLIAM HENRY SCHOFIELD. Reprinted from the *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, XIX, 1. Baltimore, 1904. 8vo, pp. 62.

Pearl Rendered into Modern English Verse. By S. WEIR MITCHELL. New York, The Century Co., 1906. 8vo, pp. 57.

Pearl, a Fourteenth-Century Poem. Rendered into Modern English by G. G. COULTON. London, David Nutt, 1906. 16mo, pp. viii, 51.

This noble West-country poem, the work of an unknown pietist contemporary with Chaucer and Langland, will henceforth receive increased attention. On the linguistic and the metrical side it has already been studied with some care, though much is still to be learned. As literature we are only beginning to perceive its importance. Whatever be the view taken of its purpose, we shall all agree in pronouncing it, as a record of thought, highly interesting and significant, and as a work of art, by no means lacking in skillful workmanship, in vivid coloring, in warm life. The editions announced by Professors Emerson, Holthausen, and Osgood will render the poem easily accessible to a wide body of scholars and readers.

Dr. Brown, after discussing the problem of authorship, and without great effort disposing of the Huchown and Strode theories, takes up the author's Biblical knowledge and theological opinions. He certainly makes it much more than "moderately clear" that the poet was an ecclesiastic (p. 126). On the theological side, Dr. Brown shows clearly that the poet was aiming his argument, like Bradwardine, at the Pelagian thought then current, while he was opposed to Bradwardine in asserting "that the rewards of the heavenly Kingdom are equal." Dr. Brown's argument is convincing.

Professor Schofield has not, we fear, been equally successful in maintaining his contention, which is that *The Pearl* is neither elegy nor autobiography, but is merely a conventional debate and vision setting forth a subtle theological argument. That the framework of the poem is that of a vision, and that the debate effectively expounds and defends the equality of heavenly rewards, no one will doubt; but that this *excludes* the possibility that the poem is based on a personal experience is still, we think, an open question. Mr. Coulton has referred (p. vii, note) to those ecclesiastical conditions which would allow the poet, if he was a member of a minor order, to marry. That the poet nowhere calls Pearl his daughter (p. 158, note), or that she addresses him with "Sir," is not important. He distinctly says (l. 233),

Ho watȝ me nerre þen aunte or nece,

gaining by the circumlocution a rime for *Grece, pryse, spyce*; and if we bear in mind that she was now transformed into a girl old enough to be a bride of the Lamb, there is nothing in her address inconsistent with filial devotion or love. The rebuke of l. 290,

Wy borde ȝe men, so madde ȝe be ?

is addressed to men in general. With regard to the line (243),

Regretted by myn one, on nygte,

it seems a perfectly fair and plausible inference that the mother of the child was dead (p. 160); Mr. Gollancz may indeed have gone too far in supposing her to have been unfaithful; but in any case the poet's failure to speak of her can hardly be thought of as "a grave artistic fault." The relation of father and child had been especially