Review

Author(s): Aubrey F. G. Bell

Review by: Aubrey F. G. Bell

Source: *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 9, No. 4 (Oct., 1914), pp. 554-556

Published by: Modern Humanities Research Association

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3713650>

Accessed: 08-02-2016 07:57 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.

Modern Humanities Research Association is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Modern Language Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

the passages in support of 1532 prove at most that Bernardes was born about the year 1530. But this very affectation of certainty has its value; for it excites opposition and leads to discussion of all these moot questions and to new researches with a view to their solution. No one interested in Portuguese literature can afford to neglect Dr Braga's volume. His attempt (pp. 267–287) to deny that in the matter of *romances* Portugal followed in the wake of Spain is scarcely successful. The *romances* which he quotes are, with exceedingly few exceptions, Spanish or of Spanish origin, and his patriotism carries him rather far when he asserts that the Portuguese imitated the Spanish *romances* not from admiration or lack of originality but from a wish 'to give comic relief to their verses'! If the poets of Portugal failed to admire the Spanish *romances* all the originality in the world would serve them but little.

AUBREY F. G. BELL.

S. JOÃO DO ESTORIL.

That Imaginative Gentleman Don Quixote de la Mancha. By MIGUEL DE CERVANTES SAAVEDRA. Translated into English by ROBINSON SMITH. Second Edition, with a new Life of Cervantes, Notes and Appendices. London: Routledge. 1914. 8vo. lxviii + 752 pp.

A Spanish critic recently remarked that '*Don Quixote* has been written by posterity.' It remained for Mr Robinson Smith to show that it was written by Cervantes' predecessors. 'I have gathered,' he modestly says, 'everything of importance previously discovered in this matter of appropriation, and have been able to add a considerable number of new allusions and borrowings.' 'No book gains so much by illustrative comment.' But the process can be carried too far. At the end of this volume we have a list which 'includes only those books that have lent phrase, idea or incident to the *Don Quixote*.' They number some 150, but, on closer inspection, are found to include, for instance, the *Chronicle* and the *Poem* (first printed in 1779!) of the Cid merely because the Cid is mentioned in *Don Quixote*. So, when Don Quixote speaks twice to no purpose we are given a quotation from Virgil; when Don Quixote is thin from penance we are referred to the leanness of Amadis; when Sancho curses the hour we are referred to Amadis; when Don Quixote inquires 'What news?' we are again referred to Amadis, who uses these words. Mr Smith might have turned his reading to better account.

It is worth noting these strained references because in the sketch of Cervantes' life which precedes his translation Mr Smith builds up theories and arguments on foundations equally vain. To take two instances: the 'new evidence' to show that the spurious Second Part of *Don Quixote* was written by Luis Aliaga (Philip II's confessor!), and the 'proofs' that the First Part of *Don Quixote* was written in 1603. The 'new evidence' consists in noting that the incident of the children following Don Quixote into Barcelona is based on a similar incident in

Avellaneda's Second Part, and that Sancho's wife is described as 'brown,' *avellanada*. Let him who can extract from this an argument in favour of Aliaga's authorship, already fully exploded by Professor Fitzmaurice-Kelly in his introduction to Shelton's translation of *Don Quixote*, pp. xxi, xxii, and elsewhere. The considerations as to the date of *Don Quixote* are even more amazing. Mr Smith will not accept the fact that the First Part was written in 1604 and published in January 1605. It was printed before May 20, 1604, he says (p. xxxiii), before May 26, 1604 (p. xxxii), and was written in 1603 at Valladolid, in a house in the Calle del Rastro. (Its *privilegio* is dated September 26, 1604.) In order to prove his case Mr Smith assumes that (1) if a book published in 1603 is referred to in the First Part of *Don Quixote* Cervantes must have been writing in 1603. 'It is interesting,' he says, 'to see how very soon after their publication Cervantes read the books of his day.' (2) If a book published in 1604 is referred to in the First Part of *Don Quixote* the book must have been printed in or before 1603. The Second Part of Alemán's *Guzman de Alfarache* was published in 1604. It did not receive its *privilegio* until September 1604. But Mr Smith finds references to this work in the First Part of *Don Quixote*, and he infers not that the First Part of *Don Quixote* was written in 1604 but that *Guzman de Alfarache* was printed in 1603. Mr Smith discovers an allusion in the First Part of *Don Quixote* to a passage in Lope de Vega's play *El Casamiento en la Muerte*. Unfortunately the date of this play is 1604. Mr Smith is not deterred. He invents an earlier edition for the play and dates it 1603. Another proof is the date of Lope de Vega's *Arte Nuevo*. Mr Smith gives this as 1602 and then justifies this date in a note on the ground that the treatise is referred to in the First Part of *Don Quixote* and must therefore have been written before 1603. It will be seen that Mr Smith wields a two-edged sword. It is also a little unfortunate for his theory that the house in the Calle del Rastro in which he shows us Cervantes at work on the First Part of *Don Quixote* in 1603 was still building in August 1604. (See Professor Fitzmaurice-Kelly's *Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, A Memoir*, Oxford, 1913, p. 117.) The whole argument is a good example of the extraordinary lengths to which a critic may be led in support of some darling theory of his own.

But indeed this sketch of Cervantes' life bristles with strange theories; that, for instance, which makes St Ignatius the model of Don Quixote. Some of these theories have been withdrawn by their inventors, a fact of which Mr Smith was probably unaware, since in his notes he refers continually not to original documents but to Rius' bibliography and does not even mention a recent authoritative English work on Cervantes. The language in which Mr Smith expounds his theories is often as grotesque as the theories themselves. Thus he informs the listening world that he is 'fed up on Isabel,' that 'the reception of Don Quixote was immediate,' that Cervantes was 'bearded like the pard' and 'looks the vicissitudes that his life has been.' It is therefore with some misgiving that we turn to the translation. This is marred by an

alternation of slang and stilted phrases, and the omission of the stories in the First Part will strike many as a singular piece of audacity. Mr Smith would have shown discretion had he also omitted the lines in the Second Part in which Cervantes refers to those who pass by these episodes 'regardless alike of their grace and construction.'

AUBREY F. G. BELL.

S. JOÃO DO ESTORIL.

The Life and Dramatic Works of Doctor Juan Pérez de Montalván (1602-1638). By GEORGE WILLIAM BACON. (*Revue Hispanique*. Vol. XXVI, pp. 1-474.)

In 1903 Dr Bacon published at Philadelphia a short essay upon the life and dramatic works of Montalván. He now offers us a revised and much enlarged version. A considerable part of the new edition is devoted to long analyses of Montalván's dramatic works, but there is also much new and valuable material, more especially in the way of notes to the plays, to show that Dr Bacon has studied his author with fruitful diligence.

The first section deals with the dramatist's life and works. Here something ought to have been said about the sources and foreign versions of works like the *Sucesos y Prodigios de Amor*, and at least a reference might have been made to Matías de los Reyes's *Para Algunos* apropos of *Para Todos*, of which latter, by the way, there is an edition published at Seville in 1645. In discussing Montalván's relations to Lope de Vega—our author's chief title to fame—Dr Bacon misses Lope's explanation of the matter. In a preface to *La Francesilla* (1620), Lope states that he became interested in his *protégé* because of obligations to his father, a well-known publisher, and because of ability shown by Montalván in an address read before the Real Monasterio de las Descalzas.

When we come to the sections devoted to the plays, we find a complicated system of classifications, and, to make matters worse, Dr Bacon has separated his analyses, notes, and bibliographical references. Much might be said about details of the notes, but I will confine myself here to a few remarks of general interest. Dr Bacon finds fault with Paz y Melia for classifying *Escanderbech* as an *auto sacramental*. It is so called by Montalván in *Para Todos*, and moreover the closing scene clearly shows that the work was intended for a Corpus Christi celebration. A good example of a somewhat similar type of *auto* is Calderón's *La Devoción de la Misa*. In indicating where copies of plays are now to be found, Dr Bacon is not definite enough, nor does he make any distinction between contemporary *sueltas* and those of the eighteenth century.

Among plays not accessible to Dr Bacon occurs a curious title, *Por el mal vecino el bien*. It is so quoted by La Barrera, but the title ought to read, *Por el mal me vino el bien*. In this rarest of plays, Blanca loves Rugero, but she is loved by the king, who banishes his