

---

Norwegian Life and Literature: English Accounts and Views by C. B. Burchardt

Review by: Herbert G. Wright

*The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 16, No. 2 (Apr., 1921), pp. 196-197

Published by: [Modern Humanities Research Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3714931>

Accessed: 25/06/2014 08:16

---

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 lighter and yet more elusive task of similarly defining the sum total of our literary obligations to Germany.

In conclusion we cannot praise too highly the typographical arrangement of the work. Fortunate, indeed, are the American scholars who can induce publishers to undertake such magnificent series as that in which the present volume appears, and for whom the publication of a learned book does not involve the assumption of a serious financial burden.

L. A. WILLOUGHBY.

SHEFFIELD.

*Norwegian Life and Literature: English Accounts and Views.* By C. B. BURCHARDT. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1920. 8vo. viii + 230 pp. 10s. 6d.

Mr C. B. Burchardt's work is a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the development of English interest in Scandinavia and its literature. It displays the same thoroughness and grasp of detail as Mr Frank Farley's admirable treatise on *Scandinavian Influences on the English Romantic Movement in the Eighteenth Century*, with which it deserves to rank. The book also contains appendices with useful bibliographical material.

The author comments on the absence in the first half of the nineteenth century of any Englishman with a knowledge of Norwegian literature. It is possible that Sir John Bowring and George Borrow might have acquired that knowledge, had they received sufficient encouragement. Originally both possessed enthusiasm and some familiarity with the subject. But the reception with which their proposals for translating Norwegian and other Scandinavian authors met did not stimulate them to penetrate further. It is, however, of interest to note that Borrow translated Edvard Storm's *Thorvald Vidförlé* and *Zinklars Vise*, P. H. Frimann's *Hornelen* and C. B. Tullin's *Maidagen*, though the two last have, to my knowledge, not yet been published. As Mr Burchardt's treatise was written in 1918, he may be excused for not knowing what was contained in Borrow's manuscripts. Similarly, his statement on p. 110 that 'Apart from Mr Gosse's pages on Wergeland and those written by Mr Latham thirty years before, no detailed account of the Norwegian poet has ever appeared in English' was correct at the time it was written. Since then, however, Mr I. Gröndahl's privately printed study of Wergeland has appeared. On the other hand it is unfortunate that so scholarly a work as Mr Burchardt's should contain the statement that 'Borrow's Danish ballads were imitated from A. S. Vedel's collection of Danish ballads' (p. 78, note 3). This view, so carefully spread by Borrow himself, was shown to be incorrect some years ago by Mr Edmund Gosse.

Mr Burchardt rightly makes merry over the ideas of Norway and the Norwegians to be found in English novelists who have laid the scene of their stories in Norway. Many of the travellers are not less delight-

fully absurd, as witness H. Smith, who in his *Tent Life in Norway* tells how he came to a gate with the inscription 'Luk grinden' ('Shut the gate'), which he clearly takes to be the name of the owner ('Luk' = Luke)!

It is strange, as Mr Burchardt indicates, that on the whole so little attention should have been paid to translating Holberg's comedies. It is highly desirable that they should be better known. At the close of his treatise, Mr Burchardt points out how few translations have been made into English of modern Norwegian writers, such as Knut Hamsun. It is as if interest had been exhausted by Björnson and Ibsen. No doubt it is all to the good that Mr Burchardt should have singled out the gaps in our knowledge of Norway and its literature and it is to be hoped that the various new organizations of which the author speaks will do something to remedy these deficiencies.

HERBERT G. WRIGHT.

BANGOR.

### MINOR NOTICES.

In Dr J. H. H. Lyon's *Study of The Newe Metamorphosis written by J. M. Gent., 1600* (New York: Columbia University Press; London: H. Milford, 1919, 8s. 6d.) we are introduced to a very curious production—a poem of some 30,000 lines preserved in Add. MSS. 14824–6, written, as the editor shows, between 1600 and 1615, and extremely discursive in subject. As poetry, it is a work of a very low order, but it is clearly of value as a reflexion of Elizabethan life. Its account of Essex's capture of Cadiz in which the author took part is especially vivid and interesting. The editor gives a number of extracts from the poem which make us eager to have the whole, but his dissertation is mainly occupied with determining the identity of the author 'J. M. Gent.' The MS. had belonged to F. G. Waldron (1744–1818) who had jotted down the names of four men of letters with the required initials: John Marston, Jervase Markham, James Martin, John Mason. Since his time the work has been most generally ascribed to Marston. Dr Lyon disposes of Marston and the last two, and makes out a strong case for Jervase Markham (whose first name is however more frequently spelt 'Gervase'). Markham was however a voluminous writer both of prose and verse, and if he were 'J. M.' one would think that it would be possible to find passages in this MS. poem which were echoes, in thought or expression, of passages in Markham's acknowledged works. This the editor has not done, in fact he finds that Markham's verse style is far more ornate than J. M.'s. J. M. has peculiarities of language, e.g. he uses 'loade' = 'laden.' It is not shown that these are shared by Markham. We are left with only a general agreement between the two authors in an interest in fish and country pursuits and in a general sympathy with Puritanism. Till the proof has been pushed a little further, one must consider that J. M.'s identity with Markham is not yet established.