

Review

Author(s): Arthur Tilley

Review by: Arthur Tilley

Source: *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (Jan., 1907), pp. 182-184

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3713325>

Accessed: 13-12-2015 09:15 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>

Montaigne, a Study. By R. WARWICK BOND. London: Henry Frowde, 1906. 8vo. 93 pp.

This thoughtful and well-informed essay will be welcomed by those who love the writings of Montaigne. A short sketch of the Essayist's life is followed by a short survey of his thought. The comparison of Bacon with Montaigne is a passage of special interest. Having noted many points of similarity in ideas, Mr Bond proceeds as follows:

'For Montaigne, after all, discussion is the main thing: he has too deep-seated a distrust of human powers to expect any very valuable result, and too little patience and industry to get to the end of a subject. For Bacon decision, fruit is the object; his confidence in human capacity is boundless; and his own patience and industry are equal to enormous effort, if hardly to one commensurate with his mighty aim. Montaigne will enjoy, and suggests the same quiet Epicureanism to others: Bacon will achieve, and show others how to do so. There is a world between the golden mean of the one and the arduous ambition of the other; and the moral contrast is as marked as the intellectual. Montaigne's teaching exhibits the higher standard on all points of practice save the gratification of the senses. He upholds disinterested virtue; he expressly repudiates the political doctrines of Machiavelli, cannot away with falseness and dissimulation in princes, and does not believe in any profit to be reaped by wars of aggression. Nothing is worth more to him than his personal happiness and self-respect. With Bacon success in life is the great object, and the doctrines of Machiavelli colour his views at every turn...Montaigne's is as indisputably the warmer and the nobler heart, as Bacon's is the grander and more potent intellect.'

Mr Bond refers to the excellent study of Montaigne by 'Mr M. E. Lowndes.' But may not the author of the *Essays* have had another *fille d'alliance* beside Mlle. de Gournay?

EDWARD DOWDEN.

Maurice Scève et la Renaissance Lyonnaise. Par ALBERT BAUR. Paris: H. Champion, 1906. 8vo. vi + 132 pp.

Students of the French Renaissance should be grateful to Dr Baur for having turned his attention to Maurice Scève. For though Scève is far from an attractive poet, the Lyons school, of which he is one of the two chief representatives, forms an important link between the Marotic school and the Pléiade, being connected with the former through Marguérite de Navarre and Des Periers, and with the latter through Pontus de Tyard. Dr Baur has also done well to make Scève the occasion for a general survey of the Renaissance at Lyons, which for a short period was of even greater importance than Paris as a literary centre.

Considering the prominent position occupied by Scève at Lyons, singularly little is known of his life, and Dr Baur with all his industry has added little to our knowledge of it. He modestly claims, however, to have 'extirpated certain errors.' Guided by M. Poidebart's researches he shews that Scève's family had nothing to do with the illustrious Piedmontese house of Ceva. As regards his birth he accepts provisionally the supposition of M. Buche that he was born in 1504 or 1505, but suggests on the evidence of the portrait which appears on the title-page of *Délie*, and on certain expressions of the poet about old age, that he was born two or three years earlier. But this sort of evidence is not very trustworthy, and considering that Scève's first work appeared in 1535, and that he began his poetical career in 1536, I should be inclined to put his birth later rather than earlier than 1505. His death is usually given as 1564, but there is, I believe, no good evidence for this, and Dr Baur rightly points out that all we know about his later days is that he published his *Microcosme* in 1562, and that he is spoken of as dead in 1575. He adds a conjecture of his own that he died in voluntary exile forgotten and unknown.

In the first chapter Dr Baur gives an account of Lyons in the early days of the Renaissance. There are one or two names that I miss; such as Sanctes Pagnini the Hebrew scholar, Benoist Court the editor of the *Aresta Amorum*, Jacques de Ventimille the translator of Xenophon, and, as a temporary resident, Cornelius Agrippa. But on the whole the chapter is full and good. There is also little to criticise in chapters II and III, which deal with Scève's youth and early writings. In chapter IV, on Scève and the Humanists of Lyons, the references to Protestantism are not quite satisfactory. *Les Evangéliques* or *Ceux de l'Evangile* was the regular name by which the Protestants called themselves in these early days. The real parting of the ways between Protestantism and Humanism surely dates from the affair of the Placards in 1534, and the treaty of Nice in 1538 marks only the culminating point of a policy which had become inevitable. It is therefore strange to say that from 1536 to 1538 'there reigned in France a liberty of thought which is almost modern.' At the bottom of page 65 Dr Baur makes it appear that Rabelais took refuge with Guillaume du Bellay in Piedmont as the result of this policy. I think there is some truth in this, but it should have been stated that Rabelais did not go there till 1539 at the earliest, and then in the character of Du Bellay's physician. That Scève was a Protestant is a pure conjecture, without much evidence to support it.

In the chapter on Platonism, a subject of great interest, there are one or two corrections to make. Dr Baur does not know of the edition of *La Parfaicte Amye* published by Dolet in 1542, or of the edition of *L'Amye de Court* published in the same year. Copies of both of these are in the Christie collection at Victoria University, Manchester, and are recorded in Christie's bibliography of Dolet. It is very doubtful whether the ordinary view that *L'Amye de Court* is a reply to *La Parfaicte Amye* is correct.

I have not space to discuss Dr Baur's treatment of Louise Labé and Pernette du Guillet, but it is curious that he does not mention M. Boy's edition of Louise Labé's works, where he would have found an excellent and sober account of her life. The character of both these ladies must remain a matter of opinion, but on the evidence before us it is neither scientific nor good manners to speak of Pernette du Guillet as Scève's mistress or of Louise Labé as a courtesan as if these were ascertained facts. I may add that the third *Elegy* in which Louise speaks of her age is evidently intended as an *Envoi* to the volume, and was therefore presumably written just before its publication. I hope that Dr Baur in his promised work on Scève's poetry will deal more fully with the question of the influence of *Délie* on Louise Labé's sonnets. I confess I am somewhat sceptical as to its existence. With reference to what he says on p. 115, I would call his attention to M. Vigney's *L'influence italienne chez les précurseurs de la Pléiade*, in which the influence on *Délie* of Serafino dell' Aquila is clearly set forth.

An interesting chapter is devoted to the visit of Henri II to Lyons in 1548. The preparations for his reception were intrusted to Maurice Scève with the co-operation of Du Choul, Aneau, and others, and Scève was ordered to write the official account of the proceedings. This was published by Roville in 1549, and is chiefly known for the beautiful woodcuts with which it is illustrated. Dr Baur attributes them to Bernard Salomon, but I do not know on what authority. They have been conjecturally attributed by M. Bouchot to Corneille of Lyons.

ARTHUR TILLEY.

La Poésie Philosophique au XIX^e siècle: Lamartine. Par MARC CITOLEUX. Paris: Plon. 1906. xi + 386 pp.

Madame Ackermann. Par MARC CITOLEUX. Paris: Plon. 1906. xiii + 249 pp.

Dans ces deux importants ouvrages, l'auteur nous donne les premiers résultats d'une enquête qu'il a entreprise sur la Poésie Philosophique au dix-neuvième siècle. Il a été naturellement amené, affirme-t-il, à étudier Lamartine 'parce qu'il apparaissait le premier en date, et ensuite M^{me} Ackermann pour des raisons personnelles.' C'est trop peu dire; si M. Citoleux a connu M^{me} Ackermann et a pu, grâce à ses souvenirs, consacrer une étude très vivante à cette femme de génie qu'on a pu comparer à Leopardi, c'est un intérêt de plus qui s'ajoute à son livre. Mais en rapprochant M^{me} Ackermann et Lamartine, il a pu, sans faire tort à aucun des deux, leur rendre enfin à tous deux la place qu'ils méritent, celle-là parmi les poètes, celui-ci parmi les penseurs; il a surtout cédé à l'attrait de son sujet; quels poètes ont été en France plus 'philosophes' que Madame Ackermann, tout le monde le reconnaît, et que Lamartine, M. Citoleux l'a prouvé. Quelques mots sur l'ouvrage qu'il a consacré à ce dernier suffiront à indiquer l'originalité de ses aperçus, la sûreté de sa méthode, et l'intérêt de ces études.