

Historia da Litteratura Portuguesa. II. Renascença by Theophilo Braga

Review by: Aubrey F. G. Bell

The Modern Language Review, Vol. 9, No. 4 (Oct., 1914), pp. 553-554

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3713649>

Accessed: 28/06/2014 13:10

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>

due) than the preceding relief-syllable. Professor Grammont's examples are thus, if anything, favourable to the 'scansion binaire,' although he declares, against the evidence (p. 97), that 'Ici encore pas de système binaire'! And he proceeds to quote in the very next paragraph:

Et les éGorgements et les éVentremements...
 Le Rajeunissement de la Décrépitude...
 On ne sait quel sinistre aNéantissement...
 Je suis le misérable à Perpétuité...

in which out of six examples only one is in an odd place!

Professor Grammont's experimental analysis of the lines he gives and his study of consonantal implosion are extremely valuable as *data*: we cannot accept his conclusions. But no student of French metrics can afford to neglect the new edition of Professor Grammont's book. It is to be regretted that he has not criticized his predecessors in some detail instead of merely damning them.

T. B. RUDMOSE-BROWN.

DUBLIN.

Historia da Litteratura Portuguesa. II. Renascença. Por THEOPHILO BRAGA. Porto: Lello & Irmão. 1914. 8vo. 696 pp.

Dr Theophilo Braga's first book was published over fifty years ago. He does not claim finality for his works of literary criticism, and in the preface to his new volume, which contains the corrected results of eight previous volumes, he speaks of his 'slow and successive approach' to the problems of Portuguese literature 'by means of plausible and provisional hypotheses.' It may be questioned whether a frank confession of ignorance or doubt as to some of these problems would not be more satisfactory; but that is Dr Braga's confessed method, and the conclusions of this volume are as provisional as those of which it is a summary. In each instance Dr Braga takes up a position as confidently as though no problem existed. Gil Vicente, the goldsmith, 'is the cousin of the poet' (p. 12). But that is precisely the question at issue. There is a slight balance of probability in favour of the opinion that goldsmith and poet were one and the same person. A passage quoted from Garcia de Resende disparaging the Portuguese goldsmiths seems to add to the probability, since the slight may have been aimed especially at Vicente. The poet, we know, ridiculed Resende, introducing him in one of his plays as a tunny-fish, in allusion to his corpulence. Dr Braga explains away the mention of *Gil Vicente trobador, mestre da balança*, by the supposition that the goldsmith wrote verses. It is as simple to assume that the poet wrought in gold. Again, 'the date of Gil Vicente's birth *can be fixed with certainty* in 1470' (p. 41). The only evidence adduced is a phrase 'I am already sixty-six,' spoken by an old man in a play written by Vicente in 1536. The dates of the birth of Sá de Miranda and Diogo Bernardes are given, respectively, as 1485 and 1532 on evidence no less vague and fragile. There is nothing to show that Sá de Miranda was the eldest of four children legitimized in 1490, and

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 Quijote 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 Quijote*.' 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