

Review

Author(s): Louis Brandin

Review by: Louis Brandin

Source: *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 10, No. 1 (Jan., 1915), pp. 118-119

Published by: Modern Humanities Research Association

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3712963>

Accessed: 26-06-2016 23:06 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

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*

well as individual, it has the special virtue of close touch with the actual. And its Reading of Life as well as its Reading of Earth interprets the present in wise relation with the past and in ardent preparation for the future.

HELEN DARBISHIRE.

OXFORD.

Untergegangene und veraltete Worte des Französischen im heutigen Englisch. Von HUGO BRÜLL. Halle: Niemeyer. 1913.

Monsieur Hugo Brüll a eu une excellente idée, celle de signaler les mots français qui, vieillis ou disparus de notre langue, ont survécu en anglais. Malheureusement l'exécution du travail est de qualité tout à fait inférieure. L'auteur ne sait qu'insuffisamment le français et l'anglais, ce qui lui fait commettre de nombreux oublis. L'examen du commencement de la lettre *a* permet de noter l'omission des mots anglais suivants: *abele* de l'anc. franc. *abel*, forme dialectale de *albel*, du latin *albellus*, désignant le peuplier blanc; *acceptance*, *acceptor*, *accidental*, *accordant* (qui aurait dû être cité à côté de *accordance*); *accountant* (qui aurait dû être cité à côté de *account*); *accrue*, *acetous*, *acquiere*, *acquittance*, *affined* (du v. fr. *affin*, anglicisé), *afflict*, *affray* (qui avait autant de titre à entrer dans cette liste que *abash* puisqu'il vient de *esfrayer*, *affrayer*, comme *abash* vient de *esbaïr*); *ague*, *alas*, etc. Il est inutile d'aller plus loin dans l'examen méthodique d'un ouvrage aussi superficiel. Aussi me suis-je borné à noter les mots dont l'absence m'a frappé au cours d'une lecture rapide. *Mattress* de *materas*, *mountaineer* de *montanier*, *sirloin* anglicisation de *surlonge* manquent également à l'appel. Pourquoi? Pourquoi mentionner *bachelor* et exclure *esquire*? Pourquoi mentionner *expens* de *espandre* et ne pas mentionner *to spend*? Et pourquoi mettre *engaol* et omettre *gaol*? Pourquoi trouvons-nous *strange* de *estrange* et non pas *strait* de *estreit*? L'absence de ce dernier est d'autant plus *strange* que l'auteur, page 115, cite *estresse* de **strictiu* lequel dérive de *strictum* qui a justement donné *estreit*. Pourquoi ne pas citer les vieux mots français *bucler*, *butiller* restés en anglais sous les formes *buckler*, *butler*? Pourquoi citer *budget* et *jury* et ne pas citer *tunnel*, anc. fr. *tonel*, repris par le français sous sa forme anglaise *tunnel*, tout comme *budget* et *jury*, de l'anc. fr. *bolgete* et *jurée*? Pourquoi citer *to juggle* de *jogler* et oublier *jewel*, v. fr. *joel*? Pourquoi omettre *stubble* qui n'est autre que le v. fr. *estouble*?

L'auteur aurait pu nous donner une introduction où il nous aurait indiqué de façon précise ce qu'il entendait par ancien français; s'il y comprenait les dialectes et quels dialectes; sur quelles raisons il se fondait pour dire qu'un mot était *veraltet*; le degré de confiance qu'on peut accorder au dictionnaire de Sachs et Villate. Il n'aurait pas eu

grand peine à enrichir sa bibliographie et il aurait pu se dispenser d'écrire de façon grotesque le nom du célèbre auteur de *The English Dialect Dictionary*.

LOUIS BRANDIN.

LONDON.

D. Francisco Manuel de Mello. Esboço biographico. Por EDGAR PRESTAGE. Coimbra: Imprensa da Universidade. 1914. 8vo. xxxv + 614 pp.

The late Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo was of opinion that Mello was 'the greatest genius of the Peninsula in the seventeenth century, with the exception of Quevedo,' and expressed surprise that he should have found no biographer. He was a man whose life could never have been uninteresting, even had it been spent in the most humdrum circumstances and whose actual adventures would have made the dullest man an object of interest. Yet he has had to wait three centuries for a biography, and owes it finally to a foreigner, although it is written in Portuguese. However, he has waited to some purpose, and the present biography is likely to stand foursquare to the winds of criticism and will not be superseded, although it is to be hoped that fresh documents will be discovered before a second edition is printed. Mr Prestage in an accompanying leaflet asks that any knowledge of documents or facts concerning Mello's life or works should be communicated to him at the Academy of Sciences, Lisbon. Meanwhile this volume contains not only a detailed bibliography but the text of 121 documents, many of them now first printed. The accepted date of Mello's birth has long been 1611, and, in spite of the fact that his age is given as 18 in 1626, and that in one of his letters he says that he became a soldier at 17 (in 1625), the date 1611 would still be going from critic to critic had not Mr Prestage discovered the certificate of Mello's baptism (December 1, 1608), which is here given in facsimile. It may be said that baptism is not birth, but two passages in Mello's work tend to prove that he was born on St Clement's day, November 23. The case is precisely similar to that of Cervantes. A passage in document No. 1 (p. 427) confirms the date 1608: Mello says that he attained the age of 36 in the royal service (at the time of his imprisonment in 1644).

Mr Prestage remarks that in the familiar style Mello is unexcelled, and says that his imprisonments and exile 'made of this versatile soldier a great writer.' At his best he stands out from contemporary writers as a rapier among uncouth and tawdry sticks, and there can be no doubt that his misfortunes gave the edge to his directness, a quality so rare in Portuguese authors. Probably, too, he had studied with care the more familiar works of the classical Portuguese writers of the sixteenth century, the *Ropica Pnefma* of João de Barros or the *Ulyssipo* of Jorge Ferreira de Vasconcellos, for instance, in which one is reminded of Mello's style but may look in vain for his wit and wisdom. He will always be read with pleasure and interest not only or chiefly in