

Review

Author(s): O. H. Fynes-Clinton

Review by: O. H. Fynes-Clinton

Source: *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (Apr., 1910), pp. 253-255

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3713355>

Accessed: 03-11-2015 05:09 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>

même légère était possible. Jamais je ne l'ai trouvée en défaut. Je tiens à en donner un exemple, entre beaucoup d'autres. À la page 133, M. Tilley parle de la *Tyr et Sidon* de J. de Schélandre. Il y a en réalité deux pièces distinctes, une tragédie publiée en 1608 (dont un exemplaire fut découvert au British Museum en 1883, et un autre à l'Arsenal en 1897), et une tragi-comédie en deux journées, publiée en 1628. Or, les historiens de la littérature Française, les critiques, les auteurs de manuels, les compilateurs de recueils—Weiss, Lacroix (le bibliophile Jacob), Asselineau, P. Jannet (dans son *Ancien Théâtre Français*), Vapereau, Guérard, Faguet, Aulard, Rigal, Doumic—sont unanimes, soit à confondre les deux pièces en une seule, soit à ne voir dans la seconde qu'une simple réimpression de la première—M. Tilley s'est bien gardé de tomber dans l'erreur générale—et cela fait grand honneur à sa perspicacité. Mais pourquoi, au lieu de renvoyer seulement le lecteur à l'édition de la tragi-comédie, M. Tilley ne cite-t-il pas aussi l'excellente édition critique de la tragédie donnée par M. J. Haraszti dans la *Société des Textes Modernes*? Peut-être son volume a-t-il paru peu de temps avant celui de M. Haraszti (ils portent la même date, 1908). En ce cas, les deux auteurs seraient arrivés indépendamment aux mêmes conclusions, et M. Tilley partagerait avec M. Haraszti l'honneur d'avoir remis les choses au point. Ce serait encore une preuve, ajoutée à toutes celles qu'il nous a déjà données, de l'étendue de ses recherches, et de la sûreté de sa documentation.

H. E. BERTHON.

OXFORD.

Chapters on Spanish Literature. By JAMES FITZMAURICE-KELLY.
London: Constable and Co. 1908. 8vo. ix + 259 pp.

Lecciones de Literatura Española. Por JAIME FITZMAURICE-KELLY.
Traducción directa del inglés por DIEGO MENDOZA con un prólogo
de RUFINO JOSÉ CUERVO. Madrid: V. Suarez. 1910. 8vo.
xxi + 326 pp.

To all lovers of Spanish literature any book from the pen of Professor Fitzmaurice-Kelly makes instant appeal, and we find here all that his readers have long since learnt to expect: wide and minute research combined with that lightness of touch and power of selection which are the mark of a true master of his subject. One naturally turns for purposes of comparison to the same author's *History of Spanish Literature*, but here he is able to give much freer play to his powers: he is not cramped by the limitations of the handbook and its inexorable masses of detail. Nor does he repeat himself or merely state afresh opinions already enunciated. He always has something new to tell or some modification to make of previous judgments.

In the opening chapter the real and the, to most of us, far better known legendary Cid are each excellently treated in all their bearings and the interesting question is touched upon as to the indebtedness of the *Poema* and the *Crónica rimada* to early French literature. We have no hesitation in saying that no such excellent account has ever been written of the *Libro de buen amor* (as Professor Fitzmaurice-Kelly reminds us is the true title of the work) of the Archpriest of Hita. His foibles, his originality, his poetic genius, in spite of the vast amount of older material he adapts to his purpose, are all most skilfully delineated. Equal praise may be bestowed on the chapter on the Literary Court of Juan II. The prominent figures are brought out with true artistic power and critical insight, and nowhere perhaps is this more marked than in his treatment of Perez de Guzmán and his *Generaciones y Semblanzas*. In the chapter on the *Romancero*, though by far the longest in the book, the author himself admits that he has 'merely brushed the fringe of the subject,' and we hope he will, on some future occasion, find time to return to this most fascinating theme. The succeeding chapters treat of the three greatest figures in Spanish literature. We are glad to see that the slight asperity, with which the author is sometimes inclined to speak in his *History*, of the faults of Cervantes gives place here to a kindlier tone, though none would be disposed to deny, in the opening words of the chapter on the Works of Cervantes that 'the best and wisest of men have their delusions—especially with respect to themselves and their capabilities.' The world would probably have suffered little loss if no other works of Cervantes had survived but *Don Quixote* and the *Novelas Ejemplares*, but can we quite agree with Professor Fitzmaurice-Kelly that Shakespeare, to anything like the same extent as Cervantes, owes 'to a single masterpiece the greater part of his transcendent fame'?

A prominent feature throughout the book is the extraordinary felicity with which the author has found means in comparatively few pages to sketch the lives of the principal writers, without either overloading the narrative with detail or omitting a single important fact. The lives of Cervantes and of Lope de Vega are admirable productions and show what strides research has made in recent years—labour to which the author has himself contributed in no mean degree. Lope de Vega, as was to be expected, is assigned a higher place as a dramatist than Calderón, this view having now become almost a commonplace, but at the same time he does Calderón ampler justice than in his previous work. A great advance is also shown in his treatment of the Dramatic School of Calderón. The last chapter is devoted to Modern Spanish Novelists, among whom Pereda and Valera naturally take the most prominent place, but the main characteristics of all the leading novelists are excellently portrayed, and nowhere, perhaps, may this be said with greater truth than in the case of living authors like the Condesa Pardo Bazán and Vicente Blasco Ibáñez.

The translator has accomplished his difficult task in a thoroughly competent manner. We have compared many passages where a

foreigner might be expected not to bring out the full force of the original, but we have not in any case found him missing the point. The introduction by Señor Cuervo contains a delicate compliment to the high place which England has always occupied in Spanish studies.

O. H. FYNES-CLINTON.

BANGOR.

Dante. Quaestio de Aqua et Terra. Edited and translated by CHARLES LANCELOT SHADWELL. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1909. 8vo. iv + 74 pp.

To the third edition of Dr Moore's *Oxford Dante*, Dr Shadwell contributed a new text of the *De Aqua et Terra*. Previous to this all editions had been entirely unsatisfactory. As is well known no manuscript of this treatise is extant, but fortunately the *Editio Princeps* of 1508 generally gives clear enough indications of the contractions in the MS. which the editor expanded with so little intelligence. Subsequent editors, however, while correcting the grossest of his blunders, left others undetected and introduced confusions and irrelevancies of their own, and it was reserved to Dr Shadwell to produce the first satisfactory text. He did the work so thoroughly as to leave very little to his successors. This text he has now reissued in a separate volume with very slight alterations (I have noticed only the substitution of *quae* for *qua* in § XII, 61, and *quare* for *quia* in § XX, 50), and he has accompanied it with a slight but adequate *apparatus criticus*, a translation, and a brief commentary. There were already four English translations of the work (including Professor Thompson's contribution to Boffito's Polyglot edition), but Dr Shadwell's will at once take undisputed place as the standard version. It would be easy to give numerous examples of his superior insight into the Latinity, whether general or technical, of the treatise, but two may suffice. In the first paragraph he shews that discussing a point *ad apparentiam* does not mean 'according to appearance,' but 'for display'; and in the eighteenth paragraph he unravels with complete success an apparently complicated passage by shewing that *instantiae principalis* means 'the objection brought against the principal argument.' Aristotle repeatedly uses the phrase *ἔνστασις τούτου* for 'an objection urged against this,' and the slavish medieval translations (though Dr Shadwell, who never condescends to depart from the Greek text of his Aristotle, does not supply this link) render the phrase *instantia hujus*. Against the important passages in which Dr Shadwell has seen the true meaning of the text for the first time must be set one or two where (in the judgment at least of the present reviewer) he appears to have gone gratuitously wrong. For instance in § II, 7, *principium investigandæ veritatis* surely does not mean 'the first step in the investigation of the truth,' since the point in question is the conclusion not the starting-