

No menor encomio se debe á la manera y al estilo del autor. Ni sus vastos conocimientos le engríen, ni su calidad de extranjero se deja percibir por especie alguna de dureza ó desdén. Profesando el principio de que "el alma de la crítica consiste en la estimación justa de los valores relativos, sin dejarse arrastrar á la idolatría y ni siquiera á la lisonja," no se aparta una línea de él, armado como está para ello con la preparación más necesaria, qual es la versación en la literatura clásica y en las principales modernas. Con esto, al juzgar nuestras obras, alcanza su criterio una amplitud, serenidad y mesura que dan á sus opiniones fuerza convincente; y el amor que tiene probado á las letras españolas, va acompañado, como el que es verdadero en la vida social, con una delicadeza tal, que, cuando descubre ó refuta un error, no formula sentencia áspera ó infamante, sino que, á lo más, se vale de una amable ironía que pone de su parte al lector, provocandole alguna sonrisa de aquiescencia.

This admirable quality in our author—his urbanity "when he discovers or refutes an error"—has doubtless particularly impressed Sr. Cuervo because it is so conspicuously absent in many critics of Spanish literature. Sr. Cuervo concludes as follows: "In a word, no work seems more adequate than the present to inculcate a love of sane and solid erudition, which is here combined with amenity of presentation and a judicious and impartial criticism, in a style that is sober, distinguished and captivating." The justice of this judgment no one will deny, for in the present work, as in all of Prof. Fitzmaurice-Kelly's writings upon Spanish literature, are united the soundest scholarship with a clearness and elegance of style most rare in works of erudition.

Sr. Mendoza's part of the book is excellently well done. It is an adequate translation of a work that is in every way admirable.

HUGO A. RENNERT

University of Pennsylvania.

Manuel Bibliographique de la Littérature française moderne (1500-1900). I. Seizième Siècle. Par GUSTAVE LANSON. Paris, Hachette et Cie, 1909. xv + 247 pp.

The present work, which was composed by M. Lanson with the assistance of a number of his pupils, is merely intended to serve as a guide for students who desire to gain a more thorough knowledge of French literature. Hence, certain chapters (such as the chapter on translations), on which histories of literature give little or no information, have been enlarged; whereas others (cf. the chapter on Ronsard) are intentionally incomplete, inasmuch as abundant information on these subjects can be found without difficulty. Likewise, the chapters on memoirs, letters, administrative and political literature, usually neglected in literary histories, are developed more at length in this manual. Finally, the author has attempted to enlarge the list of reviews and bulletins of learned societies, for much of the useful work on this period is to be found scattered through their pages.

It is needless to say that the work of M. Lanson is well done: his *Manuel* should prove indispensable to the neophyte. An alphabetical index, however, of the authors mentioned would greatly facilitate the use of this excellent little work. It is quite difficult at times for one not thoroughly acquainted with M. Lanson's method to discover under what heading a work may be given. Every one has realized that the one great defect of Baudrier's masterly *Bibliographie lyonnaise* is the want of such an index, which causes an unnecessary loss of time and patience. That an alphabetical index would not unduly enlarge the

Manuel is obvious from the fact that Charléty's well-known *Bibliographie critique de l'Histoire de Lyon* has only nine pages of index, though it contains some 340 pages of titles. Furthermore, it might be maintained that M. Lanson's method of classification would have been more satisfactory and comprehensible had it followed more closely the more careful and minute methods of Picot and Charléty.

It is to be regretted also that the author was unable to insert a page or two on the jurists of the sixteenth century. While not immediately related to French literature, nevertheless a knowledge of their works, though they are written in Latin, is often necessary; for many of the most important scholars and literary personages of this period touched frequently upon legal subjects. And speaking of Latin, we are forced to regret the almost entire omission of the important Latinists of the sixteenth century. It might of course be objected that as this is a bibliography of French literature, Latin authors should be neglected. This is without doubt true when treating the latter part of the sixteenth century; but it is altogether different with regard to the Renaissance. Not a step in literary research in that period can be made without consulting the works of the Latinists, for their relations with the French authors were of the most intimate kind. The few indications given on p. 175 (2055-2061) are insufficient. The works of Macrin, Voulte, Ducher, Bourbon, and a host of others are strewn with references to their contemporaries, while the correspondence of Sadolet, Bunel, Boyssonné, etc., contain a fund of information not to be found elsewhere.

M. Lanson states (p. vii) that this is a *bibliographie choisie, donc incomplète*. Herein the reviewer wishes to call attention to a few things which have been inadvertently overlooked. First, on p. 5 we would expect to find Gesner's *Bibliotheca universalis*, 1545, which completes in many respects La Croix du Maine, Du Verdier and others. Next, in the long and excellent list of histories of colleges, etc. (pp. 20 *et seq.*), no mention is made of the *Collège de la Trinité* of Lyons, which was certainly equal in importance to the majority of those given by M. Lanson. While the brief study of Demogeot (*Collège de la Trinité*, in *Lyon ancien et moderne*, i, 409) may be considered incomplete, the scholarly work of Charvet, *Le Collège de la Trinité (Mém. de la Soc. litt. etc. de Lyon, 1874)* is without doubt on a par with any of the works mentioned. M. Lanson has enlarged the list of reviews, to be sure, but we are nevertheless disappointed to find no mention there of *Modern Philology*, *Modern Language Review*, *Les Annales du Midi*, *Modern Language Publications*, etc. We hope to see this list further increased by the addition of many of the excellent provincial reviews, which are usually so hard to find.

The chapters on the first half of the sixteenth century are—and this is the general defect of bibliographical works dealing with the sixteenth century—more incomplete than those on the *Pléiade* and its successors. Under the heading, *Italie* (p. 60), for example, we fail to find the excellent articles of M. Emile Picot on *Les Français qui ont écrit en Italie au XVI^e siècle (Revue des Bibliothèques, Paris, 1898)* and *Les Italiens en France au XVI^e siècle (Bull. Italien, 1902-03)*. Among the works of Charles Fontaine (p. 67), no mention is made of his *De l'antiquité et excellence de la ville de Lyon*, although it was considered worthy of a special edition in 1889 (by W. Poidebard, Lyon, 8vo).

While the *Biographie normande* and the other similar works are mentioned (p. 15), we fail to find the equally important (if not more important) *Biographie toulousaine* (1823, 2 vols.) and the *Dictionnaire historique du département de Vaucluse* (by Barjavel, Carpentras, 1841). The author has also failed to note in the bibliography of M.-C. de Buttet (p. 167) the very valuable work of M. Mugnier, *M.-C. de Buttet* (Paris, 1896). Under the heading Pibrac (p. 171), one should certainly mention the *Catalogue des ouvrages de Guy du Faur de Pibrac* (by R. de Pibrac, Orléans, 1901, 36 pp.). Furthermore under *divers poètes* (p. 166, etc.) we find such names as Etienne Forcadel, but no mention whatever of the more important personages, such as Hugues Salel, Barthélemy Aneau, etc. On p. 205 M. Lanson has noted one work of Canappe (*Du mouvement des muscles*)¹ but has omitted other more important medical scholars.²

Under works appearing outside of France, we would like to call attention to Cary's excellent *Early French Poets* (London, 1846), Kastner's *Sources of the Sonnets of Olivier de Magny* (*Mod. Philology*, 1909), etc.—The only misprints noted are *Bibliographie lyonnaise* for *Biographie lyonnaise* (p. 16, no. 169), and 1879 for 1789 (p. 16, no. 171).

JOHN L. GERIG

Columbia University

Le Cénacle de la Muse française (1823-1827). Par LÉON SÉCHÉ. Paris, Mercure de France, 1909. xv + 409 pp.

Besides editing his two reviews, the *Annales romantiques* and the *Revue de la Renaissance*, M. Séché frequently finds the time to publish a volume on one of the two periods of French literature—the Sixteenth Century and the period of Romanticism—in which he is especially interested. It is very fortunate that we have a scholar who knows thoroughly these two great epochs in French literature, for there are many points of resemblance between them. De Musset was not only related to Du Bellay in blood, but also in spirit and inspiration. And to the Pléiade may be compared the seven founders of the *Muse française*.¹

M. Séché admires the great period of Romanticism—the period of the Catholic and royalistic influence of Châteaubriand as contrasted with the liberal influence of Rousseau that manifested itself later. No better representatives of the first period can be found than Alexandre Soumet, Alexandre Guiraud and their protectress Sophie Gay, Jules Rességuier and Emile Deschamps, whose correspondence is published for the first time by M. Séché.

Besides this, we have brief studies devoted to the work published in the *Muse française* by the seven founders and twelve collaborators of that review. The interest in these chapters is heightened by the enthusiasm of the author,

¹ For bibliography of Canappe, cf. *Collège de la Trinité avant 1540, Rev. de la Renaissance*, 1908, pp. 89 ff.

² Cf., for example, *Pierre Tolet* in Bregnot du Lut's *Mélanges*, I, 187.

And under the *Langue française au XVI^e siècle*, we look in vain for Brandon's *Robert Estienne et le Dictionnaire français au XVI^e siècle*, Furst, Baltimore, 1904.

³ M. Séché shows other points of resemblance on p. 175, etc.