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The fame of Estienne Forcadel rests mainly on the fact that he was preferred for a professorship of law by the faculty of Toulouse to the great Cujas. He has been well characterized as a mauvais jurisconsulte, mais pire poète. Protests Toulousans have long been cast up upon their university, and many have attempted to prove that it is unjust. It is needless to add that M. Oulmont, influenced by civic patriotism, maintains that this celebrated dispute "n'est qu'une légende." He advances as evidence for this statement that towards the end of 1554—the year when the controversy is supposed to have taken place—Cujas was already at Bourges, and that it was two years later, the 7th of September, 1556, when Forcadel was elected unanimously to this professorship. Notwithstanding this argument, documents in the archives of the Parliament of Toulouse show that Cujas was a candidate for the place.

The Parliament of Toulouse was regarded by all humanists as more conservative than that of Paris. We can easily pardon the Faculty of Law for this earlier error of judgment in view of the invitation later extended to Cujas, and the esteem in which it held the great jurists, François Roaldés and Guillaume Maran.

M. Oulmont's study is very well presented. His style is elegant and persuasive, but unfortunately his bibliography must be consulted with caution. In the first place, he is apparently unaware of the fact that a serious study on Forcadel was published in the Revue des Pyrénées in 1894 by M. Fontès—the same review in which his own article first appeared. Furthermore, though we have little information on the life of Forcadel, M. Oulmont fails to note two important documents communicated by M. Souail to the Revue des Sociétés savantes (Series VII, Vol. I, 1880, pp. 123-6). In a prefatory note to these documents, M. A. Longnon expresses the opinion that they prove conclusively that La Croix du Maine and other biographers of Forcadel are wrong in stating that the poet died in 1573. One of these documents consists of an ordinance of Montmorency, governor of Languedoc, dated July 12, 1585, and directed against the three brothers, François Estienne, and Pierre Forcadel. According to M. Longnon, this Estienne Forcadel is our poet, and Pierre his brother, the celebrated professor of mathematics of the Collège Royal of Paris. But the Lettres patentes, published by M. Lefranc in his Histoire du Collège de France (p. 340), prove that Pierre Forcadel died before February 16, 1574. Furthermore, the Prometheus, vive de rapin animorum dialogues—which of the printing was finished on the 24th of July, 1578—was dedicated by Pierre Forcadel to his late father. Inasmuch as Gérard d'Imbert addresses Estienne Forcadel a sonnet in 1578 (cf. his Sonets exotiques no. 78), we are forced to agree with

---

1 Cf. especially the article of Bénech on Cujas et Toulouse in the Mélanges de Droit (Paris, 1857, pp. 3-779), where the learned author, in reply to the contention of Berriot-St-Prix, attempts to prove that Cujas "n'a jamais échappé dans la dispute d'un regret de droit civil à l'université de Toulouse, que s'il ne s'est pas arrêté dans sa ville natale en 1554, c'est à cause du peu d'énonçons attachés aux rémiges de l'université de Toulouse" (p. 39).

2 Cf. those of the 17th of Feb. and the 5th of April, 1554, folios 247 and 350; and also folios 676-7-8 concerning Cujas and Rossel (Aug. 23, 1555, and March 14, 1556).
M. Oulmont that he must have died in 1578, probably in the early part of the year.

It becomes obvious then that the Pierre Forcadel of the document of 1585 is the above-mentioned son of Estienne, and is perhaps the one who died, according to M. Oulmont (p. 4), before 1595. His brother, François, “docteur en droit et avocat au siège de Béziers,” was killed in a riot in Béziers on the 14th of June, 1604 (cf. *Rev. des Soc. sav., ibid.*). Of the third brother, Estienne, we learn from another document published by M. Souville (*Recherches sur les anciennes Actes à Béziers*, 1880, p. 81) that he took part in a meeting of the city council of Béziers on November 25, 1591, and that he was still *conseiller au Présidial* of that city in 1607, as M. Oulmont shows.

In the part devoted to the work of Forcadel, M. Oulmont makes first a brief and judicious review of his legal studies. He is, however, wrong in considering the 1559 edition of the *Penum juris civilis* as the first edition of this work. There is in the Library of Bordeaux (Jur. 702a, 10201), an edition published in 1544, entitled *Stephani Forcatuli Penum juris civilis ad rem alimentarium*, Lugdun., M. Famanterius, 1544, 4to.

Arnauld du Ferrier, to whom the prefatory letter of this work is addressed, was professor of law at Toulouse in 1536 and had the honor of being the teacher of both Cujas and Forcadel. Other legal works of Forcadel unknown to M. Oulmont are the following: *Oratio Stephani Forcatuli, publici in Academia Tolosana legum professoris. Ex offic. Jac. Colomerii, acad. Tolosana typ. 1556*, which is his inaugural address; *Lectiones aliquot juris*, delivered at Toulouse from 1561 to 1563; and the *Ad Legem fractus percipliantem de usu*, 1575, Carpentras, MS. 227.

In discussing the historical works of Forcadel, M. Oulmont cites no earlier edition of the *De Gallorum imperio* than that of 1595, whereas there were at least two previous editions, one, according to the catalogue Potier, published in 1579 in Paris by Guili. Chaudière (4to), and the other, according to the catalogue Claudin (December, 1580) by the same printer (Cf. Bibl. Sunderlandiana, No. 4695). Finally, the *Chant des Seraines*, of which M. Oulmont mentions only the edition of Gilles Corrozet (Paris, 1548), was published simultaneously by Jean de Tournes (Lyons, 1548, 8vo, pp. 120) and by Arnoul l’Angelier (Paris, 1548, 16mo). He fails, also, to note the words, *avec plusieurs compositions nouvelles*, in the title of this work, which prove that there must have been an edition before 1548. The 1574 edition of the *Montmorency Gaulois* is not the first edition of this work, for there is in the Library of Berne (W, 7*, 7* pièce) a copy published by Jean de Tournes in 1571 (4to of 29 pages).

M. Oulmont calls Emile Perrot *sénateur* (p. 17) and speaks of the *Sénat*

---

1 P. 5, M. Oulmont is not aware of his relationship with our poet.
3 Carpentras, ms. 204. Cf. also Lambert, I, p. 112.
4 For these two editions, see Poet, *Catalogue de la Bibl. Roehchold, IV*, and the catalogue Techenier, 1889. The latter catalogue contains the following note “Forcadel a ajouté à ses poésies l’Extrait d’un petit traité (en vers) sur le fait de la réformation de la superbeité des habiats des dames de Paris, par Alphonse de Beser, jadis, abbé de Livry, qu’il dit avoir trouvé dans un vieux ms., en la librairie de Vauluisant.”
Reviews of Books

De Toulouse (p. 18). This is merely a mistranslation of the Latin, for there were no sénateurs or sénats at this time, but conseillers and parlements. Jean Bertrand mentioned on page 9, is without doubt Jean Bertrand, first president of the Parliament of Paris, who administered the oath of office to the conseillers of Toulouse.¹

J. L. G.

Das Handschriftenverhältnis des Covenant Vivian. By WILLY SCHULZ. Halle, 1905.

This volume includes a discussion and classification of the nine manuscripts available of the Covenant Vivian (the author's spelling Vivian is an affectation. The better title, as Mr. A. Terracher has shown, is Chevalerie Vivien).² In the course of his argument, the author has to cite many passages from the MSS. It is noted with regret that these citations are full of errors. He was evidently set to copying the MSS. without due previous training in paleography. If this supposition be correct, he is less to be blamed than those who allowed him to undertake such difficult work.

The following corrections of the author's readings are offered. On p. 16 and elsewhere, the reading should be molt (with a rare possibility at times of mort), instead of moutl. The suggestion of: Il li fora is in every manner impossible. On p. 17, l. Aerosles for MSS. A and B. Under line 581, why is greules given? One should read gralles and ij gralles. Line 476: from this text one could never tell the reading of the MSS. P. 18: A has setes in l. 1179. P. 20: second l. from the bottom: iij, instead of ils; last l. instead of et son frere Laimes, read: Laimes; in same l., MS. D¹ has: ses. In the last l. of the note, the MS. has fluor. P. 21: l. 483: Enfondit should be written En fondit, as in the MS.; similarly, here and wherever it occurs, par mi. In l. 484: anfes; 487: mors and nes. Under l. 475, Maleors is followed in the MS. by a period, indicating that the name is abbreviated. This should be shown. The full name was undoubtedly meant to be trisyllabic. In l. 615, MS. A has perse, not perce. P. 22: several of the readings of the MSS. for lines 404 ss. are erroneous. For example: l. 464: MS. A has hal, and in l. 468, mora; B, in this same l, has corones and not corronnes; E has in l. 465 the abbreviation for Ihesu, not Iesus, and has vous; in l. 469, this MS. bears ari, not assis; MSS. d have, in l. 468: leur . . . esche, and the first l. quoted from D¹ has vous. P. 24: often one cannot tell from what MS. the text is given, as here for l. 1045 ss. It is safe to say, however, that, in the first verse cited one should read Guillaume, and, in the last, cuens. P. 24: under ll. 1595, 1596, if the author is going to read encrei for B, he should read entrci for D¹; the reading for D¹ is: Toni le porfent, and for B, detrenche; in the last l. but one on the page, the words should be ainesi, -vous. P. 25: the discussion of il voli (or ovol) and the nominative case is due to a mistaken reading by the author, who took ilvol (iuvol) for i voli, thus seeing difficulties that are not in the text. MS. D¹


²The author, however, has recently made a careful defense of the title as he gives it: vld. Zeitsschriffl für französische Sprache, XXXV (1910), pp. 171-178.