



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE IDENTITY OF SOMAIZE *

II

1. Concerning the number¹ and the style of Sorel's works, little need be said. Larroumet admits that Somaize's *Pompe funèbre de M. Scarron* has some good passages.² Occasionally, Sorel deviates into ease and grace of expression. But as a rule his style is humdrum and lacks distinction. This cannot be said of many authors of the seventeenth century. Furetière maliciously explains how poor a poet Charroselles (*i. e.*, Sorel) was.³ Sorel himself, indeed, makes light of the ability to write well, and considers it such a minor merit that he does not allow it to worry him at all.⁴

2. The pamphleteering career of Charles Sorel is fairly well known. The number of his *loteries, jeux, portraits, relations, chroniques, descriptions* is large and has been given in detail by Mr. Roy.

3. As a past master in the fabrication of literary hoaxes, Sorel has had few equals. His construction of his own family-tree, as described by Mr. Roy, is a most ingenious fraud. The trouble taken by him to foist *Francion* on Nicolas de Moulinet⁵ was worthy of a better cause. Even after nearly everybody was aware that he had been responsible for that popular novel, and after his friend, Guy Patin, had stated explicitly that he was the author of it, and after Furetière had made the fact public, Sorel persisted in denying the attribution⁶—and in speaking fondly of the sixty editions through which *Francion* had passed at home and abroad. In a spirit of mock resignation, while acknowledging the authorship of a long list of anonymous works, he warns readers against ascribing unworthy books to him,⁷ and

begs them to remember his important efforts in such serious subjects as history, philosophy, and science. His use of pseudonyms for purposes of mystification has already been commented on. His sly addition of hypocritical moralizing at the end of each licentious chapter in *Francion* may have been made with the object of silencing some of his church friends, for he was a good church man, and must have deplored the presentation of Molière's *Tartuffe*. In a similar manner, he disclaims all intentions of satirizing persons,⁸ yet has made a laughing-stock of Balzac as Hortensius, of Malherbe as "le grand sophi" of poets, of the absent-minded stutterer, Racan, of the impudent Boisrobert.

As for the devices and resources of literary men, he knows them all. Far be it from him, to be sure!—but there *are* authors who write letters in excessive praise of their own works, and publish them under the name of a friend.⁹ Strangely enough, this is precisely what occurred at the publication of Somaize's *Dictionnaire*.¹⁰ Later, Furetière, who lived next door to Sorel and had known him intimately, obliges Charroselles (Sorel) to declare:

Je puis dire ici entre nous que je l'ay pratiqué avec assez de succès, et que sous un nom emprunté de commentateur de mon propre ouvrage, je me suis donné de l'encens tout mon soul.¹¹

4. Sorel had many interests and many ideas. His *Science universelle* (1641) shows his wide range of thought, if not of originality. His novels are clumsy examples of the early application of scientific discoveries and conjectures—in telegraphy,¹² astronomy, physiology, mechanics—to fiction. But what dominated his mind was an overwhelming zeal for language, for literature, for words. Lexicographers like Littré have done Sorel ample justice from this point of view by quoting him constantly on the significance of old French words and idioms. When he states that in *Francion* "on pourra

*Cf. *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXIX, pp. 333-36.

¹ Cf. Roy, *Charles Sorel*, appendix.

² Larroumet, *Ét. litt.*, p. 18.

³ Furetière, *Rom. bourg.*, pp. 250-251.

⁴ Cf. *Francion*, pp. 417-419.

⁵ Cf. Mr. Roy's careful analysis in *Ch. Sorel*, pp. 431-432.

⁶ Sorel, *Bib. fr.*, p. 356.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 368-369.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 78.

⁹ *Francion*, p. 173.

¹⁰ Cf. *Case of Somaize*, p. 34.

¹¹ Furetière, *Rom. bourg.*, pp. 136-137.

¹² Cf. Koerting, *Gesch. des fr. Rom.*, II, p. 114, n. 1.

trouver la langue française tout entière, et que je n'ai point oublié les mots dont use le vulgaire,"¹³ he is scarcely exaggerating. And his affection for his mother-tongue passes the bounds of mere erudite curiosity. As there was but one supreme city in the world for him, namely, Paris,¹⁴ so there was but one supreme language for him, namely, French—the good, old, common, every-day French of his *bourgeois* childhood.

That is the secret of his life-long animosity toward the *précieux* and the *précieuses*. That is why he ridicules, attacks—and imitates them. Often, his imitation seems sincere enough. He was not averse to deriving pecuniary advantages from the fad. But that he never believed in it and always scorned it is the final impression one obtains from his works. Sentimentally, he is of the *bon vieux temps* of Marot: and the French language is with him a sentiment. Very early he seems to have become cognizant of an insidious, internal warfare against his mother-tongue, and very promptly he came to its defence. Practically everything that he wrote—*Francion*, *le Berger extravagant*, *Polyandre*, *la Connaissance des bons livres*, *la Bibliothèque française*, and his shorter writings—became weapons against the invaders.

If, consequently, the proof attempted in this paper shall appear satisfactory, it will no longer be necessary to entertain doubts as to Somaize's attitude toward *préciosité*. It can have been at bottom none other than a sarcastic and a hostile attitude.

A complete list of Sorel's *précieux* works need not be given here. It may be found in Mr. Roy's biography of Sorel,¹⁵ and in the latter's *Bibliothèque française* and *la Connaissance des bons Livres*. The titles of a few of them may, however, be of interest: *Les Lois de la Galanterie*, *Récit mémorable du siège de la ville de Pectus par le Prince Rhuma*, *Le Véritable Récit du siège de Beauté*, *Description de l'Isle de la Portraiture*, *La Lotterie d'Amour*, *Relation de ce qui s'est passé dans*

la Nouvelle Découverte du Royaume de Frisquemore.

5. As the friend, enemy, or acquaintance of the principal Academicians, of Furetière, of Boisrobert, of Guy Patin, and other people of note, and as the historiographer of the King, Sorel had plenty of opportunities for coming in contact with the *précieux* and *précieuses*. That he put such companionship to practical use may be inferred from Furetière's venomous observation.¹⁶ Nobody was more likely than Sorel to have accumulated a mass of notes on *préciosité* and the *précieux*, and nobody was in a better position for doing so.

Not the least striking detail in Sorel's acquaintanceship with the *précieuses* is his agreement with Somaize's published facts and his knowledge of those whom Somaize knew. Time and again, Mr. Roy cites Somaize to identify Sorel's friends. Thus, Sorel's neighbor, Mme du Buisson, the rival of Sapho, is Somaize's Damophile.¹⁷ Sorel's Angélique is Somaize's Angélique Petit.¹⁸ Of the *belles-filles* of Mme Cornuel, Sorel speaks of one as a younger sister and of the other as a niece. Somaize calls them both her *filles*,¹⁹ but it was the custom to use the same term of relationship for them. Aesculan, Néophile, and the fickle lady of their thoughts in Sorel's *Polyandre* are the *surintendant* Emery, his son the president of Toré, and his future daughter-in-law, Geneviève Le Cogneux. The latter figures in Somaize's *Dictionnaire*,²⁰ as does also Sorel's Mlle D. L. or Mlle de Lauvergne.²¹ Sorel, in speaking of

¹³ *Rom. Bourg.*, p. 237. "—Charroselles (Sorel) homme d'estude, monta en son cabinet, où la première chose qu'il fit, ce fut son examen de conscience de bons mots, ainsi qu'il avoit accoustumé. C'est à dire qu'il faisoit un recueil où il mettoit par escrit tous les beaux traits et toutes les choses remarquables qu'il avoit otyes pendant le jour dans les compagnies où il s'étoit rencontré. Apres cela il en faisoit bien son profit, car par fois il se les attribuoit et en compiloit des ouvrages entiers; par fois il les alloit debiter ailleurs comme venant de son crû."

¹⁴ Cf. Roy, *Ch. Sorel*, pp. 236-237.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, same citation.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 191.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 188-189.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 238-239.

¹³ *Francion*, p. 360.

¹⁴ Roy, *Charles Sorel*, pp. 72-73.

¹⁵ Roy, *Ch. Sorel*, pp. 409-410.

Mlle Le Vieux calls her Uriane: Somaize, in his *Dictionnaire*, calls her Urione.²²

In addition to the above, it would be possible to cite a large number of *précieux* expressions used by both Sorel and Somaize,—and in many cases used *first* by Sorel. Ordinarily speaking, this fact might appear unimportant, for words once published are the property of anybody. It has, nevertheless, some bearing in the present instance, since by far the most thorough student of Sorel—to whom the connection between the two men which I am attempting to establish has evidently not occurred—constantly quotes Somaize's locutions in corroboration of Sorel's. Sorel's *font figure dans le monde*, for example, has a place in Somaize's *Dictionnaire*;²³ and Sorel's *les peintres parlants*, employed as early as 1628 in Sorel's *Le Berger extravagant*, reappears in 1661 in Somaize.

Finally, there is a striking parallelism in Sorel's and Somaize's conception of one phase of *préciosité*. Both have seen the analogy between *précieux* expressions and the *argot* of the common people and of thieves and other malefactors. The two latter classes employed picturesque slang, as they do in Hugo's *Notre-Dame de Paris*, for the purpose of being able to speak in French without running the risk of having their conversation understood by French bystanders. The common people used it, as they do to-day, always have done, and always will do, because it is a short-cut and a source of humor. As Mr. Roy states, the resemblance "était frappante entre les deux jargons, tour à tour poétiques ou grossiers à plaisir."²⁴ Few persons besides Sorel and Somaize have noticed this instructive similarity.

6. Sorel's hostility toward Molière has been mentioned by several writers.²⁵ His *Bibliothèque française*, which is by no means as unimportant a history of contemporary French literature as the lack of reference to it would

seem to indicate, systematically makes short shrift of the incomparable playwright. In one place, Sorel mentions Molière last in a brief account of authors of the same name: "On ne doit prendre aussi, le sieur de Molière qui a fait en François un *Dictionnaire Historique & Poétique*, pour celui qui a fait le *Roman de Polixène*, ny pour celui qui a fait la *Comédie de l'Eschole des Femmes*."²⁶ As Mr. Roy remarks, it is a wonder that he does not warn his readers against confusing the comedian with Molière the dancer and with the sieur de Moulère, an obscure Gascon writer.²⁷ In another place, he makes a bare mention of some of Molière's plays, omitting the *Précieuses ridicules*.²⁸

The causes of Sorel's enmity are not far to seek. Molière's bare-faced plagiarism from Sorel's works, as demonstrated at length by Mr. Roy and indicated by Koerting,²⁹ were well calculated to make the author of *Francion*, *Le Berger extravagant*, and *Les Lois de la Galanterie* smart: and it is not without significance that the public attacks on Molière by Somaize began immediately after the appearance of the *Précieuses ridicules*—a play which is nothing but a clever mosaic, in so far as its subject-matter is concerned, from previous writings by Sorel. Undoubtedly, also, a strong feeling of envy entered into Sorel's reflections, and induced him to make that complaint³⁰ about the relative profits of ordinary writers and of dramatists which Furetière possibly had in mind when he charged Sorel with ruining his book-sellers. It may be, too, that Molière, outside of his plays, ridiculed Sorel's pretensions to nobility, as he is supposed to have done in 1662 in *l'École des Femmes* when satirizing M. de l'Isle.³¹

7. Sorel was the life-long enemy of Boissier, if we may judge from his published remarks. According to all the students of *Francion*, the character of Mélibée in that

²² *Ibid.*, p. 238.

²³ Roy, *Ch. Sorel*, p. 286.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 323-324.

²⁵ Cf. Nicéron, *Mémoires*, etc., Paris, MDCCLXXXV, article on Sorel.

²⁶ Sorel, *Bib. fr.*, p. 245.

²⁷ Roy, *Ch. Sorel*, pp. 373-374.

²⁸ Sorel, *Bib. fr.*, p. 188.

²⁹ Koerting, *Gesch. des fr. Rom.*, II, pp. 98-99.

³⁰ Sorel, *Bib. fr.*, p. 189.

³¹ Cf. Furetière, *Rom. Bourg.*, p. 219, n. 1.

novel stands for Boisrobert: and Mélibée is an impudent rascal, a pimp, and a swindler.³² Boisrobert, in his capacity as the official defender of Balzac,³³ must have had heated disputes with Balzac's most caustic opponent. Somaize, it will be remembered, speaks in no complimentary terms of the abbé. Whatever other reasons Sorel may have had for disliking Boisrobert, he had at least one justifiable reason, namely, plagiarism of his ideas and literary inventions.³⁴

8. Toward Balzac, Sorel felt the same instinctive antagonism that he felt toward the *précieuses*. His Hortensius is an unflinching caricature of the grand master of eloquence, and Furetière informs us that Sorel took the very words out of the mouth of Balzac and put them into the mouth of the pedant Hortensius, turning them into ridicule.³⁵

9. *Francion*, first published in 1622, is already full of squibs against the *précieux* method of speech. The list drawn up by Francion is of the purest *préciosité*: "très-indubitablement, ils allèrent, ils parlèrent, vous avez bien de la propreté, vous êtes fort admirable, vous vous piquez de jouer du luth et de faire l'amour, vous avez tout plein d'habitudes chez les ministres des affaires de l'État, vous êtes dans le grand commerce du monde, vous êtes un homme d'intrigues . . ." ³⁶ The discourse of Hortensius to his mistress ³⁷ is not outdone by Mascarille. Mr. Roy is entirely correct in the declaration given below.³⁸

10. Probably no writer of the seventeenth century was guilty of greater or more persistent coarseness of language than Sorel in his *Francion*, and probably no French author ever

surpassed his absolute vulgarity in works still read, excepting Diderot. Quotation is unnecessary. It is not surprising that Sorel to his dying day denied the authorship of the book. The point is of some import here, because Sorel and Somaize give identical excuses for their smut.³⁹

11. The discussion of simplified spelling in *Francion* is interesting, not only because it coincides with Somaize's ideas, but also because of its applicability at the present day.⁴⁰

12. Sorel's true vocation was compiling and classifying. *Francion*, *le Berger extravagant*, *la Bibliothèque françoise*, *la Science universelle* are nothing but catalogs of customs, manners, books, and facts thrown into narrative form. His *jeux*, *lois*, *descriptions* are nothing else.

13. The part played by Balesdens in aiding in the publication of Somaize's *Dictionnaire* is so vital that any evidence showing friendship between Sorel and the bibliophile-Academician cannot but strengthen the argument concerning the identity of Somaize. The recommendation given by Balesdens to Somaize ⁴¹ would not have been accorded a mere acquaintance, since it meant the possibility of stirring up a hornets' nest and of subsequent defence. That Sorel and the Academician were on such terms as to make it natural for the latter to lend his name to a rather misleading statement of the tenor of the book may be judged from the fact that "Sorel était très lié avec les académiciens Balesdens et Serisay, comme il le dit dans sa *Bibliothèque française*, de 1664, p. 244." ⁴²

14. Is Somaize's boast that he caused the Académie to assemble two or three times of

³² *Francion*, pp. 200-201.

³³ Roy, *Ch. Sorel*, p. 87.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 101.

³⁵ Furetière, *Nouvelle Allég.*, p. 174.

³⁶ *Francion*, p. 212.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 136. Cf. also p. 209.

³⁸ Roy, *Ch. Sorel*, p. 309. "Si on a la curiosité de vérifier ses assertions, non-seulement on verra les prosateurs du commencement du XVIIe. siècle dépasser en hardiesse les poètes qui les suivent, mais on trouvera chez eux, et à la lettre, soit les passages critiqués par Molière à diverses dates, soit les expressions mêmes de la pièce des *Précieuses*."

³⁹ Cf. Somaize, *Vérité. Préf.*, ed. Lacroix, notice, p. viii; Sorel, *Bib. fr.*, p. 174.

⁴⁰ Sorel, *Francion*, pp. 176-177; cf. "Aussi, parce qu'il n'est pas si facile de prononcer de telle sorte les mots, que toutes leurs lettres servent, que d'ôter ces mêmes lettres inutiles, il est expédient de les retrancher. En pas une langue vous ne voyez de semblables licences, et, quand il y en auroit, les mauvais exemples ne doivent pas être suivis plus que la raison. Considérez que la langue latine même, dont, à la vérité, la plupart de la nôtre a tiré son origine, n'a pas une lettre qui ne lui serve."

⁴¹ Cf. *Case of Somaize*, p. 38.

⁴² Roy, *Ch. Sorel*, p. 153.

any moment? It may be a mere jest. Nevertheless, it is curious that Charles Sorel should have done just that very thing. According to Furetière, Sorel "acquit tant de crédit qu'il s'étoit rendu formidable, même aux quarante Barons."⁴⁸ The two occasions on which he accomplished this feat were the publication of his *Rôle des présentations françoises faites aux grands jours de l'éloquence françoise* (1646), and of his *Discours sur l'Académie françoise, établie pour la correction et l'embellissement du langage, pour sçavoir si elle est de quelque utilité aux particuliers et au public* (1654).⁴⁴ In addition, he had waged war on Pellisson's *Histoire de l'Académie*.⁴⁵

From the investigations of Livet, Larroumet, and others, it appears that nobody took notice of Somaize's work or knew the author. Chapelain, it is true, must have exhibited some interest in these writings, for the catalog of his library arranged by Mr. Searles⁴⁶ shows that he possessed a copy of the *Grand Dictionnaire historique des Précieuses*. Nevertheless, neither Chapelain nor any other seventeenth century writer, so far as I have been able to find out in a varied and extensive course of reading, mentions Somaize or his books—excepting Charles Sorel. Is not this fact significant? Not satisfied with transcribing several pages of Somaize's *Dictionnaire* in his *Connaissance des bons livres*,⁴⁷ Sorel proceeds to abuse his compeer, whose "insolence horrible" allait "jusqu'à publier le nom et l'âge des dames."⁴⁸ This abuse, of course, if Sorel really wrote the *Dictionnaire*, would be quite in keeping with the rest of the game, and need not be taken seriously. But Sorel goes further than this. He seems to have the same affection for the *Dictionnaire des Précieuses* as for *Francion*, which he mentions and disowns. In the first part of his *Bibliothèque françoise*,

when dealing with the *romans comiques*, he observes, "Il y a aussi le *Dictionnaire du Langage des Précieuses & leur Dictionnaire Historique*, avec leur Comédie en Prose."⁴⁹ Why he should have listed those works with the novels would prove perplexing if Somaize had not already said that his only reason for not turning his material into a novel lay in the fact that he was dealing with nearly 700 characters. It is plain that Sorel and Somaize agree perfectly in their views on the *Dictionnaire*. What is still more interesting, however, is that Sorel includes the *Dictionnaire* in his own list of the works attributed to himself. "Il y a en quelques autres lieux plusieurs Pièces faites à l'imitation des premières; on a fait une *Lotterie d'Amour*, on a fait un *Dictionnaire du langage précieux*, & l'invention de cela est dans un certain Catalogue de Livres plaisans pour les Benefices de la Lotterie."⁵⁰ Now, as the *Lotterie d'Amour* is generally conceded to be his, it is fair to assume that the *Dictionnaire* is also his; and at any rate, he includes both in a catalog of books which are certainly his, such as *L'Orphize de Chrysante*, the *Suite de la Polixène*, the *Berger extravagant*, the *Maison des Jeux*, the *Description de l'Isle de la Portraiture*.⁵¹

That Sorel actually had it in mind, shortly before 1660, to compile a *Dictionnaire des Précieuses* is a known fact, because he indicates it unmistakably in his own words, and outlines both parts in exactly the form in which they were published over Somaize's name. ". . . en 1658 il (Sorel) publie une Loterie, contenant entr'autres lots burlesques les livres suivants: *La Chronique des Précieuses, qui raconte leur origine, et ce qu'elles ont fait de mémorable depuis leur établissement.—Les Précieuses maximes des Précieuses, et les Lois qu'elles observent selon leur institution.—Le Dictionnaire des Précieuses, où le langage vulgaire français est d'un côté de chaque page, et le langage précieux de l'autre.*"⁵²

⁴⁴ Furetière, *Nouvelle Allég.*, pp. 45-46.

⁴⁵ Cf. *Francion*, avant-propos, p. 8.

⁴⁶ Cf. Guy Patin, *Lettres*, etc., I, p. 314.

⁴⁷ C. Searles, *Catalogue de tous les livres de feu M. Chapelain*, Stanford Univ., 1912, p. 47.

⁴⁸ Cf. Roy, *Ch. Sorel*, p. 287.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 280-281.

⁴⁹ Sorel, *Bib. fr.*, p. 171.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 360.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 349-363.

⁵² Roy, *Ch. Sorel*, pp. 280-281.

The supposition that another man by the name of Somaize forestalled Sorel in the actual writing of this book is hardly tenable. The time which elapsed between 1658 and April 12, 1660—the date of appearance of the first part of the *Dictionnaire*—was too short to admit of the collecting of a large mass of notes dealing with over 600 *précieux* and *précieuses*. Besides, the historical documentation of the *Dictionnaire* is conclusive evidence that the material was gathered bit by bit during nearly a life-time. To one acquainted with Sorel's methods, it is practically certain that when he announced his project of a *Dictionnaire des Précieuses*, he had the subject-matter ready for production. The theory that Somaize might have stolen Sorel's notes must, if entertained at all, be discarded in view of Sorel's constantly kindly attitude toward Somaize and his *Dictionnaire*.

The facts given above seem to the writer sufficient to establish Sorel as the originator of Somaize. If his exposition is accepted as correct, another minor puzzle is probably solved. Mr. Roy, in discussing Sorel's interest in *précieux* "almanachs," has had to make a rather unsatisfactory conjecture concerning a certain *Almanach des Précieuses*, "qui a dû suivre de près la pièce de Molière, et qu'on n'a encore pu retrouver."⁵³ Is it not possible that this *Almanach des Précieuses* and the *Dictionnaire des Précieuses* are one and the same thing?

J. WARSHAW.

University of Missouri.

VARIATION IN THE OLD HIGH GERMAN POST-OTFRIDIAN POEMS¹

II. DAS LUDWIGSLIED

The peculiar discrepancy in the subject matter and geographical location of the *Ludwigslied* (MSD 11) as compared with its Rhine Franconian dialect has caused considerable uncertainty in regard to the personality of its author. In any event the direct influence of Otfrid is not to be denied. In common with the other post-Otfridian poems of the Old High German period, the *Ludwigslied* lacks the polish and stylistic accuracy of the *Evangelienbuch* itself. As compared however with the Christus fragment it stands on a considerably higher literary plane—a fact which the analysis of its variation clearly shows. I insert here an outline of the various variations contained in the poem, numbering each for convenience in future reference: (1) Ll. 1, kuning-Hludwig. (2) Ll. 3b-4a-4b-5, 6a. (3) Ll. 5, dugidi-githigini. (4) Ll. 7b-8a. (5) Ll. 10, arbeidi-11-12. (6) Ll. 13-18 (group var., diagrammed below). (7) Ll. 19a-19b-20a. (8) Ll. 21a-22-23. (9) Ll. 29-30. (10) Ll. 32, gisellion-nôtstallon. (11) Ll. 34b-35a. (12) Ll. 37, 38. (13) Ll. 40, 41 (opposed parallel var.). (14) Ll. 43b, uuidarsahchôn-44b, Northman-45b, thes her gerêda. (15) Ll. 46b, lioth frâno-47b-48a, sang. (16) Ll. 48-54 (group var., diagrammed below). (17) Ll. 55-56. (18) Ll. 57a, Hludwig-57b.

Even a casual examination of early Germanic epic poetry must soon prove that its variation, while extremely frequent, is of a somewhat haphazard nature, occurring irregularly and loosely rather than according to any carefully worked out scheme of the author. However, even in the earliest specimens, there can be found the beginnings of a tendency toward that literary jugglery which Otfrid later carried to an extreme and which Behaghel found so characteristic in Middle High German poetry (*Beitr.*

⁵³ Cf. Roy, *Ch. Sorel*, p. 260: "Le *Recueil de Sercy* de 1658 contient deux almanachs du même genre, décrits par M. Livet dans son édition de Somaize, tome II, p. 277. Sorel en fit lui-même une troisième, *Oeuvres diverses*, p. 349; il reprenait son bien.—Dans le ballet de la *Déroute des précieuses*, cité plus loin, il est question d'un *Almanach des Précieuses* qui a dû suivre de près la pièce de Molière, et qu'on n'a encore pu retrouver. C'est probablement le même que Sorel désigne sous le nom d'*Almanach des Coquettes* (*Bibliothèque française*, de 1664, p. 170)."

¹ Cf. *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXVIII, 216-217.