

marks in *Die Nation* (1905-6): "Beside the criminal, Biegler, who has been released, and who has now become a watchman at a stone mason's yard, there stands a girl who has a child by one of the journeymen. She has been kept subservient to him by false promises of marriage and has been brutally treated. For both of the chief characters, Sudermann's flexible fancy has created contrasting figures. By the side of that discharged convict who is struggling hard with life and fate, is placed another discharged convict, Struve, a comic figure, who speaks with enthusiasm of life in the house of correction, and he would not be unwilling to return to it. The heroine sighs over the shame of having given birth to an illegitimate child; her friend, a poor, deformed creature, the daughter of the master stone mason, longs for love and a child, even if the latter were the fruit of thousandfold shame. And, furthermore, the master himself is a philanthropist, and is glad to offer refuge to released criminals. The police commissioner who visits him boasts of his own kindly feelings for criminals, but does not hesitate a moment to expose publicly the secret of the man who has just succeeded in getting honorable work. One may say that for contrasts care has been well taken, the antithetical skeletons are skillfully covered with flesh and blood."

Some marked contrasts may be pointed out in *Das Blumenboot* (1905), but perhaps not many more than would ordinarily be found in a play of serious purpose having so many in the *dramatis personæ*. There must be variety in order that deadly monotony be avoided. Of the characters, I have only time to say that there are several contrasting sets and that the moral standards and ideals that govern them are opposed. Illustrations would require many pages. The four acts take place in the handsome residence of the Hoyers, whereas the *Zwischenspiel* between the second and third acts is in a low club of ultra Bohemian type, patronized by an ordinary set of actors and artists from variety theaters. It is called *Das Meer-schweinchen*, and to this Fred Hoyer takes his young wife on the night of their wedding, as he had promised the curious and advanced young lady he would do. So, we get a glimpse of two different faces of vice: the repulsive and repellent one in the *Meerschweinchen*, the polished and re-

finéd visage in the town-residence belonging to the Hoyers and in their villa near Berlin.

I do not care to pronounce judgment with conclusiveness, but if *Stein unter Steinen* be conceded to be an important criterion, then it must be admitted that Sudermann is still as fond of the artifice of contrast as he was at first, and that he uses it to almost as great an extent. But *Johannisfeuer* (1900), *Es lebe das Leben*, even *Sturmgesele Socrates* (1903), and *Das Blumenboot*, point rather toward a diminution in the glaring extent to which the ingenious device is employed. *Es lebe das Leben*, which, in a way, has as little of it as any of the plays yet published by Sudermann, is the only one of his most recent works that has achieved marked success in Germany. But the fact that *Die Ehre* and *Heimat*, in which contrasts play the greatest role, have also had the greatest success, tends to bear out Ibsen in the statement that "the personages of a play must be sharply contrasted in character and in purpose."

C. C. GLASCOCK.

Yale University.

#### SHAKSPERE AND THE CAPITOL.

The Capitol of Roman antiquity was the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus on the Mons Tarpeius: in a wider sense, the whole hill, including the temple and the citadel. With the deterioration of classical Latin we find the word used for any heathen temple ("In Capitoliis enim idola congesta erant." *S. Hieronymus adversus Luciferianos*. cap. i., cited by Ducange); then in the sense of a place of justice ("aedes in qua jus dicitur." *Gloss. Saxon. Aelfrici*, cited by Ducange); and, finally for the meeting place of the Senate (Jo. de Janua, "Capitolium dicitur a Capitulum quia ibi conveniebant Senatores sicut in Capitulo claustrales," cited by Ducange).

According to Mommsen (*Bk. i, vii*) the original meeting place of the Senate was within the area of the Capitol, but it was removed in very early days to the space where the ground falls away from the stronghold to the city, and there was erected the special Senate house called from

its builder Curia Hostilia. Here then the Senate met except under extraordinary circumstances, when, indeed, they could and did assemble in any consecrated building. At the time of Cæsar's assassination the Curia Hostilia was in process of reconstruction, under his orders, and meetings were held in Pompey's theatre. In North's *Plutarch* Cæsar is said to have been murdered in the Senate house, though there is one allusion which undoubtedly refers to the temporary meeting place:—"The place where the murder was prepared, and where the Senate were assembled, and where also there stood up an image of Pompey dedicated by himself amongst other ornaments which he gave unto the theatre."

That Shakspeare places the scene of the tragedy in the Capitol is usually regarded as an instance of conscious and deliberate variation from North's *Plutarch*. But is it not possible that Shakspeare in thinking of the setting of his great scene had no intention of departing from the narrative which had so strong an attraction for him and to which he was so deeply indebted? May it not have been that to his mind "Capitol" was only another name for the Senate house?

There was undoubtedly a very general impression that the Senate did meet in the Capitol, and consequently that the Capitol was the scene of Cæsar's death. It will be remembered that in *Hamlet*, III, ii, 108, Polonius, recalling his student days when he did enact Julius Cæsar, says:

I was kill'd i' th' Capitol: Brutus kill'd me.

an indication that in some University play familiar to Shakspeare, (possibly Dr. Edes' *Cæsar's Interfecti*, acted at Christ Church, Oxford, 1582), the scene of the assassination was placed in the Capitol.

The idea is found in the thirteenth century. In the *Life and Acts of the most victorious Conqueror Robert Bruce, King of Scotland*, by John Barbour, Archdeacon of Aberdeen, we have:—

Julius Cæsar als, that wan  
Britain and France, as doughty man,  
Africke, Arabe, Egypt, Syry,  
And all Europe also hailly,  
And for his worship and valour,  
Of Rome was made first Emperour.  
Syne in his Capitol was he,  
Through them of his counsel privie  
Slain with punsoun right to the dead;

And when he saw there was no read,  
His e'en with his hand closed he,  
For to die with more honesty. ll. 537-550.

In the Lincoln ms., *Morte Arthure*, 1400?, the word occurs three times, once speaking of the Capitol as a distinct building, and twice as the meeting place of the Senate.

Thei couerde þe capitoile, and keste doun þe walle.  
M. M. Banks, l. 280.

That on Lammesse daye thare be no lette founden,  
pat thow bee redy at Rome with all thi rounde table,  
Appere in his presens with thy price knyghtez,  
At pryme of the daye, in payne of þour lyvya,  
In e kydde Capytoile before þe kyng selvyn,  
When he and his senatours bez sette as them lykes.  
*Id.*, ll. 92-97.

Also:—

Now they raike to Rome the redyeste wayes,  
Knylles in the capatoylle, and comowns assembles,  
Soueraingez and senatours.  
*Id.*, ll. 2352-2354.

Chaucer expresses the same notion:—

This Julius to the Capitolie went  
Upon a day, as he was want to goon;  
And in the Capitolie anon him hente  
This false Brutus and his othere foon.  
*Monk's Tale.*

Coming back to Shakspeare we find in *Julius Cæsar*, I, ii, 187, 188:—

As we haue seene him in the Capitoll  
Being crost in Conference, by some Senatours.

which would seem to imply the scene of a regular senatorial debate. In *Titus Andronicus* and in *Coriolanus* it becomes perfectly evident that Shakspeare conceived of the Capitol as a *building* in which the meetings of the Senate took place:

Kepe then this passage to the Capitoll:  
And suffer not Dishonour to approach  
Th' Imperiall Seate to Vertue;  
*Titus Andronicus*, I, i, 12-14.

And again:—

And in the Capitoll and Senates right,  
Whom you pretend to Honour and Adore,  
That you withdraw you.

*Id.*, I, i, 41-43.

Later in the same scene there is the stage direction (F.<sup>1</sup>) "Flourish. They go up into the Senat house."

Coriolanus (III, i, 239) speaks of "th' Porch o' th' Capitoll:" and again (II, i, 90-93) Brutus says to Menenius:—

Come, come, you are well vnderstood to bee a perfecter gyber for the Table, then a necessary Bencher in the Capitoll.

This scene ends:—

*Brutus.* Let's to the Capitoll,  
And carry with us Eares and Eyes for th' time,  
But Hearts for the euent.

*Scicin.* Haue with you.

Act II, ii, begins with the stage direction (F.<sup>1</sup>):—

Enter two Officers, to lay cushions, as it were, in the Capitoll.

After a discussion between them the direction goes on:—

A Sennet. Enter the Patricians, and the Tribunes of the People, Lictors before them: Coriolanus, Menenius, Cominius the Consul: Scicinius and Brutus take their places by themselves: Coriolanus stands.

Later in the same scene Coriolanus goes away rather than hear his deeds discussed. When he re-enters he is greeted with—

*Menen.* The Senate, Coriolanus, are well pleas'd  
To make thee Consull.

II, ii, 96, 97.

Later, II, iii, 151-154,—

The People doe admit you and are summon'd  
To meet anon vpon your approbation.

*Corio.* Where? at the Senate-house?

*Scicin.* There, Coriolanus.

We have also, *Id.*, V, iv, 1-7:—

*Menen.* See you yond Coin o' th' capitol, yon'd corner-stone?

*Scicin.* Why, what of that?

*Menen.* If it be possible for you to displace it with your little finger, there is some hope the Ladies of Rome especially his Mother, may preuaile with him.

That Shakspeare shared this idea with at least one other Elizabethan dramatist may be determined by turning to Thomas Heywood's *Rape of Lucrece*. Here we have the same use of "Capitol" for the Parliament house:—

*Turquin.* The King should meet this day in parliament  
With all the Senate and Estates of Rome.

*Lucretius.* May it please thee, noble Tarquin, to attend  
The King this day in the high Capitoll?

I, i.

In discussing the prospects for this day, Valerius says—

I diuine we shall see scuffling to-day in the Capitoll.

I, i.

Brutus arising to address the assemblage says—

I claim the privilege of the nobility of Rome, and by that privilege my seat in the Capitoll. I am a lord by birth, my place is as free in the Capitoll as Horatius, thine; or thine, Lucretius; thine, Sextus; Aruns thine; or any here.—I, ii.

And again the idea of a splendid building—

Think how that worthy prince, our kinsman king,  
Was butchered in the marble Capitoll. II, i.

Is it not possible that so general a conception points to some common source, some definite, albeit incorrect notion of Roman archeology? Can we turn to a possible source of this general error?

About the time that the attempt was made in the twelfth century to restore the Senate to Rome, a guide book was put forth for the use of pilgrims to the Eternal City. It was a compilation by some one unknown, and was entitled *Mirabilia Urbis Romae*: the earliest extant copy is of the twelfth century, and is in the Vatican library. It proved immensely popular, going through many editions and translations in the succeeding centuries, and, of course, losing no whit of its wonderfulness at the hands of monkish copyists. A ms. of the thirteenth or fourteenth century, with additions, omissions, and rearrangements is in the Laurentian library at Florence, and being entitled *Graphia, Aurea Urbis Romae*, is ordinarily distinguished as the *Graphia*.

Says Gregorovius, in *History of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages* (M. A. Hamilton):—

"The twelfth century favoured the earliest studies of Roman archeology. The Senators, who flattered themselves that they had restored the republic on the Capitoll, calling to mind the monumental splendours of ancient Rome, rebuilt in imagination the city of wonders of their ancestors. . . . At the time of the restoration of the Senate, the *Graphia* and *Mirabilia* assumed the form in which they have come down to us; they were henceforth disseminated in transcripts, but were also reduced to absurdity by ignorant copyists. . . . The piecemeal origin

of the *Mirabilia*, at any rate, cannot be denied; nevertheless the original recension is missing. . . .

"In this curious composition, written by an unknown scholar, concerning *The Wonders of the City of Rome*, Roman archaeology, which has now attained such appalling proportions, puts forth its earliest shoots in a naïve and barbarous form and in a Latin as ruinous as its subject. . . .

"The book . . . contains nothing more or less than the archaeological knowledge of Rome, in an age when Italy made courageous effort to shake off the barbarism of the Middle Ages, the rule of priests, and the tyranny of the foreigner, at one stroke. The book of the *Mirabilia* consequently appears the logical consequence of the archaeological restoration of the ancient city in the time of the formation of the free commune."

Gregorovius, iv, 653-664.

As the *Mirabilia* and *Graphia* accounts of the Capitol show some differences it may be permissible to quote both:—

Capitolium quod erat caput mundi, ubi consules et senatores morabantur ad gubernandum orbem, cuius facies cooperta erat muris altis et firmis diu super fastigium montis vitro et auro undique coopertis et miris operibus laqueatis. Infra arcem palatium fuit miris operibus auro et argento et aere et lapidibus pretiosis perornatum, ut esset speculum omnibus gentibus.

Templa quoque quae infra arcem fuere, quae ad memoriam ducere possum, sunt haec. In summitate arcis super porticum crinorum fuit templum Iovis et Monetae, sicut repperitur in marthiologio Ovidii de faustis. In partem fori templum Vestae et Caesaris, ibi fuit cathedra pontificum paganorum, ubi senatores posuerunt Iulium Caesarem in cathedra sexta die infra mensem Martium. Ex alia parte Capitolii super Cannaparam templum Iunonis. iuxta forum publicum templum Herculis, in Tarpeio templum Asilis, ubi interfectus fuit Iulius Caesar a senatu. . . . Ideo dicebatur aureum Capitolium, quia prae omnibus regnis totius orbis pollebat sapientia et decore.<sup>1</sup>

*Mirabilia*, Cod. Vaticanus 3973.

<sup>1</sup> The Capitol is so called, because it was the head of the world, where consuls and senators abode to govern the Earth. The face thereof was covered with high walls and strong, rising above the top of the hill, and covered all over with glass and gold and marvellous carved work. . . . Within the fortress was a palace all adorned with marvellous works in gold and silver and brass and costly stones, to be a mirror to all nations; . . . Moreover the temples that were within the fortress, and which they can bring to remembrance, be these. In the uppermost part of the fortress, over the *Porticus Crinorum*, was the temple of Jupiter and Moneta, as is found in Ovid's *Martyrology of the Fasti*, wherein was Jupiter's image of gold, sitting on a throne of gold. Towards the market-place, the temple of Vesta and Caesar; there was the chair of the pagan pontiffs, wherein the senators had

Capitolium erat caput mundi ubi consules et senatores morabantur ad gubernandum orbem. Cuius facies cooperta erat muris altis et firmis super fastigio montis vitro et auro undique coopertis et miris operibus laqueatis ut esset speculum omnibus gentibus. In summitate arcis super porticum crinorum fuit templum jovis et monete. In quo erat aurea statua jovis sedens in aureo trono. In tarpeio templum asilum ubi interfectus est julius cesar a senatu.

*Graphia*, Laurentian ms.<sup>2</sup>

In connection with the last sentence quoted it is suggestive that the title of Dr. Edes' play, mentioned above, should have been *Cæsaris Interfecti*. It is difficult, however, to imagine just what idea was conveyed by the sentence as a whole. The "templum asilum" is probably the temple of which Plutarch speaks:—"Furthermore, when their cittie beganne a litle to be settled, they made a temple of refuge for all fugitives and afflicted persones, which they called the temple of the god Asylaeus. Where there was sanctuary and safety for all sortes of people that repaired thither," North's *Plutarch, Romulus*, Nutt's reprint, ed. Wyndham. But why should it have been supposed to be the scene of Cæsar's death? Unless, indeed, there was some notion that he fled there for sanctuary which was violated by the conspirators. At all events, English literary tradition seems to have ignored the templum asilum, but to have clung to the conception of the Capitol as a distinct and imposing building, the meeting-place of the Senate. One reason for this may be that the templum asilum is not mentioned in the passage of the *Polychronicon* quoted below.

Considering the popularity of this precursor of Baedeker it is not hard to account for the widespread notion of the Capitol as the scene of Cæsar's death. But the *Mirabilia* influenced English literature through another channel than the Latin text itself. The *Polychronicon* of Ralph Higden, c. 1327, has a description of Rome, transferred in

set Julius Caesar on the sixth day of the month of March. On the other side of the Capitol, over *Cannapara*, was the temple of Juno. Fast by the public market-place the temple of Hercules. In the Tarpeian hill, the temple of Asilis where Julius Caesar was slain of the Senate. . . . And it was therefore called Golden Capitol, because it excelled in wisdom and beauty before all the realms of the whole world.—Tr. F. M. Nicholls, 1889.

<sup>2</sup> These extracts from the *Mirabilia* and *Graphia* are from *Codes Urbes Romae Topographicus*. C. L. Ulrichs, 1871.

large measure, with due credit to one "Master Gregorius," from the *Mirabilia*. To the sufficiently amazing statements of the *Mirabilia* are appended extra absurdities, such as might come from the gossip of pilgrims. Of the *Polychronicon* there are more than one hundred Latin mss. extant, besides translations into English of the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries. It was printed by Caxton, 1482, and by Wynkin de Worde, 1495, and a glance at the few words therein devoted to the Capitol will demonstrate the connection with the *Mirabilia* :

"Item in Capitolio, quod erat altis muris vitro et auro coopertis, quasi speculum mundi sublimiter erectum, ubi consules et senatore mundum regebant, erat templum Jovis in quo statua Jovis aurea in throno aureo erat sedens."

This passage in the translation of John Trevisa, 1387, runs as follows :

"Also þe Capitol was arrayed wip hig walles i-heled wip glas and wip gold, as it were þe mirroure of all þe world aboute. þere consuls and senatours gouernede and rulede al þe world, as moche as was in here power ; and þere was Iupiters temple, and in þe temple wer Iupiters ymage of golde, sittynge in a trone."<sup>3</sup>

That Heywood was indebted to the *Polychronicon* rather than to the *Mirabilia* itself is shown in a speech in *The English Traveller*, I, i :

Sir, my husband  
Hath took much pleasure in your strange discourse  
About Jerusalem and the Holy Land :  
How the new city differs from the old,  
What ruins of the Temple yet remain,  
Or whether Sion, and those hills about,  
With the adjacent towns and villages,  
Keep that proportioned distance as we read ;  
And then in Rome, of that great pyramis  
Reared in the front, on four lions mounted ;  
How many of those idol temples stand,  
First dedicated to their heathen gods,  
Which ruined, which to better use repaired ;  
Of their Pantheon and their Capitol—  
What structures are demolished, what remain.

Higden mentions Mt. Sion and the Temple on its side and goes on to the relative positions of the Mt. of Olives, Calvary, and Golgotha, and also the villages of Bethpage and Bethany. The good

<sup>3</sup>The quotations from the *Polychronicon* and Trevisa's translation are taken from the edition of Churchhill Babington.

monk was also responsible for the motion of the pyramis on four lions mounted, a traveller's tale concerning the obelisk in front of St. Peter's, of which he says :—

Hanc autem pyramidem super quattuor leones fundatam peregrini mendosi acum beati Petri appellant, mentiunturque illum fore mundum a peccatis qui sub saxo illo liberius potuit repere.

With all due allowance for the high color of a guide book, whether in the twelfth or the twentieth century, the reader naturally wonders what this edifice may have been which the *Mirabilia* describes as of such dazzling splendour. Gregorovius is of the opinion that it was really the Tabularium that the Middle Ages regarded as the Senate house :

"Among the ruins of ancient monuments on which the eye rested on the Capitol, there were none mightier than the ancient office of State Archives, or the so-called Tabularium, belonging to republican times, with its gigantic walls of peperino, its lordly halls, and its vaulted chambers. The author who described the city in the twelfth century, and, in his cursory enumeration of the hills, only mentioned the Palatium of the Senators, must undoubtedly have thereby understood this mighty building. The populace, looking on the marvelous work, imagined that the ancient Consuls or Senators had dwelt within it, and the nobility of the twelfth century, beyond the church of Ara-coeli, found no more fitting spot for its meetings ; neither did the populace discover one more suitable when they determined to reinstate the Senate. We must consequently suppose that the Tabularium, which later became the actual Senate-House, had already been adapted to the uses of a Senate. It was here that the shadow of the Roman republic reappeared in 1143, hovering fantastically over the ruins—itsself a legend or a vision of the antiquity whose remembrance gladdened the hearts of its degenerate descendants.

Gregorovius, IV, 477.

And in a note to the above—

"Arnold of Brescia (d. 1155) summoned the Romans to restore the Capitol ; could this mean anything but to restore the greatest ruin, the Tabularium, as the meeting place of the Senate, and also, perhaps, to restore the Arx ?"

This conception of the Capitol was not only widespread, but it persisted even while the men of the New Learning had a clear understanding of the matter. Taking the date of *Julius Cæsar* as 1601 and Heywood's *Lucrece* as 1608, we have in 1604 *Julius Cæsar* by William Alexander, Lord Stirling. This is a dreary Senecan waste, but the

Messenger who describes the tragedy to Calpurnia is perfectly correct in his archeology:—

Then Caesar march'd forth to the fatal place;  
Nearer Pompey's Theatre where the Senate was.

And Ben Jonson in *Sejanus*, 1603, and in *Cataline*, 1611, shows his exact knowledge in making the Capitol the Arx or citadel, and in having the Senate meet in any consecrated building. However, Ben Jonson whisks the Senate about to an extent which would seem to exaggerate the facts, for authorities agree that meetings outside the regular Senate house, the Curia Hostilia, now covered by the church of S. Adriano, took place only under special conditions, such as prevailed on the fatal Ides of March.

In *Sejanus*, III, i, Tiberius swears—

By the Capitol  
And all our gods,

and *Cataline*, IV, i, opens in "A Street at the foot of the Capitol."

In *Sejanus*, V, x, the Temple of Apollo is given as the scene of the Senate's meeting, and later in the same scene we have—

*Terentius*. The whilst the senate at the temple of Concord  
Make haste to meet again.

In *Cataline* IV. ii the Praetor says,—

Fathers, take your places.  
Here in the house of Jupiter the Stayer,  
By edict from the consul Marcus Tullius,  
You're met, a frequent senate.

There is something restless and uncomfortable, a certain lack of dignity, in this picture of a peripatetic body, meeting hither and yon all over Rome. Perhaps the early poets and Shakspeare and Heywood had the best of it, romantically speaking, in their imposing vision of an imperial building with high walls and strong, rising above the top of the hill, and the glitter and splendour of the covering of glass and gold and marvellous carved work.

As farre as doth the Capitoll excede  
The meanest house in Rome; so farre my Sonne  
This Ladies Husband heere, this, (do you see)  
Whom you have banish'd, does exceed you all.  
*Coriolanus*, IV. ii, 39-42.

LIZETTE ANDREWS FISHER.

*Extension Teaching, Columbia University.*

*Molière*. A Biography. By H. C. CHATFIELD-TAYLOR. Dutton and Co., New York, 1906.

Unlike Shakespeare, Molière is so well accounted for, both as a poet and as a man, that a genuine Molière-question has never existed. Though there has been much theorizing on the nature of his art, speculative criticism has had little concern with the main facts of his life, or with that favorite theme of critics, the order of his works. Contemporary chronicle, allusions laudatory and libelous, the *Life* by Grimarest in 1705, and the very valuable 'Registre' of the actor La Grange—are quite sufficient to explain all essential points in his career. Thus, the biographer's task here would appear simple, were it not that biography depends as much on interpretation as on document, and that good interpreters are rare. As Renan once said to Tennyson: "la vérité est dans une nuance." To wring from the documents this illusive quality, to give to each detail its proper shade or color, and thereby to reanimate the facts—this in itself requires analytic and imaginative powers of a high order.

Apparently Mr. Chatfield-Taylor is alive to this responsibility, for he attempts, above all, to reconstruct the personality of Molière. As he states in his preface, his intention is to interpret, for English readers, "Molière's life by his plays and his plays by his life." One cannot quarrel with him for thus delimiting his subject. He has chosen the kernel from which all study of the poet should proceed; and—it may at once be said—he has handled his subject in a stimulating way. We are given a vivid picture of the poet's early surroundings: his father's comfortable bourgeois-home in the rue St. Honoré, and the respectable but cramped existence for which it stood; of the young Poquelin's longing for greater freedom, and his consequent flight to the stage. Then follow his period of apprenticeship with the 'Illustre Théâtre' and its light-hearted companions—the Béjarts, the storm-and-stress years in the provinces, so fertile in experience: as comedian first to the Duke of Épernon and then to the Prince of Conti, that fickle friend of Molière's school-days. And finally we read of the return to Paris, the 'Précieuses Ridicules' in 1659, the poet's worldly success and the friendship of the King,