Review

Author(s): G. C. Moore Smith

Review by: G. C. Moore Smith

Source: *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 10, No. 3 (Jul., 1915), pp. 383-384

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3712635>

Accessed: 03-12-2015 23:09 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>

Fansler to designate his processes and results would at least suggest. Similarly one must take issue with the second emphasis of the book—that ‘the one thing that binds all Elizabethan tragedy together from *Gorboduc* to *The Traitor* and *The Cardinal* is the influence of Seneca.’ The influence of Professor Thorndike’s *Tragedy* and his articles on the revenge plays is so marked in the book—being more than once acknowledged in general terms—that one cannot help regretting the failure to follow him here to the point of giving some adequate recognition to plays of the non-Senecan sort—especially to the domestic type represented by *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, *A Yorkshire Tragedy*, etc. His influence might have suggested, too, the necessity for reckoning with the Elizabethan and very un-Senecan custom of combining comedy elements with tragedy. Such a custom must inevitably have affected the technique of a tragedy at many points.

The style of the book is greatly injured by its extreme colloquialism, shown in the frequent use of the interrogative sentence, the tendency to coin such words as ‘thereforeness,’ ‘future-looking,’ the energetic statement of personal opinions as being personal, etc. These traits take it out of the realm of academic desiccation and frequently cripple a well-wrought argument. Judged rigorously the book can hardly be called a contribution at any point, but it is often interesting in its restatement of accepted ideas and at several points is stimulating.

O. L. HATCHER.

BRYN MAWR, U.S.A.

Shakespeare’s Macbeth. Edited with Introduction and Notes by H. J. C. GRIERSON. (Select Plays of Shakespeare, General Editor, J. C. SMITH.) Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1914. xl + 172 pp.

This is an excellent edition of the play. It does not aim so directly as Mr Verity’s editions do at satisfying the particular needs of Local Examination candidates, and probably it will not oust Mr Verity’s *Macbeth* from its special market. But riper students of Shakespeare will find it very fresh and stimulating.

Professor Grierson’s Introduction abounds in fine criticism and happy literary illustrations. He takes the view that Lady Macbeth was not merely absorbed in satisfying her husband’s ambition, but was ambitious on her own account—that (in spite of I, vii, 48) Macbeth had not communicated to her before the opening of the play any hint of his embryo intention of murdering Duncan—that the play undoubtedly contains additions by Middleton, and possibly passages by an earlier hand which however have been reworked by Shakespeare: and that probably no part of Shakespeare’s work has been lost. As to the last thesis, that the play is not defective, it seems to us that Duncan’s

invitation to *Macbeth* (I, iv, 42), 'From hence to Inverness,' etc., is at least surprisingly curt, that the introduction of the Third Murderer needs explanation, and that the passages (II, i, 16) 'and shut up' and (III, ii, 34, etc.) 'Unsafe the while' bear clear signs of mutilation.

The Notes (in which Professor Grierson has been assisted by Mr J. C. Smith) give little ground for criticism. On (III, ii, 51) 'the crow Makes wing to the rooky wood,' we are told that 'rooky' cannot mean 'misty,' as the word 'roky' belonged to the northern or E. Anglian dialect, and was probably quite unknown to Shakespeare. He is a bold man who would say what was unknown to Shakespeare: but we cannot think that Shakespeare would tell us, as the editors hold, that 'the crow makes way to the rook-haunted wood.'

On (I, iii, 6) 'the rump-fed ronyon,' we are told that this 'is either the scabby creature fed on offal, or the pampered, well-fed scurvy creature who grudges one a chestnut.' But to see how 'chestnut' comes in, one must turn from this edition to the 'Warwick' edition of *Macbeth*, and one will still be at a loss to see how the sense 'grudges one' can be got at. As to the crux (III, iv, 105) 'If trembling I inhabit,' the editors ignore one plausible explanation (pointed out to me by Mr Verity, though not given in his edition) by which 'inhabit' = 'harbour,' as in *As you like it*, III, iii, 10, 'ill-inhabited.' They do not point out the allusion to the *Spanish Tragedy* in III, vi, 5—7 (see *Modern Language Review*, vol. I, p. 54). On v, vii, 82 we are told that 'God be with him' (three syllables in the verse, as 'God be with you' at III, i, 43) is to be pronounced 'God b' with him.' Do not the common 1st Folio forms 'God buy you,' 'God buy' you' rather suggest the pronunciation 'God buy him'?

Mr J. C. Smith provides an Appendix on the structure and staging of the play and another on Prosody. The latter is less easy reading than the similar article by Sir Henry Newbolt in his edition of *Richard II* in this series, but gives more detailed information. Both writers go in our opinion too far in discountenancing the syncopation of syllables in Shakespeare's verse. This appears to be the present tendency, but we incline to think that the treatment of prosody in Professor Herford's *Richard II* ('Warwick Shakespeare') is a safer guide to the young student than that of either Sir Henry Newbolt or Mr Smith. We should ourselves print as two lines the three (I, ii, 37—39):

As cannons overcharg'd with double cracks;
So they
Doubly redoubled strokes upon the foe.

The first line, we believe, is to be read 'As cann'ns o'ercharg'd,' etc. But this is indeed 'against the canon.'

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

SHEFFIELD.