Review

Author(s): A. W. Pollard

Review by: A. W. Pollard

Source: *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 16, No. 3/4 (Jul. - Oct., 1921), pp. 339-340

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3713931>

Accessed: 16-02-2016 14:36 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>

towards Surrey as a man who has a right to his method, whose work is interesting and significant in itself as well as a fruitful field for the student of literary origins. Prof. Padelford has performed a signal service in what he has done to open up this field.

G. D. WILLCOCK.

ENGLEFIELD GREEN, SURREY.

The Text of Henry V. By HEREWARD T. PRICE. Newcastle under Lyme : Mandley and Unett. n. d. 55 pp. 2s. 6d.

Mr Hereward Price's paper on *The Text of Henry V* is based on so much honest spade-work and presents its case so temperately that, although it is largely devoted to the destruction of the theories of Mr Dover Wilson and myself, I hope it will find many readers. The case which Mr Price attacks, as it was set forth in the Literary Supplement of the *Times*, is that the pirated Quarto of *Henry V* (1600), in common with the pirated Quartos of *Romeo and Juliet* (1597), the *Merry Wives of Windsor* (1602) and *Hamlet* (1603), was based on the manuscript of an abridged version of an earlier text of the play, eked out with the help of a minor actor in the play as finally staged, partly from memory, partly from his own manuscript 'parts.' Mr Price's case is that the Folio text of *Henry V* was written as a single whole by Shakespeare for performance at the Globe in 1599, and that the Quarto text is the work of two pirates, a pirate in the audience present at an abridged performance of the play who used the system of short-hand set forth by Timothy Bright in his *Characterie* in 1588, and a pirate-actor, who supplied transcripts of his 'parts' of Essex (probably), Gower and the Governor of Harfleur, much as Mr Wilson and I suppose. The main differences between us are thus: (i) that Mr Price brings in a pirate in the audience to take the place of the abridged manuscript which forms part of the rival hypothesis, (ii) that he regards the play as written all of a piece, whereas Mr Wilson and I think it had existed before 1599 in a different form.

The first of these two differences is not fundamental. A publisher who would employ a pirate-actor might well employ a short-hand writer in the audience, if he thought the sale of the book would bear the double expense. Mr Price's main evidence for the use of a short-hand writer is that in Bright's system synonyms would tend to be confused, and that we can thus explain the numerous variants between Quarto and Folio, such as *graue* and *tombe*, *hurt* and *harm'd*, *check* and *chide*, *reckoning* and *estimation*, etc. He himself, however, is careful to warn his readers that his list 'is not so convincing as it looks,' as similar substitutions of one synonym for another are found where there is no question of piracy. I think his evidence for a pirate in the audience will be found weak, and lest this belief should appear somewhat less than impartial, I will balance it by admitting that in the case of *Henry V* the evidence that the publisher had got hold of a playhouse manuscript

of an abridged version is weak also, unless the much stronger evidence that this was so in the other three piracies is admitted to support it.

In support of his more important contention that Shakespeare wrote *Henry V*, as it stands in the Folio, all of a piece, Mr Price has done a valuable bit of spade-work, which enables him to claim that in numerous instances the Folio is nearer to Holinshed than the Quarto and must therefore be regarded not as a revision, but as the earlier version. He himself regards this evidence as decisive, but its relevance largely depends on how we imagine an Elizabethan dramatist worked, when called in to make an old play more attractive. Sometimes, no doubt, a dramatist would rewrite an old play as a whole; more often, it may be submitted, he rewrote only certain scenes, or parts of scenes. Now it is precisely where *Henry V* follows Holinshed most closely that I find it difficult to believe that Shakespeare wrote it about the time that he was writing *Julius Caesar*. On the other hand all that relates to Falstaff and Pistol *must* be of about this date. In the Pirated Quarto the process of abridging and transcribing would take the text farther from Holinshed than is the Folio, in which the historical verse need not have been touched; the prose humours on the other hand are simple piracies. If, as seems clear, the incredibly lame couplet which ends the Prologue to Act II,

But till the King come forth and not till then
Vnto Southampton do we shift our scene,

is an addition to explain the insertion of two London scenes in an Act which the rest of the Prologue places wholly in Southampton and France, then there must have been an earlier version of the play to correspond with the Prologue in its original form. Mr Price passes over this point in silence, and thereby weakens his case. But his pamphlet is a very able one, which no one interested in the play can afford to neglect, and for which I am personally very grateful.

LONDON.

A. W. POLLARD.

Philip Massinger. By A. H. CRUICKSHANK. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1920. 228 pp. 15s.

In view of the light that has been thrown upon his writings since the days of Gifford, Hartley Coleridge and Cunningham, an adequate modern monograph on Massinger has long been needed. The want still remains to be supplied, for Professor Cruickshank's study of the dramatist is disappointingly incomplete and superficial. It contains no systematic discussion either of the dates of Massinger's plays or of the sources whence he derived his plots, nor (a more serious omission) is any attempt made to bring within the critical survey of the dramatist's work, the large bulk of that work (unrecognized by Gifford and the earlier critics) contained in the 'Beaumont and Fletcher' folios, and this although Professor Cruickshank is conscious of the injustice that has been done to Massinger through the tacit acceptance of the early uncritical attribution to Beaumont and Fletcher of some of the best of his work.