The Complete Works of William Shakespeare. Reprinted from the First Folio by Charlotte Porter; H. A. Clarke; William Shakespeare

Review by: G. Gregory Smith

The Modern Language Review, Vol. 2, No. 4 (Jul., 1907), pp. 358-360

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3713666>

Accessed: 28/06/2014 11:40

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>

outward features of the Elizabethan age, and any student of the period, who is content not to dive much below the surface, will find these pages well worth reading. The footnotes, which are plentifully supplied, are a useful feature of the book, but there is no index. This is indispensable to a work of the kind, and, should a second edition of the volume be called for, it should certainly be added.

F. S. BOAS.

The Complete Works of William Shakespeare. Reprinted from the First Folio. Edited by CHARLOTTE PORTER and H. A. CLARKE. With an Introduction by JOHN CHURTON COLLINS. 13 Volumes. London: G. G. Harrap. n. d. [1907]. 8vo.

It is hardly necessary nowadays to insist upon the superior value of the text of the First Folio. Perhaps the American undertakers¹ of this edition are justified in saying that the publication 'will be considered a literary event of more than usual importance,' for, apart from facsimiles such as Mr Sidney Lee's, there is no accessible, certainly no working, text of the Folio for the use of students, much less of general readers. Though it is matter for congratulation that English scholarship will soon make good this omission, there need be no hesitation in thanking Miss Porter and Miss Clarke for the work on which they have spent so much time. Their design is, in the words of Professor Collins, who introduces the edition to the English public, 'to furnish the general reader with all that is necessary for the intelligent study, in the commonly accepted sense of the term, of each one of the plays—with glossaries, that is to say, and with what is requisite in the way of commentary and prolegomena for the elucidation of the text and for the history generally of the drama—its source or sources, the probable date of its composition, the influences affecting it, its relation to the poet's other works.'

Mr Collins's claim that this reprint of the First Folio has been made 'with exact fidelity' has stood such tests as have been applied. It would have been a pleasure to have stated that the editorial annotation, especially in the matter of variants, showed like accuracy. The repetition of errors in the ascription of readings to certain editors, not to speak of the wrong rendering of these readings, seems to prove that the 'authorities' have not always been before the editors. A few notes on the text of *Henry V* may be taken as evidence of this.

P. 24, l. 75: 'enough. Go to—Pope.' Pope reads: 'enough, go to.'

¹ It would have been better had this edition given some indication that it is a reissue for the English market of an American publication by Charlotte Porter and Helen A. Clarke, 'Editors of the Camberwell Browning' (New York: Crowell & Co. Copyright 1903 and 1905). The 'Notes, Introduction, Glossary, List of Variorum Readings, and Selected Criticism' (as announced on the American title-page) have been modified or omitted, but the text of the entire book is printed from the old plates. The English edition is undated.

P. 42, ll. 13-17: '*If...bough*: 5 ll. ending me, me, hie, truly, bough—Capell.' The five lines do not end so in Capell, who prints ll. 16, 17 as prose (as in the Folio). Pistol's speech '*If...high*' had been arranged in three lines by Johnson. The Cambridge editors make the same error regarding Capell's treatment of ll. 16, 17.

P. 66, l. 4: 'Goodmorrow—Rowe.' For 'Rowe' read 'F₃.'

P. 75, l. 260: Rowe reads 'Think'st.'

P. 84, l. 4: '*Estes le Gentilhomme de bon*: êtes gentilhomme de bonne—Theobald.' Theobald reads 'estes le gentleman de bonne.'

P. 89, l. 1: 'Actus Quartus: out—Rowe.' For 'Rowe' read 'Pope.' This is a bad error, for it was Pope who first rearranged the Acts in the way now accepted.

P. 95, l. 170: '*and*: an't—Pope.' Pope has 'an.' The Cambridge editors read 'an't.'

P. 96, l. 12: Rowe's reading is 'any's.'

P. 103, l. 66: '*bu'y*: b'wi—Capell.' Capell reads 'be wi'.' Dyce reads 'b' wi'.' The same wrong ascription to Capell appears in the Cambridge text.

P. 116: '*Heretere*: Héritier—Hudson.' But Knight had suggested this before Hudson.

The Introductions to the Plays do not err by being severely learned. We are told that "Henry the Fifth" is a chronological continuation of "Henry the Fourth." The Second Part of the latter places Henry V upon the throne, while the present play narrates his warlike deeds. The broad comedy of "Henry the Fourth" is almost entirely omitted. Falstaff's death is related, and his companions have sorry parts. This play is a romantic historical drama.' All this is at once very correct and very simple; so simple, that editors of school-texts may blush for their unsuspected erudition. In the section on the 'Duration of the Action' we find that 'Shakespeare has here more openly violated the old-school notions of unity of time and place than in any other play.... "Henry V" was written in an earlier period when the classic unities were still greatly in vogue, and it is so constant a disregard of those principles as to proclaim his utter divorce from them. He seems to argue that, if the stirring scenes he is striving to depict could only be put in narrators' mouths, according to the Greek school, there would be small need of the imagination, whereas the imagination was clearly needed to reinforce the scenic poverty of the Elizabethan stage.... Since the idea of the romantic school, therefore, was different from the classic, and the spectator's imagination one of the fixed assets of the play, there was no necessity for the limits of time and place; and this is the conclusion to which Shakespeare arrived more pronouncedly in "Henry V" than in any other play.' Criticism of this kind hardly requires comment.

Mr Collins's General Introduction is a handsome defence of the First Folio, and incidentally of the aesthetic value of reprints unmodernized and untinkered in punctuation and capitals. 'The power of poetry in relation to its subtlest and most delicate effects is more dependent than we suppose on the form in which that poetry is

presented to us.' This has been a nice problem since the days when Swift wrote, satirically :

When Letters are in vulgar Shapes,
'Tis ten to one the Wit escapes ;
But, when in Capitals exprest,
The dullest Reader smoaks the Jest.

The matter should be beyond debate nowadays, especially in editions addressed to scholars. Mr Collins's defence conveys the suspicion that this text is intended for some who have to be convinced of the propriety of printing :

to dye, to sleepe
No more ; and by a sleepe, to say we end
The Heart-ake, and the thousand Naturall shockes
That Flesh is heyre too?

The aids offered by Miss Porter and Miss Clarke, as quoted above, would seem to show, too, that they consider that some of their readers are not in a position to appreciate a strict text.

G. GREGORY SMITH.

Ben Jonson's Sad Shepherd, with Waldron's Continuation. Edited by W. W. GREG. (*Materialien zur Kunde des älteren Englischen Dramas*, XI.) Louvain: Uystpruyt, 1905. xxv + 99 pp.

Ben Jonson's Every Man out of his Humor. Reprinted from Holme's Quarto of 1600 by W. BANG and W. W. GREG. (Same Series, XVI.) 1907. viii + 128 pp.

Ben Jonson's Every Man out of his Humor. Reprinted from Linge's Quarto by W. BANG and W. W. GREG. (Same Series, XVII.) 1907. vii + 128 pp.

Professor Bang and Mr Greg are unwearied in their contributions to the study of Jonson's text. Within two years they have produced, in the *Materialien*, no less than five volumes of more than ordinary interest, and they promise others. The first object of the editors is to place in the hands of students of Ben Jonson accurate copies of early or important texts; in some cases, as in those of the Holme and Linge Quartos, it is their only purpose. Occasionally, when critical opportunities arise, as they do in the *Sad Shepherd*, a reasonable amount of prefatory matter and notes is presented with the carefully prepared text.

Since Mr Greg wrote this introduction to the *Sad Shepherd*, he has restated (but not quite so fully) in his *Pastoral Poetry and Pastoral Drama* (1906) his conclusions regarding the text. The chief points in these are that the text, though obviously a fragment of the play which Jonson had planned, has not been mutilated; that the *Sad Shepherd* cannot be identical with the *May Lord* mentioned by Drummond of Hawthornden, though some passages in the one may have been taken from the other; and that, whereas the latter was probably written in