The Plays and Poems of George Chapman: The Tragedies by T. M. Parrott; George Chapman
Review by: G. C. Macaulay
The Modern Language Review, Vol. 6, No. 2 (Apr., 1911), pp. 253-257
Published by: [Modern Humanities Research Association](#)
Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3713410>
Accessed: 25/06/2014 05:13

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>

temporary France is essential to a sound conception or estimate of the literary forces at work in England throughout the period of the Tudor sovereigns' rule, from the accession of King Henry VII to the death of Queen Elizabeth, and even through the generation beyond.'

L. E. KASTNER.

MANCHESTER.

The Plays and Poems of George Chapman: The Tragedies. Edited by T. M. PARROTT. London: Routledge. 1910. 8vo. xiv + 730 pp.

The need of a satisfactory edition of Chapman's plays has often been felt by students, and the work of which we have here the first instalment seems likely in a great measure to supply what was wanted. Of Chapman's dramatic works there are, as is well known, two modern editions, that published by Pearson in 1873, and that published by Chatto and Windus in 1874, the latter edited by R. H. Shepherd, who is generally thought to have been the editor also of the previous edition. Shepherd's text is not so bad as it has sometimes been said to be¹, but the edition nevertheless is a most unsatisfactory one. The editor gives no account whatever of the principles on which he has worked, and his alterations of the text of the quartos are not in any way indicated to the reader. Professor Parrott is the first to give us a text of Chapman's tragedies as a whole² on which we can rely, that is to say, accompanied by full information with regard to the authorities on which it is based and notes of all the variations from them which are admitted by the editor. In addition to this he supplies us with a full account of each play, including a good deal of very sound æsthetic criticism, and a large number of explanatory and illustrative notes, the last a very desirable adjunct to an edition of Chapman. He has not, of course, solved all the difficulties of textual criticism and interpretation which confront an editor of Chapman, but he has at least faced them courageously, and his attempts, though sometimes unsuccessful, will be of use to future workers. Some of the preliminary studies for this edition have been published in the *Modern Language Review*, as for example, the editor's investigation of the date of *Bussy d'Ambois* (Vol. III, pp. 126—140), and his notes on the text of the Byron plays (Vol. IV, pp. 40—64).

As regards questions of date and authorship the editor's judgment is usually sound. His reasons, stated in the *Modern Language Review*, for dating *Bussy d'Ambois* later than the death of Elizabeth have certainly considerable weight, but in this edition he has confined

¹ A good many unnecessary alterations are introduced, but in several instances Shepherd's emendations are good, and must be accepted: e.g. *Tragedy of Chabot*, i, 1. 187; ii, 2. 52; ii, 2. 119. This play had previously been edited by Dyce, but did not appear in the collected edition of 1873.

² Of *Bussy d'Ambois* and *The Revenge of Bussy d'Ambois* we have had satisfactory editions from Professor Boas.

himself to stating his conclusions, and the reader has no means of judging of their validity except by reference to the above-named article. In the notes, however, attention is called to the least weighty of the arguments, that which is based upon the mention of leap-year (i, 2. 82). It is really time that an effective protest should be made against the kind of reasoning of which this is an example. The author has occasion to introduce into his dialogue a jest of which the point, such as it is, turns upon the assumption that the action of the play takes place in a leap-year; but he cannot do this (it is assumed) except on one of two conditions, either that the action which is presented took place historically in a leap-year, or that it is leap-year at the time when the play is being produced. This is no burlesque of Professor Parrott's argument. 'Only one of two things can have suggested this jest to the author, either that it was a leap-year when the historical Bussy first appeared at court, or that it was a leap-year when the play was being composed for presentation¹.' Of course this is only a repetition of reasoning with which we are familiar. *Romeo and Juliet* must have been produced in 1591, because the Nurse says, 'Tis since the earthquake now eleven years,' and there was a noticeable earthquake in 1580: *The Old Law* must have been produced in 1599, because that is the assumed date of the action represented. (By the same rule it must have been first acted on the 11th of Hecatombaion, for nothing else could have suggested that date to the mind of an Elizabethan dramatist.) The leap-year argument is not essential, however, and we may reasonably accept for *Bussy d'Ambois*, as we have it in the first quarto, a date not earlier than 1604, though possibly the play may have existed earlier in a different form. As regards the revision of which the result is given in the second quarto, the editor is probably right in connecting it with the production of *The Revenge of Bussy d'Ambois*, and this may reasonably be dated 1610 or 1611. *The Tragedy of Chabot* is regarded by the editor as the result of a thorough revision by Shirley in 1634 of a play composed by Chapman soon after 1611, at which date appeared the earliest edition of Pasquier's *Recherches de la France* which can have been used as its source. Certainly it is improbable that there should have been an actual collaboration between Chapman and Shirley, and it is desirable, if possible, to bring this play into connection with the preceding series of dramas founded on French history. It is shown by the editor that there is a large amount of mixed work in the play, suggesting revision rather than collaboration, and that the contributions of Shirley may be traced in at least eight of the eleven scenes. Professor Parrott rightly refuses to allow that Chapman had any hand either in *Alphonsus Emperor of Germany* or in *Revenge for Honour*; and this being so, it might be considered reasonable that he should have excluded these plays from his edition, or at least printed them in an appendix, with a less elaborate apparatus of notes.

¹ *Modern Language Review*, Vol. III, p. 131.

The textual questions dealt with in this volume are often of considerable interest. In such remarks as have to be made upon them it will be convenient to follow the order of the plays.

Bussy d'Ambois, ii, 2. The editor is perhaps right in omitting at the beginning of this scene the fifty lines which are dropped in the second quarto, but hardly for the reason given. They are certainly not without dramatic significance. The supposed introduction of Montsurry in the preceding scene, as a spectator to whom no speech is assigned, does not in the least render them useless and is itself dramatically absurd.

The Revenge of Bussy d'Ambois, i, 1. 285. Professor Parrott objects to read 'Ere you were born' for 'Ere you're born,' because the latter reading 'shows the syncopated first foot common in Chapman,' and similarly in iv, 5. 105, v, 5. 5, where he will not read 'to the Court' for 'to' th Court,' 'opens' for 'opes,' in order not to get rid of this feature. (In *Bussy d'Ambois*, iii, 2. 1 he even assumes that the omission of 'my' in the second quarto is deliberate, with a view to metrical effect.) But this characteristic of Chapman's verse is purely imaginary: it cannot be shown that the author ever intentionally wrote such lines.

i, 1. 361. The parenthesis of the quarto is certainly right: 'never so thriftily' must of course belong to 'swearing.'

i, 1. 379. The alteration of 'friend' to 'brother' ought not to be accepted from Shepherd. In Elizabethan English 'friend' may be used of a near kinsman.

Byron's Conspiracy, ii, 1. 51. The alteration of 'service' to 'servant' is too hastily admitted. The meaning is 'My best powers in that and in all things vow service to you.'

ii, 1. 105. The emendation 'affirme' for 'assume' might well have been accepted from Mr P. A. Daniel, to whom are due also the excellent corrections in ll. 122 and 149.

iii, 1. 16. 'Tun'd in to Chaos' can hardly be right.

iii, 2. 224. 'feral' for 'femall' is a good correction: the context is quite appropriate.

iii, 3. 84. The editor says, 'This line lacks a syllable and is quite unintelligible.' (He has forgotten the theory about 'syncopated first foot'.) Read 'Out, remedy of pity.' The sense is fairly clear: 'remedy of pity' means, as Mr Daniel says, 'reason for discarding pity,' and is quite in Chapman's style.

iv, 1. 160. The editor should print 'Dolphin' here, and not modernise to 'Dauphin,' thus losing, or at least blunting, the point of the expression.

Byron's Tragedy, i, 1. 123. Shepherd's emendation 'overwatch'd' might well be accepted.

iii, 1. 124. The explanation given does not fit the text, which probably needs some correction.

iii, 2. 31. 'He will not come' should be given either as an exclamation or a question. This is clear from the context, especially l. 56, in spite of the different form which the remark has in the chronicle.

iii, 2. 44. There should be a note on 'dis[m]ay'd.'

iv, 2. 172 ff. The conversation of Henry with Auvergne is of course aside.

iv, 2. 294. The alteration here proposed is not convincing. The intransitive use of 'overthrow' is hardly to be found later than Middle English, and the falling over of a pageant because it was too large can hardly have been a familiar spectacle. We must be content with the more homely similitude of the quartos, which perhaps may be illustrated from the common saying 'Herculis cothurnos aptare infanti.'

The Tragedy of Chabot, i, 1. 206. 'In' for 'I' is no doubt right.

ii, 2. 51. 'arm'd,' as suggested in the note, might well have been adopted in the text. (The quarto reading is 'ariu'd,' not 'arriv'd.')

ii, 2. 87. The reading 'nor honour' is a good one, but it was first suggested by Brereton (*Mod. Lang. Rev.*, Vol. III, p. 67).

ii, 3. 103. The reading proposed by the editor is an excellent one and should have been adopted in the text.

iii, 2. 169 ff. The editor remarks that the syntax of this is unusually difficult, but neither he nor any other critic has perceived, apparently, what the solution of the difficulty is. It seems to me almost certain that the speeches of the Proctor-General and of Chabot have been by some means disarranged in the quarto. Chabot's speech is wrongly broken after l. 146 by the interpolation here of what should have been the conclusion of the Proctor's oration (ll. 147—168). If this be placed where it ought to go, after l. 116, little difficulty remains. We get rid of the very unnatural interruption at l. 146, and Chabot's speech at this point will read,

Only beseeching all your learned judgments,
Equal and pious conscience, to weigh
The variety and wonder now presented
To your most noble notice and the world's,
That all my life etc.

This simplifies the syntax very much, though it does not entirely reduce it to correctness, and gives a proper connection also for 'And then consider' in l. 178.

Cæsar and Pompey, i, 2. 193. 'To take' is of course right. Examples of the construction are very frequent: e.g. Shakspeare, *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, ii, 6. 1 ff. and ii, 7. 80.

i, 2. 288. I do not know what the editor means by his note, p. 667. Chapman of course wrote 'Great Agamemnon or the king of men' with reference to the Homeric *ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν*.

v, 1. 51. 'Left' seems a very probable emendation for 'Lost.'

The explanatory notes are often valuable, but leave a good many difficulties unsolved, as the editor would readily admit. The remarks which I have to make upon them shall be brief. In *Bussy d'Ambois*, v, 4. 135 ff., Professor Parrott can attach no definite meaning to the imagery, which, no doubt, is somewhat obscure. But Pindus and Ossa (not 'Pelion and Ossa') piled with their snows upon the hero's heart stand for the weight of cold with which death was oppressing him, and

which might have altogether benumbed his being, but that the red beams of his sun melted the snow into torrents of bitterness. In the *Revenge of Bussy*, iii, 2. 107, 'No time occurs to kings' is a translation of the legal maxim, 'Nullum tempus occurrit regi,' that is, 'No lapse of time impairs the king's rights.' Finally, the concluding lines of *Chabot*, which are given up by the editor as meaningless, may nevertheless be explained:

Kings, they say,
Die not or starve succession: Oh, why
Should that stand firm, and kings themselves despair
To find their subject still in the next heir?

That is, 'Kings can find successors always to themselves, but cannot always find a successor to such a subject as this.'

Let me conclude by saying that this edition of Chapman's tragedies is on the whole a very valuable contribution to scholarship, and that the volume containing the comedies will be looked for with much interest¹.

G. C. MACAULAY.

CAMBRIDGE.

The Authorship of 'Timon of Athens.' By E. H. WRIGHT. New York: Columbia University Press. 1910. 8vo. viii + 104 pp.

Timon of Athens has hardly received sufficient attention hitherto. Mr Wright has collected the results of previous critics, and with their help reconsidered from the beginning all the general problems connected with the play. The book is a useful one.

With regard to the sources, besides Plutarch he finds only the old play of *Timon* (or, no doubt, some lost source of that play) necessary. Lucian's dialogue may have been used. Mr Wright's method is to divide up the play roughly on aesthetic and technical grounds, and then, working on that division, to assign to Shakespeare and the 'other author' as far as possible their own shares in writing and plot-construction, and to solve the problem of priority. Principally from considerations of style and metre he gives Shakespeare more than most previous critics. In only two passages, the last half of I, 1 and the prose parts of III, 6, does he find it impossible to feel at all certain. Some of the ascriptions towards the end of IV, 3 on grounds of style and matter are not very convincing; and if the passages in this scene attributed to each had not been lumped together for the purposes of the 'metrical table' some contradictory results would have been reached.

The division thus made and every consideration of the play lead Mr Wright to accept Shakespeare's priority. This is rendered even more certain by the conclusions which he arrives at before the end of the book. But in any case this view, which most critics accept

¹ There are a good many trifling misprints scattered about the volume, which should be corrected in a future issue.